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The history of a university should be of interest to all its stakeholders. Staff can be proud of working for an institution that has made, and is making, positive contributions to knowledge that benefits society. Alumni and students can learn more about the institution that is designed to help shape their careers and well-being. Employers can better appreciate what the institution has done, and is doing, to ensure that their employees enable them to succeed in a competitive world. Sponsors and representatives who generously give their money, time and expertise to the institution can share the pride that comes with progress and success.

To stakeholder benefits can be added the academic ones that emerge when researching an organization across time. Two topics that are continually being discussed in the management literature are leadership and change. These topics are particularly relevant to the higher education sector with the challenges created by global competition and reduced state funding. Today the role of Vice-Chancellor is as demanding as that of any CEO in a large organization. Vice-Chancellors have to be alert to the problems and opportunities being created by a changing environment, possess the knowledge and skills to lead their institutions through change and to do so in ways that win and maintain the commitment of current and future stakeholders.

Leadership and change are the underlying themes in this history. The early history of City University has already been well covered in John Teague’s account of the period from its foundation in 1894 to 1978 (Teague 1980). The present history will therefore focus on the period 1978 to 2008, touching on the earlier years when necessary to help the reader understand the evolution of the University. On achieving university status in 1966 the first Vice-Chancellor was Sir James Tait (1966-1974); the second was Edward Parkes (1974-78), later Sir Edward Parkes. In 1978 Professor Raoul Franklin became the third Vice-Chancellor until he retired in 1998. In 1998 Professor David Rhind succeeded him. When he resigned in 2007, Professor Malcolm Gillies succeeded him. Thus this publication of the University’s history covers primarily the leadership years of Franklin, Rhind and the first year of Gillies. Prior to gaining university status the Principals of the institution were: Robert Mullineux Walmsley (1896-1924); Samuel C. Laws (1924-47); J. Eric Richardson (1947-56); and James Sharp Tait (1957-66), later Sir James Tait.

Outline of subsequent chapters.
Chapter 1 is an overview of the academic development of the University. As well as linking into the earlier publication of the institution’s history, it shows the academic changes that have taken place under the guidance of successive Vice-Chancellors. Chapter 2 illustrates how the funding bodies, and other government agencies, have used their financial muscles to exert pressure for change; how the University responded to these pressures during the period 1978 to 1993 is outlined. Chapter 3 continues this theme, but in the context of corporate governance. A number of reports have enhanced the importance of ‘good’ corporate governance, and the Higher Education sector has been pressurized to conform to the reforms that are recognized as good practice in the commercial sector. The very significant reforms introduced by the University from 1998
to 2008 are outlined. Chapter 4 shifts focus onto the constituent parts that form the core of the University – the Schools where teaching and research are carried out. A brief account of the development of each School is given. The aim here is to convey the academic complexity that faces those responsible for managing the University, and not to write a detailed history of each School. So far only one detailed history of a School has been published (Williams 2006).

Chapter 5 reverts back to a university-wide perspective and explores the negotiations and alliances entered into with other academic institutions during the years 1978 to 2008. One was a failed attempt to ‘force’ a merger on the University (i.e., with City Polytechnic), while others reflected one of the successful strategic aims of the University, i.e., validation partnerships.

Chapter 6 focuses on two groups of stakeholders – sponsors and alumni – and shows how they have made important contributions to the development of the University. Chapter 7 concludes the University’s history so far by introducing one of the latest environmental features affecting its progress – competitive rankings. Leadership is highlighted as the internal force most likely to enable the University to cope with its environmental challenges. A theoretical discussion of the concept is inappropriate here, except to say that leadership is understood to be a distributed force affecting the development of a complex social system embedded in an unstable and ever more complex environment. Multiple examples are given of leadership-induced changes that have facilitated a positive outcome to the University’s historical progress. In keeping with the brief of researching and writing a history that is short rather than detailed, a limited number of ‘leaders’ have been identified by name. This in no way lessens the role and contributions of those not named.

The approach used in researching the University’s history is outlined in Appendix 1. This appendix also includes grateful acknowledgments to all those individuals without whose help the value of this history would have been much reduced.

Displayed in the Box below is a chronological list of some major events and achievements during the years 1978 to 2008. Its purpose is to familiarize the reader at the outset with some historical facts, and to enable them to place subsequent observations in their right sequence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some major events &amp; achievements: 1978 to 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978 Dr Raoul Franklin appointed Vice-Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 Lord Mais succeeds Lord Alport as Pro-Chancellor &amp; Chair of Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 Thatcher government policies create a series of financial crises for universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 Lord Howie appointed Pro-Chancellor &amp; Chair of Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 First attempt to force a merger with City of London Polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 St Bartholomew’s College of Nursing &amp; Midwifery incorporated into University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 Sir John Leahy appointed Pro-Chancellor &amp; Chair of Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1992 Second attempt to force a merger with City of London Polytechnic

1993 Sale of City Technology Ltd for £24.5 million gross £20 million net

1994 Centenary celebrations

1997 Sir Paul Newall appointed Pro-Chancellor & Chair of Council

1998 Professor David Rhind appointed Vice-Chancellor

2001 Inns of Court School of Law incorporated into University

2003 The Queen opens the new building for Cass Business School

2004 Sir David Howard appointed Pro-Chancellor & Chair of Council

2006 Supplemental Charter and Statutes approved by Privy Council

2007 Professor Malcolm Gillies appointed Vice-Chancellor

2008 The University raised over £24 million in philanthropic gifts in 2004-08
CHAPTER 1


Mission, strategies and culture

Nowadays any discussion about leading organizational change will inevitably mention mission, strategic goals and culture. A useful research literature has been built around these concepts. ‘Mission’ highlights the overall goal that provides the purpose for which the organization exists; ‘strategic goals’ indicate the pathways through which the mission is to be achieved, and thereby defines the dominant environmental features of the organisation; ‘culture’ has many facets, but is often expressed as the values and routines that characterize the organization when dealing with its environment. Mission, strategies and culture are closely intertwined in, for instance, the academic profile of the institution (i.e., the areas of knowledge in which teaching and research occur). It is the evolution of the academic profile of the University that will be the focus of this chapter.

In the early history of the University, John Teague shows how the Northampton Institute came about (Teague 1980). The original aims of the Institute were spelt out in 1891, several years before recruiting its first students (see Box 1.1). These aims were successfully pursued by the founding members (individuals and institutions), who were particularly concerned in educating the ‘whole person’. Indeed, the first Principal (Robert Mullineux Walmsley, 1896-1924) was someone who had been a technical teacher at the Finsbury Technical College before becoming a Professor of Electrical Engineering and Applied Physics at Heriot-Watt College in Edinburgh. His leadership of the Northampton Institute was undoubtedly influenced by his early experiences at Finsbury Technical College. The needs of the Clerkenwell district, packed with small workshops, meant that the six departments in the 1890’s spanned mechanical engineering and metal trades (covered building and furniture trades), artistic crafts, applied physics and electrical engineering, horology (clockmaking, springing and timing), electro-chemistry, domestic economy and women’s trades (included dress making, household management and health, artificial flower making and tailor’s cutting).

During the first half of Walmsley’s stewardship the engineering areas expanded (e.g. aeronautical engineering), some subjects were given independent recognition (e.g. technical optics was hived off from the department of applied physics, and electrical engineering was given departmental status), while subjects with less academic content were transferred to other institutions (e.g. domestic economy). Following a visit to American technical educational institutes in 1903 he introduced the idea of ‘sandwich courses’ where students spent some of their time within a firm while maintaining a degree of academic supervision. Moreover, an international element was introduced by him when placing some students in firms abroad. Sandwich courses became a distinctive feature of Northampton when it achieved College of Advanced Technology status in 1957. As early as 1908-09 Northampton candidates were presented for the University of London BSc degrees in engineering (from 1900 selected individuals were recognized as teachers of London University).
Box 1.1. The original aims of the Northampton Institute, 1891 (Teague, 1980, p.27)

“The promotion of the industrial skill, general knowledge, health and well-being of young men and women belonging to the poorer classes, by the following means:

1. Instruction in:
   a) The general rules and principles of the arts and sciences applicable to any handicraft, trade or business.
   b) The practical application of such general rules and principles in any handicraft, trade, or business.
   c) Branches or details of any handicraft, trade, or business, facilities for acquiring the knowledge of which cannot usually be obtained in the workshop or other place of business.

The classes and lectures shall not be designed or arranged so as to be in substitution for the practical experience of the workshop or place of business, but so as to be supplementary thereto.

2. Instruction suitable for persons intending to emigrate.

3. Instruction in such other branches and subjects of art, science, language, literature and general knowledge as may be approved by the Governing Body.

4. Public lectures or courses of lectures, musical and other entertainments and exhibitions.

5. Instruction and practice in gymnastics, drill, swimming, and other bodily exercises.

6. Facilities for the formation and meeting of clubs and societies.

7. A library, museum, and reading-room or reading-rooms.”

Samuel Laws (1924-47) succeeded Walmesley as Principal. His many previous posts included Lecturer in Physics at King’s College, London, and Principal of Loughborough Technical College. In 1924 Laws made an unsuccessful bid for Northampton to become a full school of London University. By now there were 14 ‘recognised teachers’ and 80 registered London University students. A period of growth and consolidation followed, and there was no change in subject coverage. He was succeeded in 1947 by Eric Richardson (1947-56), whose previous post was Principal of the Royal Technical College, Salford. This was a period of expansion, new buildings, and activities aimed at fulfilling the conditions of those institutions seeking to be recognised as one of the prospective colleges of advanced technology (CAT). The conditions had initially been expressed in the Report of Lord Percy’s Departmental Committee on Higher Technological Education in 1945. Given the subsequent development of management as a discipline at the University it is worth noting that one of the conditions was: Management Studies should be part of all courses in the final two years and one institution at least should be selected as a centre for the post-graduate study of industrial administration. By 1957 The Northampton met the criteria that had been specified in the Ministry of Education Circular 305 for achieving the CAT status. Three of these conditions specified: the college must provide a broad range and substantial
volume of technological and allied work exclusively at advanced level including research
and postgraduate work; the constitution of the governing body should be such that it
includes strong direct representation of industry, reasonable representation of authorities
who regularly contribute substantial numbers of students to the college, and universities
and professional technological interests; an advisory committee representing in particular
industry and the appropriate professional bodies, should be established for each
technology studied in the college.

Sir James Tait. On the day that James Tait (1957-66) took up the position of
Principal of the Northampton, the college was designated a College of Advanced
Technology (CAT). Tait had previously been Head of the Department of Electrical
Engineering (1947-51) at the Northampton and then Principal of Woolwich Polytechnic
(1951-56). In his reference to Tait, Teague comments: “Of outstanding ability, the right
man in post at the right time for his immense initiative and drive to lead the college to full
university status in nine years upon a flood-tide of national concentration of resources on
higher education particularly in science and engineering” (p. 108).

In 1966 the mission and strategies of the University were embodied in its Royal
Charter. This new status resulted from a recommendation made by the Robbins Report
on Higher Education (1963). The key paragraph in the Royal Charter is reproduced in
Box 1.2. It is not surprising that the emphasis remained on science and technology, given
the University’s earlier history and its CAT status.

Box 1.2 A statement from the 1966 Royal Charter.

“The objects of the University shall be to advance knowledge, wisdom and understanding
by teaching, research and professional training, particularly in science and technology,
both within the University and in close association with industry and commerce, and by
example and influence of its corporate life to benefit society.”

In the last year of the CAT period (1957-66) the academic departments were as
shown in Box 1.3. Little change was made to the academic profile on gaining university
status. Production Technology and Control Engineering changed its name to Automation
Engineering, and Management and Social Science was split into the Department of
Management and the Department of Social Science and Humanities. There were several
reasons for this split including the motion passed by the Court of Common Council of the
City of London in June 1965: “In connection with the new City University, the
corporation would welcome the establishment of a Faculty for Business
Management…..”(Williams 2006). The culture of the institution’s past was clearly
preserved in the domination of the engineering departments. Nevertheless, the seeds for
future change were sown at this time by the recognition of those in power that the future
of the University lay in being closely linked to the City of London. This was
demonstrated by Oliver Thomson (Chairman of Governors) and James Tait (Principal)
striving successfully to get the name of ‘The City University’ accepted against strong
opposition from the University of London, and by forging links with the City Corporation
through the brilliant idea of installing successive Lord Mayors as Chancellors of the new
University.
Sir Edward Parkes. However, in the early years of the University the expected student numbers in science and engineering fell far short of the targets agreed with the University Grants Committee (UGC) for the 1970s. This was the challenge facing Edward Parkes when he was appointed Vice-Chancellor in 1974. Parkes was formerly Professor of Mechanics in the University of Cambridge; previous to that he was Head of the Department of Engineering, University of Leicester, following earlier experience at the Royal Aircraft Establishment.

The fall in numbers of science and engineering students was partially compensated for by innovative developments in other academic areas, particularly in the field of business and management. One of the constraints under which the University had to operate was that academic initiatives had to be self-financing if not previously approved by the UGC. An example of this was the University's decision to launch in 1977 a Diploma in Law against the advice of the UGC, but with the support of the Council of Legal Education. In later years this example of entrepreneurial behaviour became a blessing; it encouraged the University to develop a culture which became less and less dependent upon the vagaries of successive government policies toward higher education (see next chapter). By 1978/79 the departmental/centre profile of the University showed considerable expansion and diversification (Box 1.4).

**Box 1.3 Academic profile in 1965/66.**

*Civil and Mechanical Engineering
*Electrical and Electronic Engineering
*Aeronautics and Space Technology
*Production Technology and Control Engineering
*Mathematics
*Physics
*Chemistry
*Management and Social Science
*Ophthalmic Optics.

**Box 1.4 Academic profile in 1977/78.**

*Civil Engineering
*Mechanical Engineering
*Electrical and Electronic Engineering
*Systems Science (previously Automation Engineering)
*Aeronautics
*Mathematics
*Computer Science
*Physics
*Chemistry
*Optometry and Visual Science
*Social Science and Humanities
*City University Business School
*Centre for Information Science
Professor Raoul Franklin. In 1978 Parkes was invited by the Secretary of State for Education and Science to become Chairman of the University Grants Committee. Raoul Franklin was appointed Vice-Chancellor in October 1978. Previously he was Tutor and Fellow of Keble College, Oxford, and a lecturer in the Department of Engineering Science. Besides his impressive career as a researcher in plasma physics, he had gained considerable administrative experience while at Oxford (e.g., for several years chairing the General Board which controlled 70% of the university’s budget). During the 20 years of his Vice-Chancellorship at City the academic structure changed significantly. A major factor in this process was the continuing fall in student numbers in engineering combined with government cutbacks to the higher education sector. In adapting to these environmental challenges leadership initiatives were taken which resulted in a re-synchronization between mission, strategies, structures, products/services, financial and human resource policies. The changes that occurred were described in the preface to the Vice-Chancellor’s annual report to Court for 1996. This statement of the mission and objectives of the University (see Box 1.5) mirrors the changes that had taken place as well as indicating future changes. The focus of attention was now much broader than science and technology; the sphere of influence was widened beyond the national to the international; educational and training services were provided beyond industry and business to public enterprises (e.g. the National Health Service). The emergence of newer markets was recognised (e.g. providing a validation service to institutions not able to award their own degrees; meeting the needs of the continuing education market).

**Box 1.5 Mission and strategies as expressed in the 1995/96 Annual Report to Court**

City University’s mission is to advance knowledge, wisdom and understanding by teaching, research and professional training. Within this mission, the university has these particular objectives.

*To contribute significantly to the reputation and strengths of London as an international city and world centre.*

*To maintain a distinctive place in meeting the higher education needs of the professions and business enterprises, both in the City of London and in the wider metropolis.*

*To develop major schools with a significant European reputation in professionally-related fields.*

*To undertake research of national and international excellence.*

*To support UK industry by promoting understanding of its engineering, financial, social and environmental aspects.*

*To be a major regional provider of quality education and training in the National Health Service.*
*To form developmental links with other educational providers, through affiliation and validation.
*To meet local and regional needs for employment-related continuing education, in collaboration with the Further Education sector and other providers.
*City University has built its reputation on excellence in professional education, dating back to 1894, in pursuing its mission, the University continues to value this heritage.

Evidence of these changes, and the commitment to future change, can be seen in the University’s school/departmental profile in 1996. The process of forming departments into schools had begun in the 1980s in order to decrease the amount of bureaucracy that had developed with growth in size. Having a structure to cope with the situation that had arisen required greater devolution of power down the chain of command. Note the absence of the two basic sciences of physics and chemistry, the relative decrease in engineering and the corresponding rise of new academic areas. Also notable is the presence of the St Bartholomew School of Nursing and Midwifery which was incorporated in 1995/96; this provided a significant boost to the size of the University - staff numbers increased by over 200 and student numbers by 1000. Validation partnerships with other institutions are not shown in this list because they were administered by the Registrar’s Office although the academic leaders were drawn from appropriate schools/departments. Validation was a minor but noteworthy part of the university’s strategy in fulfilling its mission, increasing its income and enlarging its alumni (see chapter 5).

**Box 1.6 Academic profile in 1995/96.**

*School of Engineering (Departments of Civil Engineering; Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering; Mechanical Engineering and Aeronautics)
*School of Mathematics, Actuarial Science and Statistics (Department of Actuarial Science and Statistics; Centre for Business Systems Applications; Department of Mathematics)
*School of Informatics (Departments of Business Computing; Computer Science; Information Science; and Centre for Software Reliability)
*School of Social Sciences (Departments of Economics; Psychology; Sociology)
*Business School (Departments of Banking and Finance; Business Studies; Property Valuation and Management)
*St Bartholomew School of Nursing and Midwifery (Departments of Applied Behavioural and Biological Sciences; Nursing; Midwifery and Neonatal Nursing; Quality Improvement and Academic Standards)
*Departments not in yet in Schools: Arts Policy and Management; Clinical Communications; Continuing Education; Journalism; Law; Music; Optometry and Visual Science; Radiography; Social Statistics Research Unit; Systems Science.
In recognition of his service to the University Raoul Franklin was made a C.B.E. in 1994. In his last address to Court in December 1997 he highlighted some of the changes and achievements that had been made during his tenure of office. The following are extracts:

“….In order that figures are firm I have compared 1976 and 1996 (i.e. in respect to student numbers and financial summary) ….. they show an overall growth in student numbers by a factor of more than three. But more remarkable than the change of size is the change of shape. In 1976 Engineering was dominant…… The Business School was the Graduate Business Centre and of very modest size and scope; Law was just beginning as was Music. It shows the regrettable loss of Physics and Chemistry. At the same time the acquisition of Clinical Communication Studies (Speech and Language Therapy) in the mid 80s and, more recently, the incorporation of the Barts School of Nursing and Midwifery and the Charterhouse College of Radiography, had a major impact on the subject balance. The growth of Social Sciences has kept pace with that of the institution as a whole. Informatics has emerged as a major area to balance the loss of Physical Sciences. Mathematics has benefited significantly from the activity in Actuarial Science which also was just beginning in 1976. Optometry had held its own as a major national centre. Arts Policy and Management, and Journalism have taken advantage of our location to emerge as the leading courses in those areas in the country…… What is immediately apparent (from the financial picture) is the massive shift from grant, from the University Grants Committee, to fees 82% to 27%. No other university has undergone such a change over the period …… This is largely due to a change of postgraduate percentage of the total from 26% to 43%....” (Franklin 1997).

Professor David Rhind. Under the Vice-Chancellorship of David Rhind changes in progress were consolidated (e.g. finalizing the formation of Schools, particularly the School of Arts), and systematic reviews of the University’s strategy and corporate governance were instigated. Before coming to City he was Director General and Chief Executive of Ordnance Survey, Britain’s national mapping organization and a government department. His earlier academic career included being Professor of Geography and Dean at Birkbeck College. His managerial and academic achievements have been recognized at the highest level (e.g. CBE in 2001, Fellow of the Royal Society in 2002, Fellow of the British Academy).

It is significant that David Rhind was the first non-engineer to be appointed to lead the University. This may be seen as the culmination of a cultural shift that had been taking place since the institution gained university status. It was no coincidence that under his watch the catch phrase of City being ‘The University for Business and the Professions’ was widely promoted, after its initial introduction under Raoul Franklin. The process of reviewing the University strategy involved consulting all staff during the period from February to July 1999, and obtaining the approval of Senate and Council. In presenting his 1999 Annual Report to Court he introduced the new University Strategy that sets out a vision for the institution. He stressed the importance of having a clear idea of where the University wants to be in an environment characterized by rapid change. Box 1.7 lists the six strategic aims included in the strategic document as approved by Council.
### Box 1.7 City University’s mission and strategic aims as expressed in the strategic plan 1999-2003.

**Mission:** To be recognized regionally and internationally as the professional university for London.

**Strategic aims:**
- To provide high-quality education which meets the needs of our students and their employers.
- To develop and enhance research which has acknowledged standards of excellence.
- To influence policy and practice within our chosen areas of expertise.
- To make a significant contribution to the success of London as a world city.
- To increase the international scope and reputation of the University.
- To develop the University through growth and strategic collaboration.

These strategic aims grew out of an analysis of the strengths of the University, particularly its geographical location and its focus on the professions. Therefore when the 1996 and 1999 sets of strategic aims are compared, the similarities are not surprising. What are significant are the differences which recognize the cultural shift that had gradually been taking place. For example, the 1996 version repeated the mission statement that appeared in the University’s Royal Charter of 1966; whereas the 1999 version by-passed this statement to emphasise the international and professional elements. Also note that the words ‘industry’ and ‘engineering’ had been dropped. Introducing these changes was no mean achievement as is clear in the ‘consultation file’ housed in the University archives. The consultation process aroused a rich correspondence of divergent views - mainly favourable from the business school but unfavourable from those in engineering and some disciplines (e.g. economics) who felt that the mission statement in the original consultation document (‘to be the university for business and the professions’) did not recognize their academic orientation.
The new strategy was reinforced by commissioning outside consultants to create a new visual identity for the University; one which presents “a university attuned to fast-changing times, living in one of the world’s most important cities”. The resulting logo (i.e. the four letters, each symbolic of a City-based feature) was introduced in 1999. Toward the end of David Rhind’s stewardship thoughts were given to changing the logo once more. This was taken further under Malcolm Gillies, and a new logo was introduced in time for the academic year 2008-09. Box 1.8 illustrates the logos inherited by Raoul Franklin (1977-1978), by David Rhind (1997-1998), and by Malcolm Gillies (2006-2007). The successive changes made indicate attempts to move away from the ‘too traditional’; and it is interesting to see that the most recent version resurrects an element of the original shield while recognizing the University’s modernity (2008-2009). The 1997-98 design was an attempt to get away from the ‘fussiness’ of the earlier logo, while retaining the beacon and emphasizing City since in lists it appeared alphabetically as City.

A second strategic plan was produced for 2004-2009. Again it was a very comprehensive document that reflected good management practice, i.e., it developed from a review of strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities in the light of the institution’s mission and strategic aims, and where possible spelt out targets and the criteria for assessing their achievement. Box 1.9 shows that the essence of the revised mission statement remained the same as before but that research was given additional emphasis. The strategic aims are worded at a higher level than the 1999 set, but essentially reflect the same intent.
Box 1.9 City University’s mission and strategic aims as expressed in the strategic plan 2004-2009.

Mission: To provide rigorous research and education for the world of work.
Strategic aims:
* To meet the changing educational needs of individuals, employers and society.
* To improve further our excellence in education, especially professional education, and to extend the range.
* To increase high-quality research activity that influences strategy, policy and practice.
* To enhance our reputation and effectiveness.

Changes made to the academic profile continued the process of bringing together cognate subjects into single schools, thereby strengthening the management structure and increasing the visibility of the University’s strengths in the eyes of the external market. The structural changes are readily seen when comparing the contents of Box 1.10 with those of Box 1.4. Thus, Actuarial Science and Statistics had moved into the Business School; Mathematics was absorbed into the School of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences; a School of Arts was formed to include the Departments of Cultural Policy and Management, Music, Journalism and Publishing, Education and Lifelong Learning; and the Departments of Nursing, Midwifery, Optometry, Radiography/Radiotherapy, Speech and Language Therapy were brought together into the School of Health Sciences. The Law department together with the recently amalgamated Inns of Court formed the City Law School.

Box 1.10 The seven Schools forming the academic profile at 2007.

* School of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences
* Cass Business School
* School of Informatics
* School of Health Sciences (now Community & Health Sciences)
* School of Social Sciences
* School of Arts
* City Law School

Professor Malcolm Gillies. David Rhind was succeeded as Vice-Chancellor by Malcolm Gillies in August 2007. He is an Australian and joins from the Australian National University where he was Vice-President (Development), based principally overseas within Yale University in the US. Before that post he was Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), based in Canberra. Earlier appointments included Dean of the Faculty of Music at the University of Queensland, and Pro-Vice Chancellor responsible for commercialization, and for the faculties of humanities, social sciences and the professions, at the University of Adelaide. Commenting on Malcolm Gillies appointment, Sir David Howard (Chair of Council) said: “The City University is a world-class institution and as such has to attract the very best to lead it. Malcolm brings strong
leadership experience, particularly in the areas of internationalization and research, and so, is the ideal candidate to build on the great success achieved by his predecessor David Rhind.”

The appointment of a new Vice-Chancellor provided a further opportunity for the University to review the strategy that had been guiding action under the Strategic Plan for 2004-2009. The process undertaken for this review largely reflected the consultative process adopted in formulating the previous plan; involving inputs from the Executive Committee, Council, Senate and staff. The thinking of both the Executive Committee and Council were explored in the separate ‘away days’ they organised. The final version of the strategic plan for 2008-2012 was approved by Council in July 2008. Aspects of the plan as posted on the internet are included in Box 1.11. As with the previous Plan this one also spells out priorities in the full document and measures of success. The Plan is designed to enable the University to face the challenges of the new century, and the need for excellence in higher education. It focuses on partners (students, employers and the users of research and knowledge), and underlines the University’s orientation on business and the professions.

Initial steps taken to enable the strategic priorities to be achieved include: the appointment of a Chief Operating Officer (Henrietta Royle who moved across from a similar role with Cass Business School) to ensure the delivery of services in a business-like and professional manner; and the appointment of three Deputy Vice-Chancellors - Professor David Bolton to ensure the educational infrastructure and environment is fit for purpose; Professor Dinos Arcoumanis to oversee research and national/international partnerships; and Professor Julius Weinberg to actively manage the established risk management processes and to implement and monitor the achievement of goals and priorities.

**Box 1.11 City University’s Strategic Plan 2008-2012.**

**Vision:** To lead London in education, research and knowledge transfer for businesses and the professions.

**Purpose:** *To provide students with the knowledge and skills essential to business and the professions associated with London*

*To create and disseminate knowledge and insight that adds value to our role as the university for business and the professions.*

**Strategic goals:**

1. **Students & Alumni** wishing to develop & enhance skills leading to careers in the professions & businesses: high quality courses; student recommendations; professional skills; raise standards of entry; lifecycle approach.
2. **Employers** wishing to recruit the best graduates & develop employees: diverse offering tailored to specific markets; collaboration with London institutions; continued revitalization of curricula; responsive & clear, creative & flexible.
3. **Staff** wishing to work in a demanding yet supportive environment: rewarding terms of employment; management & HR systems to empower teaching & research; staff experience programme; celebrating diversity.
4. **Research & Knowledge Transfer** for those wishing to understand & influence strategy, policy & practice: support high quality research; invest in strategic international research; high quality knowledge transfer accessibility.
5. **Sustainability**: to operate in a sustainable manner, ensuring our processes take account of their broader, environmental impact and are financially sound: sustainable operations; challenging targets for carbon footprint reduction; investment funds.

As yet the academic profile has not changed under Malcolm Gillies although the number of Deans has been reduced. One of the structural problems encountered was to preserve adequate representation on the Executive Committee of the main constituent parts of the University while limiting its size. An additional problem was that the voice of some schools carried a lot more weight because of the wide differences in relation to income – thus some Deans were responsible for an annual turnover above £30 million while others were responsible for only £10 million. The solution was to introduce the concept of conjoint deans. From the August 2008 Professor Ken Grattan became Conjoint Dean of the Schools of Informatics and Engineering and Mathematical Science; and Professor Christina Slade becomes Conjoint Dean for the Schools of Social Science and Arts when she joins the University in January 2009.

**Revised Charter and Statutes**

Revisions to the University’s Charter and Statutes became necessary to reflect the changes that had taken place since 1966, including the major governance reforms to be discussed in Chapter 3. The changes to mission and strategic aims since 1966 stand out when comparing the contents of Box 1.12 with those in Box 1.2. Science and technology have in effect given way to business and the professions, and consultancy activities are seen as a legitimate service. Implications of these changes will be brought out in later chapters, but attention needs to be drawn to the distinctive link between the University and the City of London and the professions. The academic profile of the University was transformed as a result of the involuntary decrease in engineering students in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and the attempt to develop a more balanced pattern in student recruitment. In the process of expanding in new areas two related factors played key roles – the University’s location and association with the City of London. These provided a competitive advantage when it came to forming links with financial and professional institutions. These links became even more important in the early 1980s when the Thatcher Government reduced the protection provided by the State to Universities, and opened up markets generally to more competition. The University was at the forefront in introducing postgraduate courses in such areas as export management, journalism, arts policy and management, shipping, law, and so on. The Vice-Chancellor, Raoul Franklin (1978-98), used to say that City was in the business of making graduates from other universities employable! Since those days the number of postgraduate courses has grown significantly in a wide range of subject areas. Virtually all the undergraduate and postgraduate courses have been designed in close consultation with professional bodies, thus enabling students to obtain exemption from many of their professional examinations.

**Box 1.12  The objects of the University as written in the revised Charter assented in 2006.**

“The objects of the University shall be:
(a) To provide education.
(b) To conduct research.
(c) To disseminate knowledge and promote scholarship, and to benefit society by the example and influence of the University’s corporate life.
(d) To work closely with business and the professions.
(e) To provide consultancy services.”

Conclusions
The University has gradually adapted its strategies to benefit from the competitive advantages provided by its location (e.g., City of London, London as an international City). Originally when the institution was founded in the 1890s it was surrounded by small manufacturing/craft firms, and it made sense to develop technological and scientific disciplines. Its academic achievements were recognized in the late 1950s when it was made a College of Advanced Technology. In the early 1960s the three CATS located in London had to make the critical choice of whether to stay in London or not. Brunel (Brunel University) and Battersea (Surrey University) moved to the outskirts; Northampton CAT remained in the centre. This decision had profound consequences for the City University, and some of these consequences became more obvious when the market for students wanting to study engineering declined. Tracing the history of the institute’s mission and strategies reveals the influence of environmental forces and the University’s traditional and innovative responses to these forces, including: building closer links with the City of London, developing an international market, developing a postgraduate market by catering for a range of professions, growing collaborative links with other educational institutions, generating additional sources of income, conducting research that influences policy and practice, adopting ‘model’ managerial practices. The result has been to enable the University to grow and to be less vulnerable to unpredictable funding cuts and other crises.

In relation to the current profile of the University it is worth noting that two of the seven Schools owe their origins to bodies that predate the foundation of the University in 1894. The Community and Health Sciences School consists largely of the Bart’s School of Nursing and Midwifery, a body founded in 1877 and incorporated into the University in 1991. The City Law School brought together the University’s Department of Law and the Inns of Court School of Law in 2001. The latter body was formed in 1852. Both these additions to the University have a long and distinguished history of their own. The remaining five Schools (Engineering and Mathematical Sciences, Cass, Informatics, Social Sciences, Arts) can be seen as emerging from the engineering origins that characterised the early history of the University.
CHAPTER 2

One of the characteristics of UK universities with little in the way of endowment funds is their dependence on insecure income from one year to the next. In the seventies and eighties the University was largely reliant on government funds which were allocated by the University Grants Council (UGC) and later by the University Funding Council (UFC). The decisions of these bodies were influenced by government policy and by projected student numbers; unfortunately both these factors are unpredictable. This has resulted in a number of ‘crises’ for the management of the University. The following edited extract from a draft manuscript (Teague 1993) will spell out some of the details of how the University learnt to cope by short term measures (e.g., reducing staff numbers), and long term measures (e.g., innovations in the academic profile). These coping responses emerged from and influenced the strategic goals outlined in chapter 1.

Key factors in the 1977-93 period of crisis, change and development, were already in place at the outset. City University had planned for full-time equivalent student numbers for 1976-77 of 2588 undergraduates and had achieved 1972. The number on post-graduate courses had been set at 349, with 389 enrolled and post-graduate research numbers were to have been 274 and only 178 were in place. The total shortfall on the planned load of 3211, then, was 672. The 616 shortfall in undergraduates was entirely in engineering and science. Ominous as this failure to achieve planned numbers in the mainstream disciplines of the University might be, there was much promise and success in the newly developed areas of teaching. Music was developing well in its own right, Law studies had been discouraged by the UGC, but nevertheless a Diploma course was started in October, 1977. Arts Administration and Journalism Diploma courses were set up, and there were undergraduate courses in Actuarial Science, Banking & International Finance and Environmental Engineering, and all of these led to later growth. Systems Science and Social Sciences were flourishing and the Business School was experiencing strong growth in all its Divisions.

A discussion document was published by the Department of Education and Science in 1978 - "Higher Education into the 1990's". It concluded that demographic trends indicated that the 18-year old population would reach a peak in 1982-83 and thereafter decline slowly until 1989/90 and thereafter more rapidly. The age participation rate for young people in higher education had increased rapidly throughout the 1960's, but for the last seven years had been steady at about 14%. Even if the participation rate were to increase by one half (to 21%), demographic trends indicated a plateau in the mid-1980's and a sharp fall in the 1990's. The report stated that the only way that universities could maintain their 1978 size was for the pattern and age composition of the student body to radically change.

Edward Parkes, the Vice-Chancellor, commented on the implications of the report for the University. He noted that student numbers at City University had totalled "rather more than 1% of all university students in the late nineteen sixties... (and then) ...our numbers fell both proportionately and absolutely in the
early 1970's with the swing away from science". From 1975-76 student numbers at City grew proportionately more rapidly than in the university system as a whole and UGC targets were found to place severe limitations on expanding new developments. As the UGC target figure for 1981-82 was 3,100 and the grant was to be based upon this figure, only limited overshooting of the mark was possible, and then only in self-funding initiatives; indeed extra fees gained by means of taking increased numbers of undergraduates would be deducted from the grant. The UGC had abandoned the quinquennial funding system mid-way through the 1972-77 quinquennium and moved to annual funding with strict cash limits. The 3,100 was exactly one per cent of the planned national total.

In December 1978, Senate agreed to reduce the 1979-80 overseas intake. This had the effect of reducing income, since in 1976 the Government became concerned about the increase in the number of overseas students in British universities, and introduced differential fees between home and overseas students. As the number of the latter continued to grow, the prospect of financial sanctions loomed. The change to a Conservative government in May 1979, led to a full cost fees policy with the grant to each university being reduced over a three year period by the average cost of overseas students in residence in 1979-80. This reduced the numbers of foreign students in British universities and it was followed by a volume cut in funding that implied a reduction in home students over the period 1981-84. The fourteenth Annual Report to Court (1979-80) noted an increasingly uncertain financial provision and a declining total student enrolment, the latter largely due to the full cost overseas students' fees requirement.

For 1980-81 the situation was worse, with the UGC proposing to reduce grants to universities by 15% over the three subsequent years. Further, grants would in future be determined on academic criteria rather than the previous historic basis. When the UGC offered subject advice suggesting that there might be a reduction of activity in Social Sciences, in Mathematics and in Mechanical Engineering, involving dispensing with almost a third of the staff, Senate restricted itself to accepting that there was scope for flexibility within the engineering departments. It was realised, of course, that such cuts would make City the smallest English university, of the same size as Stirling, leaving no scope whatever for economies of scale......By March, 1981, the UGC became aware that redundancies would result from the severe cut-back as well as drastic reallocation of funds. Thus the grant for 1981-82 was not announced until the 1st July, 1981.

**Draconian Measures, 1981-82.**

Senate held special meetings from July to September, 1981 and set up a working party on the Future of the University. Its report included findings such as: "There was no escaping the fact that City was a high cost university, for reasons that could not easily be changed, namely ... London allowance on salaries, a high proportion of leased space and lack of opportunities to take advantage of economies of scale. The problem of the leased buildings had to be addressed during the 1981-82 crisis period and Lionel Denny House and Gresham College leases were then surrendered. By October, 1981, the financial prospect for City University was really serious, the financial year having begun with a deficit of
£250,000 and quite clearly, without a reduction in the number of staff, there would be a deficit in 1981-82 of £1.0 million on an estimated income of £12.4 million. It was resolved to reduce expenditure by £2.5 million per annum by 1983-84. Redundancies were likely, the capital cost of which it was hoped would be met by the Government......Short-term finance was to be arranged.

Senate reported to Council on 2nd November that the necessary staff reductions would be sought by voluntary means in the first instance. The Committee of Vice-Chancellors & Principals prepared a scheme for severance payments, based on the existing premature retirement scheme, but extended down the age range to 50-55. Those under 50 years of age would receive payment related to salary and years of service.

In February 1982, the UGC was able to announce a government approved scheme for reimbursing universities with these costs. This lifeline was highly significant in the survival of certain universities, including City University. A major achievement of the University was obtaining the required levels of reduction by voluntary means. Well over one hundred staff left full-time employment in the University in the academic year 1981-82. In his annual report to Court the Vice-Chancellor Raoul Franklin said: "A rough calculation shows we will be losing a thousand years of accumulated experience in the service of the University amongst academic and related staff alone, and this blow is one, the effects of which are now beginning to make themselves felt. At the beginning of academic year 1981-82 there was a total of 840 staff in the academic, clerical, technical and related grades, reduced to 706 by the following year, in the main by premature retirement (54 were in academic and related grades). Thus the main part of the reduction in recurrent expenditure required over the period 1981-84 was achieved by the end of 1981-82" (Franklin 1981-82). It should be noted that the total staff in these categories in 1979-80 had been 915 and the trend from 1966-1976 of increasing the staff/student ratio had ended abruptly and had been reversed, partly by not filling posts when they became vacant.

Academic development came to be more than ever reliant on non-UGC funding and some success was recorded in this, no doubt based on previous experience. As the remaining balance in the Development Fund (£750,000), could not be used for current expenditure, a bank overdraft facility of £1.5 million was arranged though not used. The May Degree Congregation of 1982 was abandoned. No department was closed directly as a result of this severe crisis, but structural changes and drastic reorganisation did occur. Common first year courses, joint programmes and reduction in unit degree course options were means of avoiding excessive extra load on the remaining staff. The following academic year was of course a most difficult one of adjustment to the loss of experienced staff, internal promotions, and a further, but smaller number of early retirements and voluntary redundancies. At the same time plans for extension of the subject range were afoot, by association as in the case of Clinical Communication Studies, or by validation of courses elsewhere.

The drastic staff pruning of 1982, which, together with other economies, put the University on the road to financial viability, had immediate effect on the unit cost per student and gradual effect on the content, and, indeed, the type of courses taught. The gradual effect on teaching was occasioned by many of the academics who had so helpfully taken early retirement, carrying on their teaching
in a part-time capacity for several years. The University then paid only these part-time teaching costs and the Government paid the additional costs via the UGC early retirement funding scheme. It became a younger staff, reduced in number and with no automatic replacement for posts falling vacant. There was a preference for internal promotion and inter-departmental transfer, other things being equal. It became a far less homogeneous staff as to academic discipline, and staff were probably expected to work harder than in the past. New academic staff were selected with a sharper eye to their research potential. Innovation was encouraged.

Fairly soon "crisis" discussions in the Senate led to the introduction of new courses tailored to the changing demands of the market place…..Student numbers rose overall even though overseas student numbers declined because of the full cost fees policy. The academic balance of the University veered sharply towards Economics, Commerce and the Arts, from its traditionally heavily weighted Engineering and Applied Science predominance. Courses that had been introduced without UGC funding, but with non-governmental endowment, were among those ideally placed for development and expansion. These included Law, Journalism, Property Valuation & Management and Clinical Communication Studies. There was by now an idea of a "critical mass" for a university to be considered viable in the longer term; and yet, at the same time, student numbers were restricted by a quota system, presumably in an attempt to rationalise courses nationwide and to loosely control the number of graduates produced in each discipline. When the pre-eminence of the accountant was finally enforced by government on the university world, in 1984, with student fees becoming the directly attributable income of each university, then student numbers could increase and other income-generating activities could proceed unhindered. Retention of student fees was, of course, to offset massive cuts in direct government funding. Among the income-producing academic activities to which we have referred were short post-experience courses, diploma courses, part-time continuing education and accreditation of carefully selected courses run by of other institutions.

The Strategy for Development.
In November 1983, financial stability for 1983-84 was in sight even though the 1983-84 recurrent grant was half a million pounds less in real terms than that of 1982-83. This remarkable turn-round had its origins in careful planning, both academic and financial. Originating from a Joint Working Party of Council & Senate, the academic strategy had been one of development rather than contraction. The development included the gaining of more external funds for new Chairs, proceeding with the planned removal of the Business School to Levels 13 and 14 of Frobisher Crescent in the Barbican, the launching of an evening MBA course (aimed at City employees), the establishment of new self-funding courses, the establishment of the Master of Engineering course, expanding Adult Education and encouraging the growth of Music and Arts Administration by according them departmental status……Research Centres were designated in order to focus attention on areas of research strength.

The financial planning resulted in 27% of income for 1982-83 coming from non-public purse sources. There was a surplus which allowed sums to be
added to designated reserves. Part of this (£420,000) came from covenanted profits of City Technology Ltd. (see chapter 6 for more on the company). The 1981 reduction in student numbers was totally reversed in relation to home students and the University was urged to take as many undergraduates as possible in 1984 and 1985. This was to be without additional funds, entirely financed from fees and endowments, thus reducing the notional unit of resource. Helpfully, there was a reversal in government policy in October 1983, and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office was able to use its overseas aid money to assist foreign students. New professionally oriented postgraduate courses became available and successfully met needs in Law, Finance, Information Transfer and Arts.

In informing the UGC of its Development Plans in 1984, the University had stressed its

"uniqueness in its association with the professional activities of the City of London. During a period of contraction, reducing UGC funding and limitation on UGC student numbers, it has attracted private funding and fee income making possible the development of several new courses which are self-financing in UGC terms: the increased activity arising from these courses amounts to about 500 full-time equivalent students. This level of self-financing activity, in relation to a UGC base of only 2,020 full-time Home and European Community students, is also unique. Taking into account its overseas and part-time students, the University numbers over 3,000 students.

The means of achieving this activity have been diverse: endowments (for example in Export Management), appeals to professional bodies (Property Valuation and Management), charging full-cost fees (Business Systems Analysis), association with a charity (Clinical Communication Studies), contracts with external bodies (Diploma Course in Internal Audit for the Treasury), teaching help from industry (Rio Tinto Zinc). This far from complete list of self-financing initiatives since 1981 serves to show both the complexity of this sector and the fact that professional activities associated with the City of London run much wider than the financial and commercial interests traditionally associated with the "Square Mile".

It has been the University's objective to change from being a predominantly "technological" university to being a "professional" university in the broad sense and, in the process of change, to exploit its advantageous position in London to the full. Much of the work of the University, not only the business-related activity on its key site in the Barbican, benefits from proximity to the City. Many of the specialist activities of the University: Journalism, Arts Administration, Music, derive their individuality from their London environment."

In August 1985, a circular letter from the UGC noted that whilst small departments were not necessarily weak, nor large ones necessarily strong, nevertheless exceptions could not be the reason for no action. In their view rationalization was essential in order to make the best possible use of declining resources. At that time the Government believed that student demand would fall early in the 1990's. In stressing its conclusion that rationalisation was the answer,
the UGC suggested collaboration between universities and other suitable institutions involving the transfer or closure of courses. Funds would need to be transferred by agreement as well as library books and equipment. It was seen to be necessary for many factors to be taken into account when considering a department for closure, or removal elsewhere, or within the university. Above all, small size was the major factor putting a department at risk. This was directly linked, of course, with the departmental cost per student (not only the staff student ratio here, but additional cost factors such as being in London). Obviously the national demand for student places in the subject, the age structure of the staff, the success rate and the number of good honours degrees achieved, the disposition and condition of the buildings and the adequacy of library provision, all needed to be addressed.

**Surviving yet more cuts.**

A letter from the UGC, "Planning for the Late 1980's", proposed 2% annual decline in recurrent grant over the four years, 1985-86 to 1988-89. At City, the Joint Committee reported to Council in November 1985 that the University could survive such cuts - just! The report stressed the professional and vocational strengths of the University. It was seen that a 3% cut in staffing would be necessary over the planning period as it was obvious that externally funded activities were subject-specific and would not bring in uncommitted income to make good the shortfall. They would, however, support new areas of activity and contribute to central overheads. The University drew to the attention of the UGC the harm that reduced funding would cause in the very area of science and technology which the Government said it was committed to expand. The University's Joint Committee Report recommended the formation of a School embracing the Departments of Aeronautics & Mechanical Engineering, and this school was set up from 1987/88, as was the School of Mathematics, Actuarial Science and Statistics. The City University Business School formally became a School of the University at the same date. Electrical Engineering and Applied Physics were already formed into a School.

In 1985 the UGC stated that the concept of deficiency grant funding was no longer applicable to its activities. With hindsight, it can be seen that the Committee had been consistently moving away from it since 1979. UGC pointed to the advantages to be had by universities by maximising their income from other sources. Significantly, City University had emerged from the 1980-84 cuts period in a healthier financial position than at any previous time. In 1979-80 it had relied on UGC for 70% of its income, but by 1983-84 the figure was under 52% (Franklin 1985-86). At this time, too, the UGC stated that higher education would be encouraged to make the shift to science and technology as far as possible within existing resources. City University was being edged in the opposite direction by financial pressures, lack of student demand, and so on; a consequence no doubt of government failure to match policies with adequate finance.

In deciding recurrent grant for 1986-87, the UGC decided to fund City University for the total 1984-85 student numbers. This meant that the UGC was at last recognising and funding new activities taken on over the preceding ten years on a self-funding basis. This confirmed the far-sightedness of Edward Parkes in supporting the first (unfunded) moves into Journalism, Law, Property Valuation
& Management and Arts Administration. It also accepted the validity of the more recent venture into Clinical Communication Studies.

Whilst emphasis on strategic planning and good management was timely and was acted upon, the Government's own performance in planning was seriously at fault. In his November, 1986, Report to Court, the Vice-Chancellor observed that year by year since 1979 while there had been a forward commitment as to the amount of recurrent grant, frequently it was withdrawn. The average time before the start of each academic year when the grant was assured was less than two months. In two cases the grant was subsequently reduced after it was announced (Franklin 1985-86).

Departmental status was accorded to the Centres for Legal Studies, Journalism and Clinical Communication Studies with effect from August the first, 1987, following UGC funding of the students for the first time. In the 1987 updating of the University's Development Plan it was stated that the Research Centre policy was bearing fruit with the annual rate of new grants and contracts approaching 25% of the U.G.C. recurrent grant. External support for new Chairs was growing. Intense demand for places on City University courses in subjects such as Business Management, Banking and International Finance, Economics and Accountancy, Actuarial Science and Arts Administration, continued. Together with expected expansion in the fully self-financing part-time courses, the full time equivalent student load would become 4,400. Rationalisation continued with the termination of the intake to the Department of Applied Physics in October, 1986 and the transfer of the student numbers to the integrated courses in Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Control Engineering and Computer Engineering. Engineering activity, already much less than planned in the 1970's, looked to the formation of a School of Engineering as the rational eventual path to economic operation.

**Crisis Planning Once Again.**

The annual revenue surplus that the University had achieved by drastically planning its way out of the 1981-82 crisis was imperilled by the UGC recalculating the recurrent grant from 1986/87. In order to move into financial surplus by 1990-91, a further major cut in staffing was planned. Academic staff was to be cut by 33 over three years, technical staff by 25, and the total reduction for all categories of staff was to be 92. At the same time research income was expected to rise by 10% over the period and it was confidently expected that City Technology Ltd. would contribute more as profits rose.

At the end of 1988, E.P.Chappell, the University Treasurer, wrote: "The financial future is uncertain and there is a limit to the University's own efforts in overcoming the economic problems that are posed. The new Universities Funding Council must recognise this and attempt to assist those institutions who have not only resolved their financial difficulties with care and firm action but managed to progress at the same time". He was writing, in the context of the achievement of a small surplus of £11,000 in the 1987-88 financial out-turn, whereas a deficit of half a million pounds had been expected. The pessimistic forecast had been based on a considerable element of UGC under-funding of an academic salary award, and a low increase in the base recurrent grant (1.3%). Thus economies had rapidly been put in hand. As the expenditure was in excess of £35 million, "the £11,000
The gap between surplus and deficit was perilously thin. Without considerable growth in external funding this could not have been achieved. A remarkable 47.3% of funding of total activity derived from non-public sources. The Business School continued to be most successful in attracting external support and added another three Chairs. City Technology Limited's covenanted profits of £379,000 were obviously of valuable assistance (chapter 6 will elaborate on this wholly owned company of the University).

The University Academic & Financial Plan.
The University's 'Planning Statement' had always been under continuous annual review and updating, but the June 1988 Revised Plan was very much a landmark of change to new directions as well as a rationalisation of existing activities. The required reductions in staffing from 1987 levels had largely been achieved, with academic staff down from 296 to 279 and a drop of 50 in other staff. Agreed severance and early retirements for the following year would reduce the number of academic staff to 265. This was a successful outcome except that Mechanical Engineering remained overstaffed. The changing subject balance of the University made it essential to correct the funding imbalance between cost centres, that is to say to reduce the funding of Engineering & Technology to about 8% of the total, making the released funds available to growth areas such as the Business School. The unit of resource was to be adjusted as between areas of study to match the UGC model.

Non-UGC funding grew as was shown in a new "total activity" financial statement. The profits of City Technology Ltd. continued to be used largely in direct support of development, but some research equipment was paid for from this source. ‘Private’ funding was to be increasingly sought, as was profitability of marketed services. The Business School had attracted additional externally funded Chairs and one Research Centre. Economies of scale would be achieved in the School of Engineering, in operation from August 1988, with the new joint B.Eng. Courses, rationalization of workshop facilities, coordinated use of research laboratories and re-use of vacated space. The new School of Engineering would include three departments: Civil Engineering, Mechanical Engineering with Aeronautics, and Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering, with a resulting academic staff cut from 89 to 70.

The Business School had completed its transition from department to school structure with two main departments, Business Studies and Banking & Finance, each with a number of specialist centres and a Management Development Centre. Co-operation with Ashridge Management College was developing arising from the validation link. Other developments in professional studies were in Law, Property Valuation & Management, and Arts Policy & Management.

The School of Mathematics, Actuarial Science & Statistics had been in operation for a year. Business Systems Analysis had been drawn out of the Business School to be associated with Computer Science and Information Science in a consortium, to lead to the formation of a new school. The Department of Chemistry was set to concentrate on the two areas of work where it offered a distinctive approach, namely Chemistry & Management and the development of
the B.Sc. course in Biological chemistry, into Biotechnology and Medicinal Chemistry.

The Department of Social Science Humanities which included main areas of Economics, Psychology and Sociology, with some Philosophy as a contribution to the unit B.Sc. degree scheme, was to be the vehicle for developments in Health Care Studies (including restructuring the very successful nursing course). Other activities related to medicine were, of course, those of the Department of Optometry & Visual Science and the Department of Clinical Communication Studies. The Department of Music had a growing demand for places on its distinctive courses; entry standards, both academic and practical were high. The above developments are all consistent with the strategic goals adopted by the University in the 1980s.

**University finance.**

The financial priorities remained the achievement of a balanced budget on the UGC grant/fee account whilst strengthening private income, so as to provide working capital for new developments and reducing reliance on leased buildings. As to student numbers the overall full time equivalent was well above 4,000 rising to 4,700 by 1989-90. This would continue to include fully self-financing, part-time courses. The 1988 revised plan included the comment:

> “The University is fully aware of the problems and financial risks of building such a substantial externally-financed activity on a comparatively small UGC-funded base. However, the unique location of the University and its increasing reputation as the City's University both reduces the danger and increases the pressure to respond positively. The University is now seen as the natural vehicle for high-level professional training in the City and the demand, both for its graduates and for it to provide special courses, is insatiable”.

The University Funding Council, in operation from April 1989, continued the UGC’s growing control in the use of public funds. The stated aim of the UFC was the encouragement of universities in exercising their autonomy "whilst operating within the framework of full accountability for their use of funds derived from the Council, as provided in the Education Reform Act, 1988". The Act acknowledges that universities have the scope to pursue their own policies in using funds from other sources. It is in this area of non-public funding that the UFC, reflecting government policy, saw most scope for universities to develop further. Indeed, the UFC was looking for an increasing proportion of general income being so derived. The survival and growth of City University, certainly, already derived its underpinning from such sources and the trend continued. Thus non-Grant funding was as a percentage of total income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The UFC announced its intention to adopt a four year planning cycle, for, long since, the quinquennial funding system had collapsed. In its place there had developed a hand to mouth practice whereby the recurrent grant to City University had been notified at anything from twelve months in advance (1984-85), to five months after the commencement of the academic year (1983-84).

At the outset the UFC announced that the first quadriennium would be 1991-92 to 1994-95, with 1990-91 being a year of transition. The four year plans were to be continuously updated in conjunction with annual financial forecasts submitted by universities. At this time there was a major change in funding that arose from a political decision to move towards fee funding as rapidly as possible. The Department of Education and Science announced that tuition fees for Home and European Community students would rise from £660 to £1,690 per annum from 1990-91 with a matching reduction in block grant. Thus provision could no longer be made in subject fields where students failed to materialize. For City University the relocation of Chemistry to other universities became inevitable. Further, recruitment targets, rationalisation of provision and staff reduction in Engineering once again became urgent planning matters.

The Department of Education and Science then revised its projection of student demand for higher education and indicated a constant level throughout the early 1990’s, which, in view of the demographic trough in the eighteen year old population, implied a substantial increase in mature students. Thereafter the projection was for a rise in student numbers by 25% by the year 2000. Meanwhile, in 1992, in deepening recession, the shortage of immediate graduate employment opportunities, encouraged more higher degree applicants. As to the take-up in various disciplines, Engineering remained below target as did Computer Science. These were both fostered by the Engineering and Technology Programme; the extra places it provided remained unfilled, nationally, by 10% and 5% respectively. Meanwhile over-recruitment was recorded nationally by about 10% in the Social Sciences, Law and Business Studies.

The UFC, in the same paper, stressed: "the maintenance and enhancement of scholarship and research, the fruits of which should increasingly be made accessible to external organisations and individuals, in both the private and public sectors, and thereby enhance institutions' own opportunities for further development". Both full and part-time students, young and mature (now defined as over 21) should be offered an increasing range of opportunities for learning. In the 1986 Annual Report to Court the Vice-Chancellor wrote: "We are now in the position where over 40% of our student body are post-graduates. This does not take into account post-experience and short course activity. This means that we are now graduating more Ph.D., M.Phil., M.Sc. and Diploma students per year than B.Sc. students".

To City University's undoubted contribution to postgraduate professional education was added in 1990 the introduction of certain first degree courses in the same subject areas. These courses, such as B.Sc. in Journalism & Social Sciences and B.Sc. in Insurance & Investment, provided additional possibilities for students to find their metier before the full commitment involved in a specialised higher degree. They also represented a prudent redress in the over-concentration on postgraduate work of the University. The UFC's financial model benefited City
University in significant ways. The increased student numbers taught has been acknowledged with enhanced funding for teaching. The growing stature of research in the University has also resulted in financial benefit. The special attention that UFC pays to the University plan has proved helpful.”

Additional observations
The above extract from Teague (Teague 1993) illustrates some of the ways in which the University has had to adapt to its changing environment, particularly with respect to financial matters. The period covers 15 of the 20 years that Raoul Franklin was Vice-Chancellor of the University. As a result of subsequent information provided by Franklin (e.g., Franklin 1997) it is possible to highlight and expand on some of the critical events affecting the development of the University. These events bring home to one how government policies can profoundly affect the higher education landscape, and the key role that Vice-Chancellors and their teams can sometimes play in mitigating the worst consequences for their universities. Four examples will be mentioned here.

The first concerns overseas students and their fees. In 1975 a government directive proposed that the fees for overseas students should be increased; City was one of the universities who resisted implementing the proposal. By 1978 it was clear that the Department of Education and Science was concerned at the rate of growth of overseas students, and that some form of sanctions would be applied. The Vice-Chancellor persuaded Senate that the University should cut back its intake of overseas students. In 1980 the government removed £100 million from university funding, and directed that it should be in proportion to existing overseas student numbers per institution. Consequently the University found that its reduction in grant was much less than would otherwise have been the case (probably £400,000 per annum less).

The second relates to the demise of tenure. A further cut in government grant in 1980 forced the UGC to resolve how to distribute the cut throughout the sector. Redundancies were inevitable, and those that had expanded with the belief that additional resources would be allocated in the future were the hardest hit. A problem with this solution was academic tenure provided for staff in the Charters and Statutes of the universities. In the end the UGC (under pressure from Vice-Chancellors) convinced the government that extra funds would have to be made available so that universities could persuade staff to take early retirement or voluntary redundancy. “If all staff at that time with tenure had sat tight, there would have been a constitutional crisis, because it would have become clear that the government by its own action, had caused one or more Chartered Bodies to become bankrupt” (Franklin 1997). Fortunately, at the University the Vice-Chancellor was able to persuade the required number of staff to make the necessary decisions. It was not surprising to find that attempts by the government to get the universities to change their Statutes failed. Some years later they did manage to force the termination of tenure in relation to the majority of staff by appointing Statutory Commissioners in 1985, and passing the necessary legislation in 1988. While existing contracts were respected any new appointment (including internal promotion) did not carry the protection of tenure.

The third relates to the further decline in university funding which led the UGC to explore additional means for achieving greater efficiency. One idea that was informally mooted was that a university should have above a certain number of students (e.g., 6,000+). If this took hold the City University would have been very vulnerable with its 3,500 students in 1984/85. The Vice-Chancellor calculated that going down this pathway
would have had a number of undesirable consequences, and only likely to achieve economies of scale some seven years down the line. His findings were communicated to the Chairman of the UGC, and further journeys down this pathway died down. In 1986 a new initiative from the UGC was launched – the first research assessment exercise. The idea here was that the research element of a university’s funding grant should be determined by its research performance as measured by various criteria (e.g., amount of external research income obtained). This new environmental challenge meant that a number of the less research oriented universities could be faced with noticeable drop in income. To alleviate too great a trauma for these institutions a ‘safety-net’ was proposed so as to ease transition into the new research funding regime.

The fourth illustrated the political manoeuvres that underline the importance of Vice-Chancellors’ networking and negotiating skills. The Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) initiated a forward planning exercise in 1983 to find ways in which the polytechnics under their control could cope with declining student numbers in their catchment area. The ILEA approached the University in October 1983 asking it to consider a merger with the City of London Polytechnic. After discussions at Senate and Council, a joint committee was formed to oversee any negotiations. The scope of the discussions was widened to include elements from two further institutions (i.e., Polytechnic of North London and the Guildhall School of Music). At the end of the discussions it was agreed in October 1984 that, in the face of the uncertain future of the ILEA, that the way ahead for the University and the Polytechnic was through collaboration rather than merger. Almost exactly a year later a letter from the DES invited the University to reconsider its position in the light of the DES White Paper ‘The development of Higher Education into the 1990s’. “The University responded in December indicating that both the Chairman of NAB and the Chairman of UGC had recently indicated publicly that in general they were in favour of collaboration, but not merger, because of the recurrent and capital costs involved” (Franklin 1997). Merger pressures disappeared as there was a change in the Secretary of State for Education in the summer of 1986 (Kenneth Baker replacing Sir Keith Joseph), and a policy of expansion was introduced.

In 1989 the newly appointed Provost of the City Polytechnic sought the help of consultants in examining the options for resolving the future tenure problems of its rented buildings. They rejected merger with City University and recommended an option involving the development of a site owned by the Corporation of London. The Corporation was not receptive to this solution. There followed a second serious attempt to get the University to consider a merger with the Polytechnic. The pressure came from the two funding councils (i.e., for the polytechnics and the universities), and had the support of the Corporation. There followed the formation of a Study Group, and the terms of reference were agreed at a meeting at Guildhall in July 1991 in the presence of the Chairs of the Corporation’s Education Committee and its Policy and Resources Committee. The Study Group met six times between November 1991 and April 1992, and produced a report listing the strengths of each institution, particularly in relation to the City of London (Polytechnic and University 1991). At this time the Education Reform Act (1992) was being implemented, and the UFC published its protocol for mergers. As it became clear that the funding councils and the Corporation were unable to contribute to the costs of a merger and to the capital costs of the necessary constructions, the University concluded that a merger held no advantages and created serious
disadvantages. The Study Group reported to the Chairman Designate of HEFC, and the discontinuation of the Study was announced in July 1992.

From the point of view of the history of the University it is important to go into some detail into the merger story for three reasons: the development of the University over the last twenty years would have been quite different (e.g., it was unlikely to have progressed as a research oriented university); powerful voices in the environment (e.g., ILEA, Corporation, funding councils) can manipulate forces so as to achieve their goals in ways that may not be in the interests of the University; courses of action are taken which may be based on erroneous information (e.g. the University being placed in the ‘safety net’ when in fact it was financially healthy). Merger proposals arise because at least one party is in financial difficult and/or because two or more parties recognize the strengths that can emerge from existing synergies. The two attempts to pressurize the University into a merger were met with a positive response so long as the advantages outweighed the disadvantages. These events underline the importance of the Vice-Chancellor and his team having access to the informal networks that are aware of ‘behind the scene’ discussions. The latter inevitably accompany formal negotiations when parties involved have conflicting goals and cultures. The voluntary partnerships discussed in chapter 5 are in marked contrast to the above.

The next chapter again illustrates the process of adaptation, this time in relation to governance matters. Governance moved to the top of the management agenda in most large organizations in the nineties.
CHAPTER 3
GOVERNANCE: 1998-2008

The way in which the University went about organizing itself to meet the interests of diverse stakeholders, within the context of its mission and strategic goals, is the subject of this chapter. The attention will be on governance, including management and support structures. The next chapter will focus on the historical development of the academic structure from the 17 departments in 1978 to the 7 Schools today.

The University’s Royal Charter and Statutes (1966) specifies the governance structures. Council (on which there is significant external representation) is the governing body with ultimate responsibility for employees, finances and estates; as such it sets the strategic direction, determines the structure, and appoints the senior officers of the University. Council is responsible for the allocation within the University of all resources. Senate (consisting solely of internal representation) has delegated authority from Council for overseeing academic quality and assurance of academic standards.

From 1978/79 until 1998/99 there had been few changes affecting Council or Senate. Council had a membership of 40 the majority of whom were from businesses, commercial organizations and the professions. There were also representatives of academic and non-academic staff, and of the student body. The Chairman, Vice Chairman and the Treasurer were drawn from the external members. The detailed work of the Council were dealt with by committees, particularly the Finance and General Purposes Committee which in turn was supported by important sub-committees such as Resource Planning and Estates, Building Committee and the Audit and Information Services Committees. These committees included external members. As the principal academic and administrative officer of the University the Vice-Chancellor was responsible to Council for maintaining and promoting the efficiency and good order of the University. The Pro-Vice Chancellors and three senior administrative officers (the Secretary of the University, the Academic Registrar, and the Director of Finance) were part of a structure that enabled the Vice-Chancellor to fulfill these responsibilities.

Government pressures for greater efficiency.
Since 1979 there were a number of government initiatives to improve efficiency. The demographic decline in eighteen year olds was an opportunity for reducing expenditure on higher education. In April 1984 a steering committee was set-up for efficiency studies in universities, chaired by Sir Alex Jarratt. The publication of the Jarratt report in 1985 emphasised the academic and the executive roles of the Vice-Chancellor, and criticized the size of Senates and the use of the committee system to obtain consensus. Council membership should be predominantly professionals who would apply their skills and expertise to improving the management of the university, particularly aligning academic decisions with strategic plans. The assumption was that better governance, and the adoption of good business practices with respect to financial (e.g., budget delegation to cost centres) and human resource management (e.g., the use of staff appraisal and development schemes), would bring about the efficiency gains sought. The Jarratt Report led the UGC requiring feedback from universities as to how far they had implemented some of the recommendations.

Following the Education Reform Act, 1988, the University Funding Council
(UFC) replaced the UGC. A central aim of the Act was to make higher education institutions more accountable to their funding sources through the operation of market forces. The new body went further in strengthening management in the universities in order to be able to cope with the challenges of a changing environment, including the power to dismiss incompetent staff and to abolish tenured appointments. Many of these recommendations had already been introduced by the University in attempts to increase its flexibility in responding to environmental changes. Thus from June 1981 only fixed term appointments were made, and Heads of Department and Deans were appointed for 5 years only (renewable if within the limits of 10 consecutive years). An academic staff training committee was set up (chaired by a Pro-Vice Chancellor), and from May 1992 a range of training courses were provided. The University policy of increasing its private funding was well under way when the UFC encouraged universities to do just that.

The influence of the UFC, and the direction of influence, was enhanced by strengthening its outside membership and by giving it more autonomy in the allocation of funds to individual universities (including the power to attach conditions to the funds if necessary). Further government legislation led to the abolishment of the ‘binary line’ and to transforming the polytechnics into universities in June 1992. This change was followed by a new body – the Higher Education Funding Council – replacing the UFC in April 1993. Having a single body responsible for the whole of higher education meant the closing down of the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) – the degree awarding body for the former polytechnics.

In May 1996 the government set up the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education under the Chairmanship of Sir Ron Dearing. The report was published a year later. Several of its recommendations relate to governance (Dearing 1997). The report states: “Although institutions have made impressive improvements in efficiency in the face of dramatic fall in public funding per student over the last 20 years, the challenge to find new and better ways of doing things will continue and intensify. Some institutions currently fall far short of the performance of the best. Our main report considers how institutions might make better use of their staff, their estates, their equipment and other resources…….We believe that institutions may often be able to achieve greater clarity and effectiveness in the way they govern themselves.” Recommendation 57 is reproduced in Box 3.1. The Government’s response to Dearing (Higher Education for the 21st Century: Response to the Dearing Report, 1998) accepted this recommendation, except for the last point – it felt that if the Funding Bodies encouraged the application of these guidelines and monitored their implementation there would be no need for the threat of possibly withholding public funding.

**Box 3.1 Recommendation 57 relating to Governance in the Dearing Report.**

“We recommend that each governing body should systematically review, at least once every five years, with appropriate external assistance and benchmarks:
*its own effectiveness and, where there is in excess of 25 members, show good reason why a larger body is needed for its effectiveness;
*the arrangements for discharging its obligations to the institution’s external constituents;
*all major aspects of the institution’s performance, including the participation strategy.
The outcomes of the review should be published in an institution’s annual report. The Funding Bodies should make such a review a condition of public funding.”
A later publication reinforced many of the recommendations of Dearing. This was the Lambert Review, commissioned by HM Treasury, the Department for Education and Skills and the Department for Trade and Industry in November 2002 (Lambert 2002). The purpose of the review was essentially to find ways of strengthening the collaboration between industry and the universities. Its recommendations included: developing “a concise code of governance representing best practice across the sector…..Each governing body should systematically review its effectiveness in carrying out its obligations to all stakeholders every two or three years. These reviews should take into account the stated objectives of the governing body, the performance of the institution against key performance indicators, evaluations of senior management and the results of effectiveness reviews of senate and committees. To ensure transparency, the methodology and results should be published in the university’s annual report and on the internet.” These recommendations received full government support. The University’s actions relating to these various publications are outlined below.

More recently HEFCE commissioned the Committee of University Chairman to produce a code of practice guide for members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK. This publication drew on higher education governance reforms in other countries. HEFCE and the Department for Education and Skills have continued the push to improving governance within universities. A notable initiative of the latter body has been in providing the funding for the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, which runs governor development programmes and supports relevant research (e.g. Bolden, Petrov et al. 2008).

Reform of Council

In the Council Minutes of 10.11.1998 it is reported that a Working Party on Governance had been formed with three external council members (Maurice Stonefrost, Fred Dickenson and Dame Pauline Neville Jones), a Pro-Vice Chancellor (Professor Martin Dockray) and the Secretary of the University (Michael O’Hara). After reviewing existing procedures at the University with those recommended in various publications (e.g., second report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, Nolan Committee 1996; Effective Management in Higher Education, HEFCE 06/98), the Working Party were able to make certain recommendations with the proviso that these should be put on hold until the University had reviewed its strategy. The most important recommendation stemmed from the observation that executive responsibility was in the hands of Council, and that fulfilling this responsibility was difficult in practice in an executive decision making body of 40 members.

At the end of the Annual Report for 2005/06 a Corporate Governance Statement was published. The first two paragraphs of the statement read:

“The City University endeavours to structure its governance arrangements in accordance with the recommendations of recent reviews of corporate governance (for example, the Cadbury, Turnbull and Lambert reviews), the seven principles identified by the Committee on Standards in Public Life (selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership) and with the guidance to universities provided by the Committee of University Chairmen in its Guide for Members of Governing Bodies of Universities and Colleges in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The University is an independent corporation, whose legal status derives from a Royal Charter originally granted in 1966. As a consequence of the reform of governance
at City, a new Supplemental Charter and Statutes was approved by Privy Council in March 2006. The Supplemental Charter and Statutes revoked most of the 1966 Charter and set out the new objects, powers and framework of governance.”

No changes were made with respect to the positions of Chancellor (the Lord Mayor of the City of London), Pro-Chancellor (Chair of Council), and Vice-Chancellor (Chief Executive of the University). Appendix 2 lists those who held these high officers across the years (note the role of Pro-Chancellors in providing continuity). Changes made resulted in a tightening of the governance arrangements, strengthening the influence of Council in the management of the University, and increasing the power of the independent and external members of Council. Thus from August 2006 Council consisted of a maximum of 22 members, and a ratio of 2:1 of the independent members to staff and student members applied. Three standing committees of Council are chaired by an external member – the Audit and Compliance, the Corporate Governance and Nominations, and the Remuneration Committees. See Appendix 3 for a list of actual Council members at four points in time – 31 members in 1977/78, 38 in 1997/98, 20 in 2006/07, and 20 in 2007/08.

A fourth standing committee is the Executive Committee which has no lay members of Council; it is the senior management team, and is chaired by the Vice-Chancellor. The primary purpose of this committee is “to provide strategic management and leadership of the University, working with the Council and within the limits of its authority to devise, implement, monitor and review University strategies. It ensures that the University is a solvent and academically successful enterprise operating on the values and in pursuit of the strategic goals, which are from time to time approved by Council. It consults and engages with the Deans of Schools and with Senate to facilitate the success of the institution. The Committee is empowered to act on all matters delegated or referred to it by the Council within the agreed delegations framework.”

Apart from the Vice-Chancellor the senior management team (i.e., Executive Committee) normally consists of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the PVC for Teaching and Learning and the PVC for Research and International Affairs, alongside the Heads of the two central administrative portfolios: Finance and Business headed by the Director of Resources (finance, property, internal audit, human resources); Information Services headed by Chief Information Officer or the Director of Library and Information Services (business systems, computing, library, academic development and services, marketing, development and alumni relations, services to students). Until 2006 there was a third central administrative portfolio, Academic Development and Services (Human Resources, Marketing and Business Development, and student services) headed by the University Secretary – but his responsibilities were distributed between the remaining two portfolios when Ian Creagh resigned from the post in 2006. The disappearance of the University Secretary post (the Director of Resources now acts as Secretary to the Council) was also accompanied by abolishing the role of University Treasurer whose functions are now met by the Chair of the Audit and Compliance Committee. The role of Vice-Chancellor remains much the same as before. He has a general responsibility to the Council for maintaining and promoting the efficiency and good order of the University. As the CEO he “exercises considerable influence on the development of institutional strategy, the identification and planning of new developments and the shaping of the institutional ethos”.

As we have seen there have been changes made at intervals over the composition
of the senior management team working closely with the Vice-Chancellor. From 1978 to 1998 there was no formal executive committee under Raoul Franklin, its role was shared by several committees the closest being the Financial and General Purposes Committee and the Academic Policy Committee. Day to day executive decisions were dealt with by an informal group, usually consisting of the Vice-Chancellor, the University Secretary (Michael O’Hara), the Academic Registrar (Adrian Seville), and the Finance Director (Frank Toop). Under David Rhind changes were made with the retirement of Michael O’Hara and Adrian Seville and the arrival of Ian Creagh in 2001 (the latter taking on the roles of both the Secretary and the Academic Registrar). When Ian Creagh resigned in 2006, his responsibilities were redistributed between Frank Toop and Kevin Swindin (Director of information systems). Under Malcolm Gillies this arrangement has been reviewed and from August 2008 the appointment of a Chief Operations Officer was made (Henrietta Royle from Cass Business School where she filled a similar role). From this date the Executive Committee consists of the Vice-Chancellor, three Deputy Vice-Chancellors (David Bolton for Education; Dinos Arcoumanis for Research and International Affairs; Julius Weinberg Corporate and Strategic Planning), two conjoint deans (Ken Grattan for Engineering, Mathematical Sciences and Information Science; Christina Slade for School of Social Science and School of Arts), three deans (Richard Gillingwater for Cass; Mary Watts for Community Health Sciences; Peter Kunzlik for The City Law School), and the Chief Operations Officer. The last re-structuring of the Executive Committee is designed to provide a balance between the academic and administrative constituents of the University, while maintaining a small enough group for effective decision making. An important principle being applied is that each body represented by a conjoint dean or dean should be responsible for bringing in a similar income to the University so that no single voice carries undue weight in the decision making process.

Under the 1966 Charter a number of ‘stakeholders’ in the University had the right to appoint a member to the Court. This was a large body with representatives from City Livery Companies, professional and scientific associations, local authorities, and so on. It met once a year to receive the annual report and financial accounts from the Vice-Chancellor and the Treasurer, and to appoint the chairman of Council and the external auditors. The new governance proposals recognized the value of an annual stakeholders meeting, and the need to change its composition to reflect the more up-to-date University strategies and the make-up of the student body. The appointment powers that the ‘Court’ had were no longer retained by the renamed ‘Stakeholders Meeting’ (there is a possibility that the traditional name of ‘Court’ may be reintroduced in the near future).

An important aspect of governance relates to ensuring compliance with legislation. Senior managers across the University have day to day responsibility for ensuring legislative compliance. Council, through its Audit and Compliance Committee, scrutinizes appropriate plans and strategies, including training provisions. Given government initiatives over the years, there are now an impressive number of issues that have to be monitored, including: equal opportunities and diversity; disability discrimination; physical access; access to the web; freedom of information; data protection; health and safety; safeguarding children; sustainability policy (e.g. good practice in managing energy use, waste and recycling); compliance in purchasing activities; risk management.

In summary, it is clear that significant changes in the corporate governance of the University have taken place in recent years. These changes have been brought about by
external pressures to conform to ‘good’ practice operating in the commercial sector, and internal aspirations to adopt a structure that will be conducive to the development, implementation and achievement of appropriate strategic goals. Extensive discussions took place during the formulation and implementation of these changes. It is noticeable that the process took place without the overt conflict that has occurred elsewhere, such as at Oxford University where academics have frustrated the attempts of the Vice-Chancellor to reform its governance in order to increase the influence of outside members on the governing body. The proposed governance blueprint for the reform of Council was an important precursor to the reform of Senate – the academic governance of the University.

Reform of Senate
Senate is chaired by the Vice-Chancellor and has delegated authority from the Council for the enhancement of the University’s academic quality and assurance of academic standards. In June 2004 Senate agreed to review its effectiveness in the light of the draft blueprint for Council and corporate governance, and established a Working Party under the chairmanship of Professor Richard Verrall (the five others were all members of Senate who were located in different academic groupings: David Bolton, Sally Glen, Oliver Kerr, Philip Speare and Tony Woodiwiss). In pursuing its task the Working Party gathered and absorbed relevant material (e.g., blueprint for the reform of Council and its Committees; sections in the Lambert Report concerning governance; survey of current practice elsewhere in UK Higher Education; survey of City staff). It understood “academic governance to refer to the integrated framework within which academic quality, standards, strategy and planning are governed”. The principles of academic governance at City which guided the thinking of the Working Party were consistent with those that had guided the Council Working Party, including the focus on strategy and policy, and the need to limit the size of the body so as to enable thoughtful debate.

While the formal position of Senate in the University structure is clear, in practice its role and power has often been ambiguous. In terms of the University’s Charter and Statutes (both old and revised) the Council is the most powerful body. However, in the years leading up to 1998 there was little evidence to suggest that Council used its power to take the lead in initiating strategy and change. Indeed, departments/schools and central management in earlier years, were the units that took the lead in strategic developments. A culture had developed where battles were won or lost in Senate, and Council was seen by academic staff as more of a rubber-stamping body. A consequence of this was long-drawn out Senate meetings that could easily last for three hours. Now under the new Council reforms it was the Executive Committee which had the delegated authority of Council to initiate strategy and change. In the context of the Council reforms the need to clarify the role and power of Senate was clear.

One of the first tasks of the Review of the Effectiveness of Senate Working Party was to agree, and to obtain the agreement of Council and Senate, to a set of principles for academic governance (Senate Item 5, Paper D, 09.03.2005). For example five of the ten principles listed were:

* Academic governance should focus on strategy and policy.
* As the governing body, Council should approve and monitor the implementation of strategy and should provide effective scrutiny in consultation with Senate.
* Senate should approve and monitor the implementation of academic
developments and provide effective scrutiny of those developments.

*Accountability for management decisions should rest with relevant executives, not committees.

*Senate should be of a size and composition that enables thoughtful debate.

The Working Party reinforced the purpose of Senate: “Senate has delegated responsibility for academic quality and standards assurance and for the provision of advice on a range of issues that impact on institution-wide academic policy and strategy”. It also helped to clarify the relationship between Council, Senate and the Executive Committee: “…..Council has agreed that the Executive Committee will need to consult Senate on all strategic plans that impinge on Senate’s responsibilities concerning academic quality and standards, but that the Executive Committee’s reporting line in terms of accountability will be clearly and unambiguously to Council”. Another observation worth making was in the list of the duties of members of Senate, one item was: “To act always in the best interest of the University as a whole, with this duty to be observed in priority to any duty as a member may owe to those electing or appointing him or her”. The proposed membership of Senate was reduced significantly (from 55 to 30), while maintaining a balance between ex-officio and elected members, so that the former did not dominate discussion and the whole university was represented.

As with Council the sub-committee structure was made clearer and more coherent. Sub-committees proposed were: Boards of Studies (responsible to Senate for a discipline or group of allied subjects with respect to academic quality and standards assurance); Academic Governance Committee (oversees the regulatory and governance framework for issues that impact on institution-wide academic policy and strategy); Academic Practice, Programmes and Standards Committee (oversees the mechanisms that ensure that all academic courses are of an appropriate quality and standard, and enhance academic practice); Research Committee (oversees academic research); Validation Committee (oversees effective operation of all validation activity, and ensures that quality of such programmes are commensurate of those within the University); Student Affairs Committee (considers the corporate governance and other related implications of University activities in relation to student affairs).

The Working Party also recommended that School Boards should be abolished to avoid confusion with Board of Studies, and that schools should introduce executive committees to mirror central University committee structure. School Boards were the mechanism through which individual academic staff could have a direct influence on the changes taking place or proposed in their school. Over the years school boards were seen as the mechanism through which the power of heads of department or schools could be constrained. This was no longer compatible with the new management model being introduced in the University. Some schools, such as Cass Business School, had since the 1990s used school boards for communication and consultation, and formed an executive committee for decision making purposes (although the extent to which a Dean used it as a decision making or advisory function depended on the style of the Dean).

Conclusions to governance reforms.

This chapter has described the major governance reforms undertaken by the University since 1966. The fact that they were introduced during the period 1998 to 2005 can probably be explained by a mix of factors. First, as already pointed out there were an array of forces generated by a series of government sponsored enquiries/publications
putting pressure on the Higher Education sector to adopt ‘good practice’ governance and HRM systems. Related to this was the belief that adopting a more commercial model of governance and management would squeeze more efficiency out of individual universities. Secondly, universities themselves were becoming more aware of the increased national and international competition for students, staff and research grants; an awareness that was exacerbated by the plethora of ratings (e.g., RAE) and rankings (e.g., The Times ranking of universities). This in turn meant that the University had to move with the times by making better use of new technology (e.g., IT systems) and by developing a more professional approach to management (e.g., in relation to strategy, marketing, finance, HR , and so on). Thirdly, there were individuals who had the authority, motivation and expertise to take a leadership role at the right time. In other words, they were prepared to initiate appropriate action by appointing the right individuals to carry out the tasks that had to be done, by helping to create the right structures and conditions for these individuals to succeed, including monitoring progress in the achievement of objectives. While several individuals met these criteria the two that appear to have had a significant influence, by virtue of their position in the University, were David Rhind (Vice-Chancellor) who already had acquired relevant expertise in change management when he headed Ordinance Survey, and Ian Creagh (University Secretary) who had relevant experience in Australian universities.

In delving deeper into the process of managing governance changes in the University context, there are useful observations to be made that may be relevant to other institutions. These have been well elucidated by an insightful paper by Ian Creagh and Richard Verrall (first presented to the Workshop on the Process of Reform of University Systems, European Institute for Advanced Studies in Management, Venice 2006, and published more widely in Creagh and Verrall, 2008). Both individuals played leading roles in governance reform at City. They identify four positive features that emerged from the University’s approach to governance reform:

*There was a guiding coalition of senior executives and Council members that was created to steer the change process. This signalled to others that it considered reform to be an urgent priority, and by being openly self-critical of Council it demonstrated to Senate the way to reform.

Adopting a principled view of governance reform at an early stage meant that the discussion in various bodies (e.g., Council, Senate, ‘away days’) were guided by a coherent set of beliefs (see above for examples).

*There was an emphasis on strong communication. The competitive context as a prime reason for reform had to be understood by all. Some had to accept that they were no longer relevant to the future of the University, and others had to be encouraged to step forward (particularly with reference to external stakeholders on Council).

*It was recognized that confronting obstacles to change was necessary. Effective communication is important but so is the courage of leaders to confront and remove the obstacles to change. A traditional aspect of the culture of universities is the power of the professoriate to resist change which threatens their influence. Historically this power is derived from the institutions structure, and it tends to persist where the professoriate are instrumental in attracting significant research funds. In many UK universities where the State’s distribution of research funds are in the hands of central administration, and where the nature of the
professoriate has gradually changed as non-research criteria of academic leadership has increasingly been taken into account for promotion to professorship, the power of the professoriate has been weakened but not removed.

Two other significant obstacles to governance reform had to be removed at City to enable the implementation of proposed reforms: Under the original Charter a number of bodies had the right to nominate members to Council. While some of these bodies had had a key role to play in the past, this was no longer the case in the changing environment in which the University had to survive. The new set of governing principles now required Council members to behave independently, much as non-executive directors of commercial boards. This meant that the nomination rights of stakeholders had to be abolished. The original Charter also gave Senate the right to intervene in financial and managerial matters. The proposed change was to clearly define Senate’s powers for preserving academic quality and standards, and to consider all academic matters of a strategic significance. However, ultimate responsibility for strategic decisions rests with Council, after appropriate consultation.

These changes were incorporated in the revised Charter. Although some of the ‘negative’ powers of Senate were removed, its positive powers of safeguarding and enhancing the academic quality and standards were reinforced.

Charts showing the latest governance structure and governance and risk responsibilities, as they appear on the University’s web site, are reproduced in Appendix 4a and 4b. These charts will help in clarifying some of the more intricate relationships in the University’s Governance.
CHAPTER 4
THE SEVEN ACADEMIC SCHOOLS AND THEIR ANTECEDENTS:
1978-2008

We can now turn to a closer examination of the Schools of the University to trace their development from 1978 to the present time. It was pointed out in chapter 1 that by 2008 the University was divided into 7 Schools: Engineering and Mathematical Sciences; Cass; Informatics; Health Sciences; Social Sciences; Arts; City Law School. Each of these Schools brought together a number of departments and centres. However, there were two departments that were closed in the last 30 years: Chemistry and Physics. By October 1984 it became clear that the UGC wanted to adopt a policy of discouraging the maintenance and spread of small departments. It set out the criteria that characterized economically healthy departments in terms of student intakes, staff numbers and professors.

While City’s Chemistry Department rated highly on research income per staff, it failed to meet the student numbers criterion, despite attempts to attract students through innovative degrees (e.g., BSc in Chemistry and Management introduced in 1983). In the 1986-87 Annual report the Vice-Chancellor recognized the competitive situation facing the department, resulting in failure to fill its undergraduate intake quota set by the UGC. Despite the introduction of new degrees, it became increasingly clear that closure was the least unfavourable option. A phased run down was undertaken. Some staff were relocated to other universities; no intake took place in October 1989; and the final students graduated in 1992. City’s loss was a gain to other universities. Fortunately, the large cost of relocation (e.g. staff, equipment, books) was borne by the UFC. Also the UFC allowed the loss of student numbers to be made up in other subject areas where recruitment was strong (e.g., the business school). For the fate of physics see below.

School of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences.

Immediately before and after 1966 the strengths of the institution were in engineering and science (including ophthalmic optics). Difficulties in recruiting the required number of students in these traditional areas have led to their relative decline within the University and to the introduction and growth of other disciplines. Within the context of the engineering-related disciplines the period 1978-2008 has been characterized by several attempts to rejuvenate engineering. Various working parties attempted to formulate strategies that would resolve the problem (e.g, Finkelstein’s report to Senate in 2001). This was against a background in which engineering departments were over-staffed, and were in effect being financially subsidized by other parts of the University. One of the consequences was that the various ‘units’ of engineering began to explore ways in which they could collaborate more than in the past.

The decline in student intake in Physics was evident in the 1970s, and the intake to the Department of Applied Physics was terminated in October 1986. However, the fate of physics was different to that of chemistry due to its close affinity with aspects of engineering such as electrical, electronic and information engineering. Indeed, for many years the Physics department did a good deal of ‘service teaching’ for the engineering departments, and by October 1982 close collaboration resulted in a joint degree programme. This collaboration led to the establishment a year later of the School of Electrical Engineering and Applied Physics with Professor Ludwig Finkelstein as Dean.
When the School of Engineering was formed in August 1988 the remnants of the Department of Applied Physics survived as the Centre for Measurement Instrumentation and Applied Physics.

Further evidence of this increased collaboration among the engineering disciplines occurred in anticipation of the recommendations of the Finniston Report (1980). The departments agreed to develop proposals for extending the existing B.Sc. courses for those students wishing to take a new M.Eng. degree. Although this recommendation of Finniston was not endorsed by the government, the engineers went ahead with the proposal in the expectation of sufficient student take-up and continued support of sponsors. However, it was not until August 1988 that all the engineering departments were brought together under a single Dean – Professor Finkelstein. It was no mean achievement to bring the three departments into one structure: Civil Engineering; Mechanical Engineering and Aeronautics; Electrical, Electronic & Information Engineering. But integration remained limited in that each department retained its Board of Studies (unlike other Schools in the University which had a single Board of Studies), even though there was a single School Board to co-ordinate policy and resources.

At this point it is worth quoting an extract from Teague’s draft manuscript because it illustrates the more subtle changes that had been taking place in engineering, and the visionary influence of Finkelstein in facilitating these changes. “The first Dean to be appointed was Professor Ludwig Finkelstein, whose background in measurement engineering, together with his close involvement over the years in the University’s gradual evolution away from the ‘mini-M.I.T.’ concept of the late sixties to the more realistic aim of meeting the actual needs of a vastly changed British industrial base, made him ideally suited to providing leadership for the new School. The individual departments had originally been geared to the rather rigid structures of the single-honours London University engineering degrees, which were a key part of City University’s heritage. The sandwich degree concept had, of course, considerably modified those structures over many years. Thus evolution into the new flexible structures now in place did not happen rapidly. It was not until the late nineteen eighties that the demand-pull of the student replaced the supply-push of the traditional honours degree courses of instruction.”

“Change was necessary in higher education because of the profound change in the nature of the industrial basis of the British economy, that is to say a movement away from heavy engineering to electronic and service industries. At the same time the sandwich course concept needed to evolve as vastly more students stayed on at school until eighteen years of age and then expected, as of right, full-time higher education. Industry began to take on more graduates and so the University moved to more full-time provision at the expense of the sandwich courses of which it had been such a successful pioneer provider. Experienced engineers in industry, many non-graduates, increasingly fuelled a demand for Diploma and Master’s courses which City was very well placed to meet.” (p.205-206).

Changes that took place under Finkelstein’s leadership included the introduction of a common modular structure for all engineering courses in June 1991, thus enabling as much rationalization of courses as was possible. At the Senate meeting of June 1991 (Senate 152) a reduction in the establishment of the School of Engineering was also agreed (to be financed by central funding). These changes were proposed in the document “Strategy for the School of Engineering”, which in effect was the strategic plan for the future development of Engineering at City. The proposed changes met some of
the concerns that other parts of the University had about the ‘draining’ effects engineering was having on the University’s ability to adapt to its competitive environment. The importance of the meeting was that the University committed itself to supporting Engineering in aspiring to achieve its plans.

A School of Mathematics was formed in 1987 under the deanship of Henry Wynn. It consisted of three units: mathematics, actuarial science and statistics. However, the recruitment of school leavers into mathematics was becoming an increasing problem. It became more difficult to sustain the discipline as an independent department when actuarial science was attracted to the idea of being integrated into the business school – a move which took place in 2002. The observation has been made that the Mathematics Department became unsustainable because staff were reluctant to follow the trend in other parts of the University of innovating in the postgraduate area with MSc degrees. The mathematics faculty had a choice of which School to join. The business school was not interested. The engineering school was prepared to have them on condition that they were prepared to be treated as a ‘discipline group’ rather than a ‘department’.

By this time engineering had been undergoing a sea change. In October 2000 Dinos Arcoumanis had been appointed Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Dean of the School of Engineering. He joined from Imperial College and brought his research team with him. He was surprised to find that engineering had been in deficit for many years, that the University had only appointed a Pro-Vice-Chancellor for research in 1999 (i.e. Julius Weinberg), and that Engineering consisted of several small departments. A weakness in the latter structure was that heads of departments had their own budgets, and were likely to be a barrier to changes that were in the interest of the whole faculty. In the process of re-structuring he replaced departments with discipline groups each led by an Associate Dean, thus adopting a typical matrix structure. It was under this structure that he was prepared to accept the mathematicians. Hence the title of the School now includes Mathematics.

For three years the School has managed to balance its books. A hiccup has occurred as a result of the University deciding to charge Schools for the space that they occupy; potentially a heavy burden for laboratory-based disciplines. The dean has successfully argued for a graded introduction of the scheme so that this new problem becomes more manageable. From August 2008 the School of Engineering and the School of Informatics will have a conjoint Dean (Professor Ken Gratten). Dinos Arcoumanis is assuming the role of Deputy Vice-Chancellor for Research and International Affairs.

**School of Informatics.**

When the School was formed in 1990 it brought together three departments - Information Science, Business Computing and Computer Science. In the 1960s information science developed as an informal group led by Jason Farradane within the business school. It gained independent Centre status in 1970, and was upgraded to departmental status within the University in 1983, initially under Professor Bottle and then under Steve Robertson (an expert in search engines) before he left to work for Microsoft at Cambridge. A second component of the School of Informatics also grew out of the Business School - Business Computing. Business systems analysis had developed within the business school as a result of self-financing courses designed for the Civil Service in 1970. Owen Hanson provided the leadership in expanding the market for this discipline,
initially as a centre and then as a department within the business school. In 1989 the Department became an independent structure within the University, and it became part of the School of Informatics when this was formed in 1990, under the deanship of Professor Peter Osman. Computer Science was initially a division headed by Jean Scott within the Mathematics Department, and in September 1978 it became the Department of Computer Science with Professor Price as Head.

In 1998 two of the departments (Business Computing and Computer Science) merged, and this helped in bringing about more effective management under the deanship of David Bolton. This was also one of the positive outcomes of the ‘great fire’ of 2001, since the subsequent re-housing of Computing (the department that was destroyed by the fire) brought together in a single location the previously dispersed units of the School. The School included three successful Centres: Software Reliability, Human Computer Interaction Design, and Health Informatics.

**Cass Business School.**
The business school was one of the main developments that took place in the University after 1966, thus compensating for the contraction of engineering. A detailed account of its history has been published elsewhere (Williams 2006), but an outline of the milestone events since 1978 are identified below.

The Dean appointed in January 1978 was John Treasure, an economist and former Chairman of J. Walter Thompson. He succeeded an interim deanship (1976-77) which was a triumvirate consisting of three senior members of staff. The Triumvirate was intended to fill the gap until a successor to David Glen (1968-76) could be appointed. At that time the School had just changed its name from ‘Graduate Business Centre’ to ‘City University Business School’ in order to accommodate the introduction of a BSc in business studies. Strategic aims under Treasure were to develop closer links with the City and its financial institutions, and to obtain sponsorship for new Chairs to augment the academic credibility of the School. In relation to the latter he was successful in raising finance for three new Chairs (see chapter 6).

When Treasure left in 1982 to form his own advertising agency he was succeeded by Brian Griffiths, an economist who was already employed by the University as the Director of the Centre for Banking and International Finance. The Centre had a strong research tradition and it moved into the Barbican premises housing the business school on Griffiths’ appointment. A year later it became structurally part of the School, and in August 1988 it merged with the Finance Division of the School to form the Department of Banking and Finance. The School’s strength in finance grew as Griffiths was made a non-executive director of the Bank of England. He resigned his Chair at City in 1986 to become Margaret Thatcher’s chief policy adviser in 10 Downing Street. Under the Deanship of Andrew Chambers (an internal auditor expert already employed by the School) an additional crop of five sponsored Chairs were established (see chapter 6).

An important new link with the City was made in 1983 with the establishment of the Centre for Shipping, Trade and Finance under the direction of Professor Costas Grammenos. It was launched by Geoffrey Howe (Foreign Secretary) at the Baltic Exchange. The Centre is now a well established part of the Business School, and has attracted substantial funding from the City to give its degree courses and research programme financial security into the future. Costas Grammenos received a CBE in 2009 in recognition of his role in making London the World’s leading centre for teaching and research in shipping, trade and finance. Other significant structural changes under
the deanships of Professor Gerald Goodhardt (1991), David Kaye (1992-97), Professor Lesley Hannah (1997-2000), and Lord Currie (2000-07) included: the formation of VOLPROF in 1991 under Visiting Professor Ian Bruce (Director General of RNIB) with support from NatWest and BT; the incorporation of all or parts of other University departments: Property Valuation and Management (1992); Systems Science and Management (1995); Actuarial Science and Statistics (2002).

Property Valuation and Management had been established as a Centre in 1982 with the support of a Trust Fund initiated by the industry for educational purposes. The Systems Science Department was originally concerned with the application of computers and automation in industry, and on the management of engineering and technological change. Its interdisciplinary approach enabled close links to develop with engineering and management. From 1981-82 the teaching of management to the engineering and science departments was transferred from the Business School to Systems. Undergraduate degrees were established with engineering, and a joint MBA in Engineering Management with the business school. In 1983 part of the department went to strengthen the engineering departments, and when the department was dispersed in 1995 as part of the policy of migrating smaller departments to Schools, the undergraduate degree in Systems and Management and the MBA in Engineering Management were relocated in the Business School. When Mathematics moved to the School of Engineering, Actuarial Science and Statistics went to the Business School in 2002 and its head (Professor Steve Haberman) became the deputy dean of Cass. This latter move strengthened Cass’ research performance and its links with City institutions. Before Actuarial Science was absorbed the School was structured into nine departments (a consequence of David Kaye’s leanings for an internal market). While this structure encouraged each department to have its own MSc degrees, it created problems for management. Lord Currie’s arrival, combined with the ending of head of department contracts, enabled him to restructure the School into three faculties (Finance, Management, Actuarial Science). Governance arrangements (e.g. composition of the executive committee) were further refined under the present Dean, Richard Gillingwater.

His appointment in 2007 was a further example of the strategy the University has followed for the School since 1966 – developing a close relationship with the City and its institutions. Obstacles associated with cultural change (both within the School and within City institutions) meant that this relationship has evolved at a slow pace. However, steady progress has been made in this direction through its three faculties and its five programmes (BSc, MSc, MBA, PhD and Cass Executive). It is significant that Richard Gillingwater (who has had a distinguished career in investment banking), is the first professional from City institutions to be appointed to lead the School into the future.

**School of Social Sciences.**

The early history of the School of Social Sciences grew out of three main disciplines economics, psychology and sociology (plus philosophy in the very early days). The three departments that emerged around these disciplines were not part of the vision of the first Head of Social Sciences – the distinguished humanitarian Sir Robert Birley. The problem was that academics appointed were more interested in the development of their discipline rather than in developing the liberal studies component of the engineering and science degrees in the rest of the University. However, the University was to benefit from this unintended consequence of the selection process because it brought to an end an educational service that was never really appreciated by other departments, and it enabled
innovations to be introduced to the long term benefit of the University. The general attitude toward liberal studies is reflected in the words of a professor of physics who said in shopping he would not buy cornflakes with a plastic toy in the box - he does not want to pay for the toy when it is cornflakes that he wants!

In 1978/79 the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities (as it was then named) had 31 academic staff catering for 358 undergraduates. Its main product was the flexible modular degree scheme that allowed students to specialize in one of the main disciplines. Steve Miller (a psychologist) succeeded Colin Harbury (an economist) to the headship of the department just after the UGC’s review of the social sciences in which they recommended a significant reduction in student intake, and the quota was cut by a third. The response to this ‘1981/82’ financial crisis included transferring service teaching (Liberal/General Studies) out of the department and various adjustments being made to degrees on offer (e.g. the phasing out of a single honours in philosophy). By 1983/84 academic staff numbers had declined to about 20. While cutting back staff a strategy was implemented to introduce self-financing programmes by supplementing the undergraduate degrees with postgraduate qualifications. Thereafter as a result of new combined degrees (e.g., Sociology and Media Studies), the development of outside links (e.g., nursing faculty at St Bartholomew’s hospital; half year stays for students from two American universities) and the recruitment of overseas students, staff and student numbers picked up. Mid and late eighties saw a rise in self-funded postgraduate courses. Thus, the M.A. in Communications Policy Studies (the department’s first taught Masters course) was launched in 1985, and a few years later a modular programme of health-related courses for health professionals began (e.g., M.Sc. in Health Psychology or Nursing). Under Mary Watts, a psychologist, several health related qualifications developed.

By 1987/88 it became clear that an emerging strategy of the department was to contribute toward the University’s professionally oriented degrees. This was reinforced in a paper of January 1992 in which the department set out its policy as being “directed to developing the professional applications of the social sciences, particularly in the areas of health, management and communications. To establish research excellence in distinctive fields such as health psychology, communications policy, applied econometrics and the sociology of ethnicity and social change. To develop an adaptive, high quality modular degree scheme incorporating single and combined honours degrees in the social sciences; and hybrid degrees linking social science subjects to applied fields of study (e.g. sociology and media, economics and accountancy).” (Department of Social Sciences, External Relations Strategy, 16/1/92). This policy was successfully attracting funding from the UFC; thus enabling full-time equivalent student numbers to reach 490, with 32 centrally funded staff, in 1990/91. In 1989 the department became a School with Steve Miller as its first Dean. By 2000 the number of staff in the School had expanded to 80, and an extensive list of degrees are currently on offer.

A notable achievement under the Deanship of Professor Howard Tumber (1999-2004) was obtaining the commitment and delivery of a new building for the School from the University. This was opened in 2005. Prior to this the School was not only dispersed in different locations, but was occupying sub-standard accommodation (e.g. Walmsley House). This development had great significance for the School’s academic and administrative progress.

An example of the many research centres/units active within the School is the Centre for Comparative Social Surveys. This was set up in October 2003 as a result of an
initiative emerging from Howard Tumber’s contacts with Roger Jowell and others at SCPR. This research institution had had various formal and informal ties with the University in the past but they never materialized into a full partnership. When Jowell retired as head of SCPR he moved to the University as a Visiting Professor and brought with him a major European social survey project. This is a multi-nation European Social Survey (ESS) funded by the European Commission, European Science Foundation and national funding agencies. It is designed to measure and interpret changing attitudes within and between European nations, and to inform academic and policy debate about European social change in the future. In 2005 the ESS team were awarded the Descartes Prize, this is Europe’s top annual science award. In 2008 Roger Jowell was knighted for his many achievements in the social survey field.

School of Arts.
The School is concerned with professional education and research for the arts, media and cultural industries. It is a young structure that attempts to bring together a number of departments that over the years have developed their own distinctive culture. These include: Music; Journalism and Publishing; Culture Policy and Management; Language Studies; Education and Lifelong Learning. These core units of the School were in fact all located within the Centre of Arts and Related Studies prior to its dissolution into its constituent parts in 1983. When Professor Sue Robertson was appointed as the first Dean of the School in 2003, she was faced with three main challenges: drawing together the disparate departments into a coherent structure; developing "intellectual glue", i.e. a strategic rationale that all could share; and acquiring premises that would enable the School to achieve its aims.

Culture Policy and Management. The Culture Policy and Management subject area developed from an Arts Administration diploma course transferred from the Polytechnic of Central London in 1974. In 1976 John Pick was appointed Director of Arts Administration Studies, and in 1977 an MA degree course was introduced alongside the Diploma course; this was the first MA as opposed to MSc of the City University. In 1983 Pick was made Head of the Department of Arts Policy and Management when the Centre for Arts and Related Studies was separated into its constituent parts. By 1987 the Department was running five MA degrees in addition to MPhil/PhDs. Full-time academic staff increased from 3 in 1984 to 7 in 1992. In 1990 Professor Patrick Boylan was appointed Head of this post-graduate department which was now involved in teaching and research across the field of arts policy making, arts criticism, and arts and heritage management. Besides leading the Department Boylan has been a consultant for several international bodies (e.g., UNESCO, the World Bank). He retired in 2004. Currently the Acting Head is Vicky Woollard who has extensive experience as an education practitioner in museums. She is supported by 9 academic staff, and a string of visiting lecturers.

Music. Aspirations to develop music can be traced back to the early history of the institution when the ‘Great Hall’ was fitted with an organ (Teague 1993). Many years later a critical date was 1975 when Malcolm Troup was appointed from the Guildhall School of Music and Drama (where he was Director of Music) to develop a music degree, based on the existing diploma course at the Guildhall School. Close links with the Guildhall School have continued to the present day. The new degree had a bias toward computer and electronic music, which grew out of work carried out by interested individuals in the Departments of Physics (Adrian Seville) and Electrical Engineering (D.
Finlay). This emergent interest was recognized by the Worshipful Company of Musicians when they funded a research studentship in electronic music in 1973-74. This first BSc Music was an inter-departmental course, and based in the Centre for Arts. In October 1982 departmental status was given to Music, with Professor Malcolm Troup as its Head. The 1989 UGC Music Review welcomed the distinctive character of the Department. The courses reflected the unusual research interests of staff (e.g., electro-acoustic composition, psychology of music, music therapy and music theatre), as well as the more traditional areas (e.g., performance, musicology and acoustic composition).

The reputation and activities of the department have grown substantially. Currently there are two undergraduate degrees, six Master degrees and research degrees. Music has performed well in successive Research Selectivity Exercises, and the technological component of its courses has influenced similar developments in music departments elsewhere in the UK.

Journalism. The birth of Journalism in 1976 was an additional example of the emerging University’s strategy of providing ‘professional’ education. How Journalism Studies became introduced into the University followed a sequence of events typical of academic innovation. An individual inside or outside the University with links to an industrial sector puts forward a proposal to an individual (e.g. Vice-Chancellor or Academic Registrar) or decision making committee (e.g. Board of Studies); appropriate consultations are initiated, often through a working party consisting of interested parties within the University; if sufficient support is obtained then proposals are fed through formal academic and resource channels to ensure that proper academic and financial criteria have been considered.

In the present case the initial trigger appears to have been a memorandum dated January 1975 from Terry Page (Communications Consultant at the University and a member of the National Union of Journalists) to the Vice-Chancellor, Edward Parkes. Page put forward strong arguments for a postgraduate diploma in journalism studies, including the fact that the only other university in the UK to have entered this field was Cardiff which could only cater for 20 of their 300 applications. Parkes set-up a working party that brought together Jeremy Tunstall (Professor of Sociology at the University and a consultant for the Royal Commission on the Press which was set-up by the Prime Minister in 1974), David Jenkins (Director of General Studies) and Page. In November 1975 an enlarged working party under David Jenkins started to work on the details of the proposed qualification which went to Courses Committee in April 1976 and thence to the May meeting of Senate. The first intake of students was in October of that year, and Tom Welsh was appointed as the first head of journalism at City.

Integrating a predominantly vocational qualification into the University was a challenging task. With the support of key individuals (e.g. Jeremy Tunstall on the academic side and David Jenkins on the managerial side), Tom Welsh spent two years nurturing Journalism to take root within the University. His annual reports to the Journalism advisory committee show the efforts that went into getting the initial qualification accepted by the industry (e.g. accreditation by the National Council for the Training of Journalists), and obtaining sponsorship/funding for students. Contributions toward the latter came from The Times, the Sun, Reuters, the Printing and Publishing Industry Training Board, the Irish Independent, and the Department of Education and Science.

At this time Journalism was part of the Centre for Arts and Related Studies, headed by David Jenkins. The difficult period of the early 1980s (see Chapter 2) meant
that the University had to critically review its constituent parts. In 1982-83 a working party looking into the future of journalism at City (chaired by the Professor of Industrial Relations at the Business School - Sid Kessler), recommended that an independent centre should be set up with a professorial head. Reuters, The Guardian and The Economist contributed substantially to the Chair in Journalism (the first in the UK). In November 1983 John Dodge was appointed to the Chair, and in March 1984 the Graduate Centre for Journalism was formed with Professor John Dodge as its first Head. John Dodge was already familiar with Journalism at City having been a member of the advisory committee while employed as the Director of Information at the Inner London Educational Authority.

Hugh Stephenson succeeded to the Chair and Headship in 1986, and at the same time the Centre was given Departmental status. Stephenson was formerly Editor of the New Statesman and The Times Business News. He introduced a number of changes before he retired in 1996. The Diploma was re-labelled an MA so as to be more meaningful to overseas students (as with other departments the income they generated was important). An undergraduate degree was introduced in 1991 (the first in journalism in the UK); this followed the American pattern of combining journalism with a more academic subject. This innovation at City helped to integrate Journalism even more effectively into the University, provided better career development opportunities for academic staff, and helped the Social Science Department to accumulate more teaching hours for their more lightly loaded academics (e.g. sociologists).

Since 2005 the department has been headed by Professor Adrian Monck. Currently there are 23 full-time academic staff of whom four are professors. Given that journalism started with 12 students on a single postgraduate diploma in 1976, this is a success story on most criteria. Performance in terms of research has lagged behind, largely due to the vocational orientation of the subject and the criteria used on the main performance measure, i.e. the Research Assessment Exercise of HEFCE. An interesting observation made by Hugh Stephenson is the tension between the ‘Jeremy Tunstall camp’ (academic, research, PhDs) and the ‘vocational camp’ – a conflict that has always been implicit if not explicit. However, he adds that Jeremy Tunstall is the ‘godfather of journalism’ at City.

The very recent development in journalism at the University is the formation of the UK’s first Graduate School of Journalism. It includes a new Centre for Journalism Research, led by Howard Tumber, Professor of Sociology at the University and until recently Acting Dean of the School of Arts.

Education and Lifelong Learning; Language Studies. Continuing education was very much in keeping with the original intention of the institution since the very early days, with its emphasis on the local community as well as national professional education. There was always an element in the University for general education studies – named in succession as liberal studies (1966), general studies (1977), and extension studies (1982). In addition in 1971 the University started an extra-mural programme. Hans Klein who had initiated the early courses was made Director of Adult Education in 1978. On the division of the Centre for Arts and Related Studies into its constituent parts in 1983, David Jenkins became Head of the Centre for Continuing Education. A wide variety of courses were provided, and since the lecturers were mainly part-timers, the range of subjects was not restricted to those in which the University had degrees.
The Centre subsequently was given departmental status and ‘Education and Lifelong Learning’ replaced ‘Continuing Education’. The department is now one of the largest providers of open-access education in London, with around 6,000 students on continuing education programmes every year. It offers over 250 evening and weekend and short courses in subjects ranging from computer programming to food writing, and from creative enterprise to London tourist guide. Courses can either be taken individually, by module or as part of a more formal certificate qualification.

The Centre for Language Studies is based in the department. When Extension Studies was brought to an end in 1990-91, they were replaced by languages. Professor Tim Connell was appointed Director of Language Studies in 1990 with the brief of developing language studies in the University and developing links in the Square Mile. Languages are now optional courses in several degrees, and they form part of a short course programme open to individuals in the local community including the business community. Many of the latter courses have grown in partnership with the Bishopsgate Institute founded in 1895; a charitable foundation for people living and working in the City of London with shared interests to learn about a vast array of subjects. Currently the Centre for Language Studies has 6 full-time academic staff supporting the director in coordinating the teaching of languages in Arabic, English, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Spanish, Linguistics. The Centre’s professional diploma courses offer translation in eighteen language combinations, leading to the Diploma in Translation of the Institute of Linguists. It has the distinction of running the first distance learning courses in the University.

School of Community and Health Sciences.
Disciplines relating to health have been brought together through a variety of pathways. Ophthalmic Optics (Optometry) was an independent department with an international reputation as early as the 1920s. It provides courses which meet the requirements of the College of Optometrists and the General Optical Council, and through its research it endeavours to increase knowledge in relation to human disease and fundamental visual mechanisms. Clinical Communication Studies was an independent centre in the early 1980s. Its origins are recounted by Teague as follows: “…the University reached agreement in principle with the Kingdom-Ward Speech Therapy Trust to make provision for setting up a course without there being a call on UGC recurrent funds, which would not have been successful at that time …. The University agreed to take into its employ, on short-term contracts, the relevant staff employed by the Centre for Clinical Communication Studies at Blackfriars. In return the Trust undertook to donate to the University an annual sum to cover salary costs plus the appropriate contribution to central administrative costs. The UGC then stated that these students would not be part of the University’s target numbers, as they were not UGC funded. Thus at the most critical point the University was effectively penalized for an initiative in widening its academic range by setting up a Centre for Clinical Communication Studies. In addition, in academic year 1985-86 it became necessary to bring the Centre into the University’s budgeting procedures, as the Trust had suffered severe financial problems in 1984 and had to be wound up. The UGC did not take the logical step of including the student numbers in its funded totals for the University until late 1986. Departmental status followed on the first of August, 1987”(Teague 1993). Today it continues to meet the professional, academic and personal development needs of the Speech and Language
A significant group of health-related qualifications grew out of the Social Science Department. In 1968 the department collaborated with St. Bartholomew’s College of Nursing and Midwifery to launch a nursing BSc. This initial link led to further collaborations on MScs, and in 1991 the College became a School of the University and the Principal, Mrs. Studdy, was accorded the status equivalent to a Dean. Complex factors led up to this absorption within the University, and it is unclear whether the prime movers were the action of the nursing colleges or the policies of the government (Burke 2003). The Charterhouse College of Radiography was another external body attracted to being part of City University. The College was a health service education centre formed in 1991 when the old regional health authority amalgamated its five schools of radiography, which had previously existed at the major London teaching hospitals of North East Thames. The Department of Radiography at City was formed in 1995 when the College left control of its Health Authority and was formally incorporated into the University. In 2002 it joined City’s other related health sciences to form the School of Allied Health Sciences. This School, together with the School of Nursing and Midwifery, then formed the Institute of Health Sciences.

The break-up of the Systems and Management department in 1995 saw the transfer of its Health Management Masters to the School of Social Sciences. By now it was becoming clear that the University’s strength in the health area was not visible to outsiders. Professor Ewart Carson and others realized that advantages would be gained by marketing the various health bits under one umbrella, and by creating appropriate synergies. The result was the formation of the Institute of Health Sciences with Ewart Carson as its first director. When the Institute was given the status of a School, Steve Miller was appointed as the first Dean and a Pro-Vice-Chancellor. Up to this point the Barts School of Nursing and Midwifery was still a separate School until Professor Julius Weinberg brought all the health units together to form the School of Allied Health. But there were still duplicate structures within the School, e.g., two boards of studies. When he followed Steve Miller into the role of Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Mary Watts was appointed Dean in August 2006 to oversee the health area.

The problem of unifying health in a single integrated structure had proved difficult. A number of factors came together in 2006 that proved to be decisive. Government cutbacks reduced funding to the NHS (and by implication to the University). The crisis created initiated a thorough financial analysis by Frank Toop, the University’s Director of Finance. This revealed that the situation was even worse than anticipated. This led the Vice-Chancellor, David Rhind, to initiate a radical change to integrate the School into a more unified structure. The changed structure was established in 2007 under the new title of City Community and Health Sciences. This was a major re-organisation resulting in 13 academic departments and centres being placed in one of three groups, each headed by an Associate Dean. Other Associate Deans headed the shared four administrative/service functions: Pre-registration and undergraduate programmes; Post-registration and postgraduate programmes; Research; Learning, teaching and student experience. This meant that the previous duplication between the Barts element and the rest disappeared. Heading the entire structure is Professor Mary Watts, Dean and Pro-Vice-Chancellor. During her recent absence, through ill-health, Jennifer Edie was appointed Acting Dean of the School. The School has brought together a complex amalgam of departments and centres all concerned in providing education for
healthcare, and aspiring in the future to extend their current leadership to the emerging area of applied professional education designed to enhance community and social wellbeing. Incorporating ‘community’ in the new title not only reflects the School’s strategic aims, but caters for new activities such as the Centre for Investigative, Security and Police Sciences (CISPS). This Centre (initially based in the School of Social Sciences) had developed, in conjunction with the City of London Police and the British Transport Police, learning and development programmes for new recruits, serving officers and the wider criminal justice sector. These programmes provide a valuable service to the community as well as generating additional income for the School.

**City Law School.**

Law has become a significant discipline within the University. Its early growth was tentative and took place within broader disciplines. The initial seed was sewn in 1967 when Law was included by a development committee established to produce a development plan for the next 10 years. Law was mentioned as one of several disciplines to bring in students in the longer term (Teague 1980). Short courses in Law were already being delivered by the Department of Management and Social Science (headed by Alvin Leyton, a barrister) in the Northampton College of Advanced Technology days. In 1972 one of the first Visiting Professors to be appointed in the business school was a distinguished lawyer, Professor Clive Schmitthoff, to guide studies in international law. In 1971 the Ormerod Committee on Legal Education urged an expansion in the output of law graduates. The close geographical positioning of the Inns of Court and the Law Courts made City University ideally placed for legal studies. In October 1977 the University set up a Centre for Legal Studies in response to an invitation from the Council of Legal Education to participate in preparing candidates for the academic element of the Bar examinations. This conversion diploma qualification had to be self-financing, given the UGC early attempts to discourage the University from developing degree courses in Law. Success in student recruitment (a significant attraction was probably the link with four eminent visitors from Oxbridge) eventually resulted in State funding, and the Centre was given departmental status in 1987 by the University.

The next turning point came with the appointment of Professor Martin Dockray in 1989 to head a staff of nine full-time academics assisted by the distinguished visiting professors. Apart from its own qualification the Centre/Department continued to provide courses for degrees in other parts of the University, particularly in the School of Social Sciences and Cass Business School. In 1990 Dockray pushed for introducing an undergraduate law degree, and this was followed by the introduction of a postgraduate degree in 1992. A step change in the development of Law came in August 2001 when the famous Inns of Court School of Law was incorporated in the University’s Institute of Law. This initiative was triggered in 1999 by Martin Dockray and Chris Ryan, and negotiated on behalf of the University by the Academic Registrar (Adrian Seville) and the Director of Finance (Frank Toop). Deregulation moves in the Thatcher era had created additional competition for the privately owned Inns of Court, and they saw attractions in becoming part of the University. The Deed negotiated with the University allowed City to use the name ‘Inns of Court’ for a number of years. This is now ended and the Law faculty can be integrated under the title of the City Law School. Consolidating the integration of the two units has been one of the main challenges for Professor Peter Kunzlik who was appointed Director in March 2005 (he was previously Dean of the Nottingham Law School, and has had extensive professional experience). There is now a
single Board of Studies instead of two, and a single administrative structure for marketing and accounting. The merger resulted in doubling the number of law students (approximately 500 + 700) as well as acquiring many distinguished alumni, including: Gandhi, Blair and Thatcher. The City Law School is the first Law school in London to educate students and practitioners at all stages of legal education.

Recent developments in the School are reinforcing the University’s strategy of being close to the City of London, and meeting the needs of business and the professions. A typical example is the LLM International Commercial Law, focusing on law relevant to financial business. The next major challenge for the School is to raise the funding for a new building that will house upwards of 80 staff (including 20 plus full-time academics) and some 1400 mainly postgraduate students.

**University research centres**

So far little attention has been given specifically to research activities. In the 1960s and 1970s research performance was below average relative to other UK universities. In 1977 Senate gave a working party the task of reviewing research and making recommendations for improving performance. The main proposal of the working party was that university wide research units should be set up, headed by individuals with a track record in research, and that pump-priming finance should be made available for them. Accordingly in 1978 three research units were established: Personnel Research Unit based in the Business School, headed by the author; Chemical Energy Research Unit in the Chemistry Department, headed by Dr A. Tseung; Pipeline Engineering Research Unit in Mechanical Engineering Department, headed by Professor R. Duckworth (Senate Minutes 8/3/1978). In later years Senate Research Committee differentiated between centres and units, the former bringing in substantially more income. Thus in 1981 the Personnel Research Unit was re-named the Centre for Personnel Research and Enterprise Development. Prior to these developments, research was carried out by individuals or research groups which were only recognized by their departments. In the following years several more research centres were formed, but their continuance depended more on the department/school where they were based rather than the University centre. Since centres depended largely on the academic entrepreneurialism of their founder, they tended to have a limited life. As chapter 7 will show the University has made noticeable improvements in its research performance in each successive Research Assessment Exercise carried out by HEFCE. The list of current research centres in Appendix 5 shows the wide range of expertise currently represented in the structures of the University’s Schools.

The original idea of research centres was that they should break down the intra- and inter-departmental barriers and encourage more co-operative research. The culture surrounding academic disciplines is such that this goal has always been difficult to achieve. The most recent initiative in this direction was holding a competition to select four interdisciplinary centres to support the University’s strategy on bringing closer together the functions of education, research and knowledge transfer. The competition resulted in the setting-up, with financial support, of four such centres in October 2008: The Interdisciplinary Centre for Creativity in Professional Practice (led by Neil Maiden); The Centre for Health and Social Care Management and Organisation (Georges Selim); The Interdisciplinary Centre of Transport (Dinos Arcoumanis); and The Interdisciplinary Centre in Performance at Work (Jo Silvester). It remains to be seen how successful these will be.
Conclusions
The history of each School deserves a whole chapter on its own, as do the qualifications they offer and the research expertise they display. However, this would have meant a publication well beyond this short history. The twin purposes of this chapter were to provide an overview of the present fields of academic expertise in the University, and to convey the complex evolution that has resulted in the present framework of Schools. The complexity and diversity facing a Vice-Chancellor and the top team in the development and implementation strategy, emphasizes the importance of ‘governance’ which was discussed in the last chapter.
CHAPTER 5

PARTNERSHIPS

Validation links.
The Nordoff-Robbins Centre for Music Therapy in North London was the first institution to have a course validated by the University. Its diploma has been continuously validated from 1983. Validation is specifically provided for in the University Charter and Ordinances, and has become one of the strategic aims of the University. To quote from the most recent ‘Validation and Institutional Partnerships Handbook 2007-08’:

“The University’s strategic aims, set within the context of its mission to be recognized regionally and internationally as the professional university for London, include the following which have a bearing on validation:
*To make a significant contribution to the success of London as a world city;
*To develop the University through growth and strategic collaboration.

The University’s objective in forming validation relationships is to develop academic links with appropriate academic institutions which do not have degree-awarding powers, thereby both furthering these aims and broadening its academic base through the recognition of complementary activities. In doing so the University takes responsibility for the quality and standards of the programmes validated as leading to the award of a City University degree, diploma or certificate and wish to satisfy itself that the quality assurance arrangements and academic standards being applied are no less rigorous than those applied to programmes offered within the University so as to meet national higher education requirements.”

In the process of validating qualifications and institutions, the University has gained in-depth experience that benefits both partner institutions and the University itself. This experience has been encapsulated in successive handbooks. Since validation is a central activity rather than that of an academic School, the Academic Registrar’s Department (now the Academic Development Unit) was responsible for administering validation arrangements while a senior member of the academic staff chaired the relevant committees (i.e. the initial validation panels assessing the case for validation, and the subsequent course boards if a validation agreement was reached). In recognition of the growing importance of validation and institutional partnerships to the strategic aims of the University, the senior academic responsible for providing leadership in the area and chairing the Validation and Institutional Partnerships Committee now has the title and status of Dean (currently Steve Stanton). The Dean operates within an agreed framework (with membership of relevant committees) and policies so that validation activities are congruent with University strategic aims (see Validation and Institutional Partnerships Handbook, 2007-08, for further details).

This framework now takes into account that collaborative activity may extend beyond the level of a programme (as in most validation agreements) to institutional level, as reflected in current partnership arrangements with City and Islington College, City of London Police and British Transport Police, and Queen Mary University of London. The framework developed helps to ensure that different collaborative activity with a partner
institution is brought under one umbrella. This centralised control enables past experience to be shared, and lessens the risk to both the quality and standards and the reputation of the University. The name change in 2006 from ‘Validation Committee’ to ‘Validation and Institutional Partnerships Committee’ recognizes the expanding variety of partnerships the University has nurtured, both at home and abroad (e.g., the partnership of Cass MBA with the Bank of China).

Box 5.1 lists the dates, institutions and their initial validated qualification. Over time many of these institutions had additional qualifications validated, including research degrees. Some validation links no longer exist, either because the institution has closed (e.g., Gyosei/Witan Hall in Reading), or it has become part of another university (e.g., Suffolk College), or because it has been incorporated into the University (e.g., Inns of Court School of Law). Arrangements that are still live in 2008 have their dates printed in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Institution/Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Music Therapy Diploma at Nordoff-Robbins Centre for Music Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>M.B.A., Ashridge Management College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>B.Sc. (Honours) in Physiotherapy with Human Sciences, North London School of Physiotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Diploma/M.Sc. joint course in Radiography of the Suffolk College and the Ipswich School of Radiography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>B.Sc./M.Sc courses in Radiography, Charterhouse College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>M.A. in Psychotherapy and Counselling, Regent’s College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Diploma/M.A. in Dance Movement Therapy, Laban Centre for Movement and Dance (now Trinity Laban Conservatoire for Music and Dance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>B.A. in Acting at the Guildhall School of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>B.A. (Honours) in Design, Marketing and Product Development (Footwear and Accessories), Cordwainers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>B.A. (Honours) degrees in Business Studies, Business and Culture Studies and Business with Language Studies, Gyosei International College in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Bar Vocational Course (Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Legal Skills), Inns of Court School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Certificate in Education, City Literary Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>M.A. in European Management, ESCP-EAP School of European Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>M.A. in Advanced Organisational Consultation, Tavistock Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Arts Educational School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>City and Islington College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Gateway Sound Educational Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>B.A. and M.A. courses, Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The benefits and risks of developing a link with another institution are always carefully thought through by the University. Validation links are initiated by institutions that are aware of the recruitment advantages of being able to award degrees to their students. In a validation link not only does the University ensure that any degree meets
the academic standards of its own degrees, but enables the institution to share the University’s expertise in the development of appropriate administrative structures, staffing and learning conditions. Students on a validated programme are awarded degrees of the University, and successful students become alumni of the University. Validation is a business in the sense that the fees charged ensure that all costs are covered, and indeed that at the end of the day a fair profit is achieved. There is therefore some risk involved in validation for the University, but much to be gained by the validated institution. The Deputy Academic Registrar, Frances Owen, took the lead in ensuring that the early validation links were based on a sound footing. In 2003 she resigned to take up the appointment of Quality Director, Registrar and Secretary at Hull University.

From the University’s point of view the potential benefits include: developing links which may have learning outcomes for University staff working in similar academic areas; helping to meet the higher education needs of other bodies in the community; growing the pool of University alumni; the potential for developing closer relationships to the mutual advantage of both parties. An examination of Box 5.1 will show that validation is a temporary arrangement; an agreement is usually for 5 years, and is renewable if a revalidation is positive. With due warning the University may terminate an agreement as happened when Lord Currie, the Dean of the Business School (2000-07), was against the University continuing to validate the MBA of Ashridge Management College for competitive reasons (Ashridge now has its own degree awarding powers). On other occasions academics have pushed for closure when they felt that the reputation of the University was at risk, as happened in relation to Regent’s College.

Validation has grown in line with the University’s strategic aims. This service was introduced under Raoul Franklin (1978-98), nurtured under David Rhind (1998-2007), and continues to have the full support of the current Vice-Chancellor, Malcolm Gillies. Virtually all the institutions being validated are in London, and they augment the student population by some 2300. A good 1500 of this total are on the performing and creative arts side. When Ravensbourne College approached the Quality Assessment Agency for advice as to a university based in London to validate their degrees, City University was recommended. Their previous validation partner was Sussex University; but a QAA visit had been critical of both Ravensbourne and Sussex. City University has always had favourable outcomes to its QAA visits. On completion of the validation of all the degrees of Ravensbourne a further 1100 students and 39 programmes will be added to the service.

In the global and highly competitive environment of today alliances go beyond validation. Close cooperation existed with the Guildhall School of Music before any validation agreement (they provided the performance element in the University’s music degrees). In 2001/02 the University and Guildhall School launched the first joint programme in Doctor of Music Arts (DMA). The validation of the courses of the Charterhouse College of Radiography was followed by its affiliation to the University, and then complete integration. Similar pathways were followed by the Barts School of Nursing and Midwifery, and the Inns of Court School of Law.

An external attempt to bring about a merger was made in 1983 when the Department of Education and Science, and the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA), suggested that City University and the City of London Polytechnic would have much to gain by merging. Details of the events that followed over the next nine years have already been mentioned in chapter 2. Suffice it to say that while the Polytechnic (and the ILEA) had much to gain from a merger, the University had much to lose. The
Polytechnic found other ways of solving its problems when it gained university status as a result of the Education Reform Act of 1988.

A voluntary merger is of course quite a different proposition. As reported in the Times Higher Education (4.12.2008) the University is exploring the possibility of joining the University of London. From August 2008 the latter adopted new governance arrangements to give it a more corporate structure (e.g., the sizeable senate and council system has been replaced with a smaller board of trustees and a collegiate council). Once these were fully in operation any institution applying to become a member of London University would be considered if they operated in a compatible way, had a track record of excellence in teaching and research and would add value to the collective interests of the colleges. From the point of view of City University there is considerable attraction in becoming part of an institution with a strong brand image abroad (e.g., it could have a positive effect on student recruitment).

The trend toward greater collaboration in the Higher Education sector is generally recognized, and has been encouraged by the research councils and other government agencies. This was the theme emphasized by David Rhind in the University’s Annual Report for 2002-03. A mapping exercise revealed the complex network of collaborations that had developed within and outside the University. The value in these collaborations is shown in their role in facilitating innovation, prosperity and growth. One of the many examples given in the report is the strategic alliance formalized in 2001 with Queen Mary College (QM) of London University. The initial outcome was a joint degree in journalism (a strength of the University) and history (a strength of QM). The alliance was cemented with an investment in two areas where both institutions have complementary strengths – health and engineering. HEFCE provided £2.94 million under its restructuring and collaboration fund, £1.55 million came from the NHS. These additional resources have benefitted nursing, communications and radiography within the University. So far the strategic alliance has not developed as far as originally envisaged – possibly because of changes to individuals involved (both Vice-Chancellors, David Rhind and Adrian Smith, have moved on to newer roles).

Another interesting partnership based in the University is Simfonec (Science Ideas to Market Focussed ON Enterprise and Commercialisation). It was launched in 2003 by the Department of Trade and Industry, and brings together four of London’s leading universities as a collaborative Science Enterprise Centre for the exploitation and transfer of knowledge, ideas and resources among three key sectors – academic, financial and small and medium enterprises. The collaborators with City are three from London University: The Royal Veterinary College, King’s College, and Queen Mary College.

**International links.**

In the current competitive climate any high aspiring university needs to become more international. There is now a clear structural separation at City between local validation agreements and international links. The Dean of the former reports to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor for Education (David Bolton), whereas proposals relating to the latter now have to be processed through Dinos Acoumantis as Deputy Vice-Chancellor for Research and International Affairs. This new position means that henceforth there will better coordination and control over developments that can impact the international reputation of the University. Until this change, international links involving either or both teaching and research, were initiated by Schools with the minimum of central control. Now the University has an internationalization strategy led from the centre with corresponding
Associate Deans for International Affairs in each School. They form a committee to oversee the implementation of international strategy across the University. Currently six Schools have developed teaching and/or research links with educational institutions in USA, China, Korea, India, Australia, Dubai, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Russia and Europe (Senate, 07.11.07).

While most schools rely on a steady flow of European and overseas students to meet their recruitment targets some programmes, such as the Cass MBAs, operate primarily in an international market. This has meant that over the years Cass has sought accreditation of international bodies for its MBAs (e.g., European Quality Improvement System or EQUIS of the European Foundation for Management Development), as well as launching Cass degrees in collaboration with partners overseas. An early example involved the part-time ‘Management MBA’ which was launched in 1987. A version of this qualification was run jointly with a consultancy firm in the Middle East, but the arrangement was terminated in the mid-nineties because of the difficulties in supervising quality. A second attempt on the international front was made in 2003 when collaboration with the Bank of China and a local academic institution enabled the Cass Executive MBA to be launched in Shanghai. At that time the Chairman of the Bank of China was an alumnus of the MBA. However, recently the China MBA has been closed down, partly due to difficulties in transferring income back to the UK. In 2008 an Executive MBA was launched in Dubai with the intention that Cass should use this as a base for developing a hub in the Middle East.
CHAPTER 6
ALUMNI AND SPONSORS

Longevity linked to success is a positive resource. Two distinctive features differentiate universities from banks and other profit-led institutions: first, they are a charity, secondly, they have alumni. Few employees are likely to maintain their loyalty to their former employer once they leave to progress their career. Students, on the hand, are likely to remain loyal to the university that helped them to launch or to advance their career. This is more likely to occur in relation to the more successful and prestigious universities, where one’s university acts as a badge that communicates something of value to others. The badge also acts as a key to the implicit network of those who have undergone the same educational experience. This is a phenomenon embedded in our culture and can be seen at work in the context of schools, universities, professional bodies, livery companies, clubs and so on. Although the University cannot claim the longevity and prestige of some universities such as Oxford and Cambridge, it has much to be proud of, not least for the 114 years’ of progress under a series of Principals and Vice-Chancellors. Successfully retaining alumni loyalty requires active management and financial investment. The process of building alumni relationships does not detract from the need, which has always been present, for managing relationships with corporate bodies. This chapter is concerned with these issues.

Centenary.
The University’s Centenary year was in 1994 and the events organized reflected its achievements, and featured many distinguished alumni and honorary alumni (those receiving an honorary degree) proud to be associated with its celebrations (City University 1994a) (City University 1994b). For example, the speakers at the Centenary public lectures included: Sir Claus Moser on the future of higher education: the thinking of the National Commission on Education; Professor Helmut Schlesinger, former President of the Deutches Bundesbank, on the conduct of an open economy; Kenneth Clarke, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the changing world of work in the 1990s; Howard Davies, Director General of the CBI, on the engineering recovery. The Music Department organized several music events, including a gala concert in The Guildhall; the University’s longstanding connection with the City of London was celebrated with a concert by the London Symphony Orchestra at the Barbican, which included a work by City lecturer and composer James Antony Ellis.

Given the highly successful British performance in the Beijing Olympic Games in 2008, and the prospect of an equally successful London Games in 2012, it is worth mentioning that a Centenary celebration organized by Dudley Cooper highlighted the development of physical exercise. The early mission of the institution in 1894 included ‘the promotion of the industrial skill, general knowledge, health and well-being of young men and women belonging to the poorer classes’. In 1896 a gymnasium was one of the special features, and Rudolf Oberholzer, world champion gymnast, joined the Northampton Institute (CityPlus 1994). The reputation of the institute was such that members participated in Olympic teams, and some of the gymnastic events for the 1908 London Olympic Games (i.e. the boxing) were held at the institute (Teague 1980). Facilities now are geared more toward physical health than physical excellence, and the academic and scientific aspects have developed in line with the University’s general
development (e.g. until recently there was an MSc in Exercise and Health Behaviour in the School of Social Sciences). It is interesting to note, as an example of the adaptability of the University, how the swimming pool area has been developed without destroying its Grade II listed features. Below the floorboards of this section of the School of Arts the pool is preserved as are the Victorian structure supporting the roof and the changing cubicles!

Two ‘naming’ events in the Centenary celebrations are worth mentioning. The first was when the University Chancellor and Lord Mayor, Sir Paul Newall, named the City University locomotive at a ceremony at Liverpool Street Station in February (The ‘City University’ has run on the Liverpool/Norwich line). The initiative for this came from Ian Gardiner, a member of the University Council and a former engineering student of the University. The second was the naming of a 39,729 metric ton oil tanker the ‘City University’ in honour of the Centenary. This was arranged by Stelios Hadji-Ionnou through his company Stelmar Tankers Ltd – Stelios is a 1988 graduate of the MSc in Shipping Trade and Finance. These two events underline the importance of the roles to be played by Alumni.

One of the outstanding and significant achievements reported in the Centenary publications was the sale in 1993 of the Company City Technology Ltd for £24.5 million – at that time British academia’s most successful venture into business:

“City Technology Ltd was set up in 1977 by the University to exploit commercially a new design of oxygen sensor, pioneered by academics in the former Wolfson Unit for Electro-chemical Technology. The company was very successful in developing sensors for a wide range of gases and benefited heavily from the passing of environmental legislation. In 1990, it outgrew its premises on the main University site and moved to a purpose built factory in Portsmouth. At the time of the sale the turnover of the company was £11 million, it employed 140 staff and had won four Queen Awards: two for technological achievement and two for export achievement. The income will enable the University to take forward its capital plan, which includes the building of two student residences and a new block of lecture theatres. The proceeds will also be used to set up a long term endowment fund, which will provide seed-corn for future academic enterprises.” (City University 1994a).

The financial cushion provided by this windfall did indeed enable the University to reduce the risks involved in implementing major building programmes. This included building new student residences to replace Northampton Hall, and to enter into complex negotiations with developers that eventually resulted in a new state-of-the-art building for the Business School in Bunhill Row (see Williams 2006 for a fuller account of the steps involved in this building).

Sponsors.
Throughout its history the University has had to rely on non-governmental support for new developments. Earlier chapters have illustrated this through the births of several disciplines within the University (e.g., Journalism). The business school is a good example where this support has been critical for the development of research programmes, and for the introduction of new electives/courses.Externally financed posts are usually for three to five years, and are named after the sponsor. As the subject area sponsored becomes an integral part of a degree, so these posts are absorbed into the normal establishment. Examples occurring after 1978 included: the Midland Bank Chair
in Export Management in 1979 (funded by the Midland Bank with the help of the
Institute of Export Management); the Sir John Cohen Chair in Consumer Studies in 1981
(financed by the Sir John and Lady Cohen Foundation); Chair in Finance in 1981 (Esmee
Fairbairn Trust); the Price Waterhouse Chair in Corporate Finance in 1987; the
Honeywell Bull Chair in Information Management in 1987; the Market Research Society
Chair in 1987; the National Westminster Bank Chair in Personal Finance in 1987; the

Sponsored Chairs come through a variety of avenues; often the Vice-Chancellor
and/or a Dean play a key role, sometimes the initial contact is made by a friend or
associate of the University (e.g., a member of the University Council). But there are
examples of where new disciplines and programmes have arisen as a result of the
initiatives of individual academics attracting external funding. An outstanding example
was Professor Grammenos’ Centre for Shipping and International Finance, launched at
the Baltic Exchange in 1983. Its successful MScs and research programmes have
continued to attract significant levels of funding - £2 million being the sum raised in
2007.

Alumni.
The University has always recognized the importance of alumni, and for many years the
structures embodied in N’Ions (founded in 1909 as the Northampton Past Day Students’
Association, and shortened in 1912 to N’Ions since Northampton Institute was often
referred to as ‘N.I.’) and Convocation (founded on gaining university status) have
provided the vehicles through which contact has been maintained and relationships
developed. Additional structures were often introduced by individual
departments/schools because many post 1966 alumni identified with their departments
rather than with the University. Thus in the Graduate Business Centre days when the
Business School was housed in Gresham College in Basinghall Street, the Gresham
Grasshoppers was formed. In May 1991 the University Council approved the Ordinance
“Convocation together with Affiliated Societies shall comprise the City University
Society”.

A major step change in relation to alumni occurred in the late 1990s when the
immediate need arose to attract more finance for the Business School’s new building. A
visit to the USA by the Vice-Chancellor convinced David Rhind of the need to emulate
the American model of fund raising. He commissioned consultants to review the existing
set-up and to make recommendations. The result was the establishment of a
Development Office with a sizeable staff in 1999; initially headed by Edward Lord, then
Nigel Kirkup and now Chris Gethin (since 2005). The last appointment was the final link
in the process of professionalizing the University’s fund raising. Given the shortage of
funds for development purposes, universities in the UK have followed this pathway and
City has been one of those leading the way. City has an unusual structure compared to
others in that Cass Business School has its own development office headed by a
professional fund raiser (Paola Barbarino); thus perpetuating the School’s semi-
autonomous culture vis-à-vis the University.

The introduction of professional fund-raising staff has meant that more attention
is now given to alumni as stakeholders in the University. The current City University
Alumni Association is advised by a Board of Alumni. Each School is developing its own
Alumni Board, and there are alumni representatives in many countries. The valuable
contributions of alumni in recruiting students, promoting the University and mentoring
current students, are now fully recognized. Their fund raising potential is but one of the resources they embody. The significance of the alumni body, and the attention now given to it by the University, is reflected in the numbers involved – a total of 39,133 contactable alumni in 1997/98 reached 90,293 in 2006/07, and 117,665 in 2007/08 (see Appendix 6).

It is now becoming routine for universities to launch fund raising campaigns at given intervals. When the University got its Royal Charter in 1966 it launched the first development fund to enable it to build much needed accommodation. More recent fund raising campaigns have been launched to help finance the new building for Cass Business School, to furnish the Saad Radiography Centre with the most advanced equipment, to provide high quality accommodation for the Arts School, and to place the ‘Costas Grammenos International Centre for Shipping, Trade and Finance’ onto a firm financial footing. Another major donation made in 2008 enabled a Centre for Entrepreneurship to be established in the Business School (made by Peter Cullum, a Cass MBA from 1976, and founder of the Towergate Partnership).

An important group of alumni are those distinguished individuals awarded honorary degrees. In the first 10 years of the University (i.e., 1966-1976) an average of 8 honorary graduates per year were created. In the last 10 years (i.e., 1997-2007) an average of 20 were created. This increase reflects the growth in the disciplines of the University, rather than to any change in the criteria being applied. A wide range of individuals are on the list of honorary graduates, including: Chancellors and Pro-Chancellors of the University, individuals who have been outstanding in business and the professions with links to the disciplines of the University, alumni and other individuals who have made significant contributions to the development and reputation of the University. A complete list of the 500-plus honorary graduates is published on the University’s web site.

Buildings.

Changes come from the initiatives and support of individuals and institutions, but they are propelled by crises or disastrous events. The ‘great fire’ of 2001 was such an event. Details of the fire, how the University managed the immediate and longer term effects and the lessons learnt from the experiences, have been written up as a case study and the lessons shared with the rest of the Higher Education Sector (Rhind, Toop et al. 2001). The opening paragraph in this report indicates the scope of the fire:

“On the night of 21st May 2001, City University suffered a major fire in College Building. This is the largest building and houses a number of academic and administrative departments. The fire or water-induced damage to some departments, notably Computing, Music, Personnel, the Vice-Chancellor’s Office and the University Secretary’s Office, was severe. Other departments were affected to various degrees. This occurred at the height of the exam period in College Building and whilst teaching was still active therein. As a result of the fire, a significant part of College Building will be out of commission for about two years and the total cost of restitution and temporary measures will exceed £10 million.” (p. 5).

In managing the aftermath of the fire a key aspect was the formation of an emergency management team with “a range of expertise from across the University and running all the actions through its membership was crucial to the success.” The team, chaired by the Vice-Chancellor, met twice a day on the first two days following the fire,
then daily then at less frequent intervals. Its final meeting was less than three months after the day of the fire; by then fire-related matters were dealt with by normal management channels. While the negative effects of the fire were largely dealt with effectively, the fall-out could have been much worse. Although the University had been a pioneer in seeking to identify, rate and manage risks to all aspects of its business, it fell short of having a Business Continuity Plan to cope with major disasters. Fortunately much of the material in College Building was held in computer form. The benefits of this became very clear, and led the University to initiate a review of “data management, storage and business continuity plans to mitigate possible future disasters.”

A positive outcome gained from this disaster was the ensuing focus on the quality of accommodation. Several of the departments affected, plus others, were located in sub-optimal accommodation. “No less that 50% of the University property was judged as being in categories C and D (the two worst HEFCE categories)” (Rhind, Toop et al. 2001, p.10). For many years the estate strategy was for the University to occupy freehold property. Little progress was made in the 1980s and early 1990s. But the drive to improve the accommodation for the Business School, combined with the sale of City Technology Ltd and successful fund raising, resulted in the new state-of-the-art building for the Business School that was opened by the Her Majesty the Queen in 2002. The School was re-named after the major donor to the development fund – the Sir John Cass’s Foundation, an educational charity that can be traced back to the early Eighteenth Century. Plans for a new Social Science building were well under way at the time of the fire, as were those for re-housing several other departments. Not only did the fire speed up this process but it enabled more effective plans to be developed for the School of Informatics, i.e. bringing its dispersed units together in one location.

In the competitive climate of today quality of accommodation is important. The new buildings for Cass Business School and the School of Social Sciences have made a significant difference to the success of these Schools. The School of Arts is currently in the process of moving into state-of-the-art accommodation and facilities, following a £12 million appeal launched in June 2007. The University recently sold two of its halls of residence. The deal meant it lost no student places while enabling it to fund renovations to student accommodation, support student living costs and increase the quality of student learning.

Philanthropy
There is no doubt that philanthropy has played, and is playing, an increasingly important role in the development of the University. The tradition of ‘giving’ has always existed in aspects of UK culture, for example to charities catering for the poor and disadvantaged in society. In the context of higher education, universities now recognize the potential of philanthropy to aid those much needed developments that the State cannot or will not finance. The City University has benefitted from the culture of giving. Its foundation in 1890s owed much to two great livery companies (the Skinners and the Saddlers), to the City Parochial Trust and to the Marquess of Northampton (who donated the original land, hence the early name of Northampton Institute). The more recent examples of giving have enabled the University to develop new academic disciplines and research programmes, to build physical environments that enhance student learning experiences, to attract talented students and staff, to provide financial support for students, and so on.

It is only in the 1990s that the majority of UK universities followed the American model of professional fund raising. The amount raised across the HE Sector has
increased from £380 million in 2004-5 to £452 million in 2005-6 and £548 million in 2006-7. As one would expect the largest and most established universities raised the largest amounts; Oxford, Cambridge and the 27 other universities that had been operating fund raising programmes for more than ten years, accounted for 75% of funds raised (Ross-CASE 2008). City University London is not yet in this group but between 2004 - 2008 it raised philanthropic gifts of over £25 million. The annual trend is upward and this source of income is likely to play an even more important role in its future development.
CHAPTER 7
LEADERSHIP AND CHANGE

By way of a conclusion this final chapter focuses on leadership and change, a theme that has been implicit in all the chapters. The prevalence of change in higher education is understandable given the extraordinary transformations that have been taking place in the environment of universities, including: government funding policies, technologies, competition, demography, economic conditions and so on. There is no doubt that the University has successfully progressed through the changes in the past – hence the subtitle of this publication. What is less certain is whether this progress has improved its standing relative to other universities and, more importantly, whether it is in a stronger position now to cope with the changes in the future, whatever these may be. Some observations can be made on the former, but the latter must rest on the personal extrapolations of the reader.

Leadership can be used with a variety of meanings. The concept is being used here to convey the process whereby one or more individuals initiate/support those changes that are conducive to the achievement of the mission and objectives of the organization. From this perspective ‘leadership’ and ‘change’ are two sides of the same coin. Although leadership behaviours can be observed at any level of an organisation the definition adopted focuses attention on those at the top of the organization, who are in a position to alter the relationship between the organization and its environment.

Competitive rankings.

In the last thirty years there have been several externally imposed assessments that have had consequences for the income and reputation of the University. HEFCE and its predecessor have been responsible for two of these: the audits of the Quality Assessment Agency (QAA) and the outcomes of the Research Assessment Exercises (RAE). A recent addition is the National Student Survey published by HEFCE. The idea behind the QAA visits, and the earlier Panel visits of the UGC, was that they should identify the strengths and weaknesses in constituent parts of a university with regard to quality standards, control mechanisms and the learning experience of students. Feedback of assessments were an essential part of the scheme as they were intended to improve performance and not just to justify continued financial support from the State. While there has sometimes been room for improvement, the University has always received favourable if not outstanding results (e.g., the ‘excellent’ ratings for the business school in 1994 and 2002).

Schools submit themselves to further voluntary quality assessments. Thus Cass Business School has always sought, and achieved, the accreditation of AMBA and EQUIS (generally recognized as important signs of national and international quality of a business school), and all parts of the University have made a point of achieving accreditation for their qualifications from relevant professional bodies. Some Schools have also submitted themselves to the scrutiny of ‘Investment in People’, a business improvement tool designed to advance an organisation’s performance through its people. Cass was the first part of the University to be accredited. In 2008 it underwent reaccreditation under the scheme’s higher standard. The Community and Health Sciences School is currently undergoing this higher reaccreditation. It is anticipated that the accreditation of the whole University by Investment in People will be sought in 2011.
The RAE is of critical importance to the University since the results of each exercise now determines the research funding received from HEFCE. The governing principle of the RAE is to give more money to those universities able to demonstrate that their research quality was of high quality. Quality is mainly judged by a group of peers on the basis of information derived from publications and research income. Each academic discipline is given a rating based on the scale in Box 7.1. Three exercises have been completed by HEFCE using this rating scale – 1992, 1996, 2001. Twenty-five disciplines or subject groups were submitted by the University in the last exercise.

**Box 7.1 Rating scale used in the Research Assessment Exercises.**

- 5* International excellence
- 5 International/national excellence
- 4 National excellence
- 3A Substantial majority of national excellence
- 3B Majority of national excellence
- 2 Up to half of national excellence
- 1 Little of national excellence

In 1992 five of these were given ratings of 4 or 5 (i.e., Business, Civil Engineering, Information Science, Music and Sociology); nine ratings of 3 (Applied Mathematics, Arts Policy, Computer Science, Continuing Education, Electrical Engineering, Optometry, Psychology, Statistics); and the rest got ratings of 1 or 2 (Mechanical Engineering, Journalism, Law, Speech and Language Therapy). By 1996 six of the subject areas had improved their ratings (including a 5* for Information Science), and none had lower ratings than before. By 2001 eleven had improved their ratings (including a 5* for Music), and two had a lowered their ratings from 5* to 5, and 5 to 4.

These RAE results are evidence of the improved research performance of the University since 1992. It may be argued that there has been a gradual drift in ratings over the years, and these results may not necessarily show an improvement relative to the HE sector. However, further analysis suggests otherwise (Rhind 2002). In 1996 the percentage of City staff submitted who fell in the 4, 5 and 5* units were 38%, as opposed to the national figure of 43%. The corresponding figures for 2001 were 69% City and 64% national. This improved research performance is reinforced by the recently completed 2008 RAE (the more condensed four-point rating scale used ranged from ‘world-leading’ to ‘recognised nationally’). The Times Higher Education analysis of this data shows that the University has risen to a ranking of 45th out of the 159 institutions taking part; it was ranked 59th in the 2001 RAE (THE 25.12.2008). As a result of its improved performance HEFCE has provisionally announced an increase of 50.3% in its quality-related research grant (i.e. up to £10,233,988 for 2009/10 compared to £6,808,312 for 2008/09). Dinos Arcoumanis, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and International), has pointed out that this puts City University London amongst the ten institutions with the greatest rise in research grant.

The pressure to excel on these various measures is augmented by the national and international media drawing on these results (and adding a few measures of their own) to developed comparative rankings in the Higher Education sector. These rankings are aimed at helping potential consumers make more informed choices with respect to degrees and universities. While the methodology of all these schemes have their
weaknesses (e.g., the results reflect the criteria selected by the creators of the ranking tables), no university can afford to ignore them. They have a significant influence on an institution’s national and international reputation, and therefore on the recruitment of staff and students and on the active involvement of alumni. Given that many of the University’s courses are operating in a competitive global market, published rankings can be critical as they are the only objective measures of quality and prestige readily available to overseas students. While rankings are relatively new to the UK, they are a familiar part of the American scene.

How successful has the University been in some of these comparative rankings? As yet the City University does not appear in the Times Higher Education publication of the top 500 world university rankings or in the top 100 European university rankings. This is in marked contrast to the University’s Business School. The most prestigious international ranking system for business schools is that produced by the FT. Since the start of the FT world rankings for the full-time MBA the School has always been in the top 100. In the 2008 results it was placed 41st in the global ranking, 17th in the European ranking and 10th in the UK ranking (FT, 28.1.2008). The comparative figures in the 2009 exercise were 41st, 17th, and 9th respectively (FT, 26.1.2009). In the 2008 FT Executive MBA (part-time) programmes, the School was ranked 13th globally, 4th in Europe, and 2nd in the UK after the London Business School (F.T, 27.10.2008). In the 2008 FT MScs in Management rankings, the School was 15th in Europe and 2nd in the UK (FT, 29.9.2008).

The most influential UK publication affecting the reputation of universities is the Times Good Universities Guide published each year. This guide judges institutions in nine areas: student satisfaction (based on the National Student Survey), research assessment (based on the RAE), entry standards, degree results, completion rates, job prospects, the student/staff ratio, spending on academic services such as libraries, and spending on facilities such as careers and health services. Drawing from the 2009 publication the Independent paper places the University 46th out of the 113 universities in the UK, and 9th out of the 18 universities in London (Hodges 2008). Further analysis carried out identified the top 20 universities in the various subject groups. Box 7.2 shows that City was well placed in several groups. These results are consistent with the ‘business and the professions’ strategic aims of the University – four top ratings out of the five ‘Professions’ in which the University is active (Law is the fifth).

Also consistent with the University strategy is the employability rating for students in graduate level jobs six months after graduation. For many years the University has performed well on this criterion. Thus in the Sunday Times University Guide it was ranked 13th in 2007 and 5th in 2008. To summarise the University’s competitive standing: there are pockets of performance where results are excellent (e.g.

---

**Box 7.2 Subject areas in which City had rankings in the top 20 universities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities courses: Communication &amp; Media Studies</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering: Psychology</td>
<td>20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Professions: Accounting and Finance</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other subjects allied to medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 shows that City was well placed in several groups. These results are consistent with the ‘business and the professions’ strategic aims of the University – four top ratings out of the five ‘Professions’ in which the University is active (Law is the fifth).

Also consistent with the University strategy is the employability rating for students in graduate level jobs six months after graduation. For many years the University has performed well on this criterion. Thus in the Sunday Times University Guide it was ranked 13th in 2007 and 5th in 2008. To summarise the University’s competitive standing: there are pockets of performance where results are excellent (e.g.
Cass Business School; employability of graduates), but the University still has some way to go before noticeably moving up the rankings relative to the pre-1992 group of universities. Relative success can also be measured by criteria not assessed by the more influential ranking exercises, and yet may have long term significance. Growth in terms of alumni, staff and student numbers, and an institution’s ability to survive with the minimum of State funding, are examples of such criteria. Figures in Appendix 6, and the events in chapter 2, indicate an underlying strength of the University.

**Leadership.**

Government bodies and CEOs often single out ‘leadership’ as the primary cause of organizational success or failure. In the last few years there have been several articles in the Times Higher Education drawing attention to crises at certain universities. For example, a recent THES article contains extracts from a report commissioned by the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales into the problems at the University of Wales, Lampeter: “There is no coherent, well-expressed accepted strategy, either agreed or being pursued within the institution … there is no clear vision of what UWL should work to become which is shared by the senior management team, council and academics.” (Newman 2008). This observation is clearly inferring to a lack of leadership at the top. The formation of the government-backed Leadership Foundation for Higher Education stems from such observations. Their publications in the Research and Development Series include such titles as: ‘Effective leadership in Higher Education’ (Bryman 2007); ‘The characteristics, roles and selection of Vice-Chancellors’ (Breakwell and Tytherleigh 2008); ‘Developing collective leadership in Higher Education’ (Bolden, Petrov et al. 2008); ‘The composition, challenges and changes in the top team structures of UK Higher Education institutions’ (Kennie and Woodfield 2008). The present case study of the City University explores some of these issues from a different perspective to these reports, being concerned with the changes that occurred across time under different leaders operating in changing environmental contexts.

One of the observations that emerge from organisational histories is the constant tension between the forces for continuity and the forces for change (Lewin 1951). Given the positions of power that individuals/teams at the top of organizations share, it is they who have the responsibility to maintain or disrupt the balance between these two sets of forces. Continuity is inherent in the dynamics of social systems, and this is largely accounted for by the concept of organizational culture. Culture is depicted in various ways; one is that it reflects the ways in which an organization has learnt to adapt to its environment (Schein 1992). Certain routine ways of doing things become established in strategies, structures, technologies and so on. Simultaneously, associated values become deeply rooted in the organization, e.g., democratic values reflecting the national context in which the organization operates.

Continuity can almost look after itself. Doing things in the way that they have always been done reduces the risk of something going wrong (i.e., in the short term), and provides for a more relaxed setting. As long as results remain acceptable the existing set-up is reinforced and traditional responses strengthened. On occasion strong leadership is required to maintain continuity in the face of challenges that threaten the survival of the organization with respect to its distinctive culture. This is illustrated by the linked events of 1983 to 1992 when pressures were brought on the University to merge with the City Polytechnic (see the last section in chapter 2).
Top leadership is highlighted when unpredictable crises arise that require fundamental change and/or rapid responses, such as the financial crises that faced the University in the early 1980s and the ‘great fire’ of 2001. These historic events required decisive actions; but without effective leadership these actions will not go beyond solving the immediate problems. Effective leadership always has the University’s longer term strategic goals in sight. Thus in the case of the Business School, the academic staff who took early retirement in the early eighties enabled the School to recruit new staff who were more research and finance oriented (Williams 2006). The physical repairs following the fire in College Building provided the opportunity for bringing the dispersed Information Science School to a single location.

Leadership is also at a premium when outside pressures for change come up against internal resistances to change. To implement change under these conditions requires strong and skilled leadership, and not just from the top. Witness the changing academic profile of the University in chapter 1 as it adjusted to its changing environment – thus a predominantly engineering faculty in 1978 became a predominantly management and business, social science and health related faculty in 1998. This was in effect a major cultural change and little wonder it took so many years to come about. A further example was recounted in chapter 3 in relation to governance reforms. The changes made resulted in a weakening of the power of academics and a strengthening of the power of management, particularly of external stakeholders (i.e., Council) in strategic decision making. The changes brought about here were relatively smooth and quick; no doubt a function of strong external pressures combined with the appropriate mental sets of those in positions of power and the skills of those involved in the process of change itself.

A prior but related development, has been the gradual transformation of the University from an institution consisting predominantly of academics to one consisting of academics and professional staff. Government pressures for greater efficiency, models of ‘good’ management emerging from other sectors of the Economy and the ever growing competition, all contributed to this transformation. Nowadays professionals in finance, marketing, human resource management and fund raising are seen as a necessary part of a university and not as a disposable luxury.

Nevertheless the core of a university remains its academic staff and students. Leadership is required when the traditional markets are eroded and new markets emerge. Academics are needed both to maintain the status quo and to innovate. Innovation in the academic context is not straightforward. There is no single R&D department to come up with the next product. The multi-disciplinary nature of a university, combined with the ever-present shortage of funds, means that those in positions of power need to select those innovative ideas that are worth supporting. Moreover, this has to be done while maintaining the morale of the unsuccessful. The task of leaders is likely to be eased in this situation if all concerned can see clear links between academic criteria, the individual ability of potential innovators and the strategic aims of the institution.

Sometimes a number of positive forces for innovation come together to facilitate the introduction of new ventures; but these still require the backing of those in positions of power. Chapter 4 has touched on several illustrations where minor internal initiatives have had this backing, and this investment has proved outstandingly successful; journalism and music are just two examples. There are equally good examples where the impetus has come from an external initiative and, with the help of internal sponsors, have resulted in enterprises that have benefitted the reputation of the University. Examples include: Costas Grammenos and the International Centre for Shipping, Trade and Finance
launched in 1983 (renamed The Costas Grammenos International Centre for Shipping, Trade and Finance in 2007); Ian Bruce and the Centre for Voluntary Sector and Not For Profit Management (VOLPROF) launched in 1991, and transformed into the Centre for Charity Effectiveness in 2004 following the active support of the Worshipful Company of Management Consultants and others.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has tried to identify the situations in which leadership is required in the historical development of a university. The overriding theme is change – an institution continually adapting to a dynamic and uncertain environment. In this ‘Organisation/Environment fit’ theoretical framework the greatest challenge for leaders at the top is in reassessing and developing the institution’s mission and strategic goals. Only when this is sufficiently clear can leaders at all levels of the organization facilitate the achievement of these goals. As chapter 1 showed the changes in mission statements are likely to better reflect the current values of the Higher Education Sector. Changes in strategic aims, on the other hand, are critical as they have a real bearing on the direction in which the institution will be steered and this in turn will affect its competitiveness. In the processes of clarification and implementation Vice-Chancellors and their executive teams are dependent on the knowledge and co-operation of key stakeholders (e.g., Council and Senate). Stakeholders in a position to provide a different perspective, and to ‘make things happen’, need to have the opportunity to contribute at an early stage and to be consulted at a later stage. These processes were illustrated in chapter 1 (strategic planning) and in chapter 3 (governance reforms).

Acts of leadership in introducing new research/degree programmes, exploiting new markets and introducing new structures, are a constant occurrence in higher education. Competitive advantage comes when one is an early innovator rather than a late imitator; the risks may be greater but so are the rewards (at least for a time). The University has often been an early innovator. It was one of the first universities (as opposed to polytechnics) to introduce undergraduate degrees in Business Studies and in Journalism to name but two. In the 1980s and 1990s it was ahead of most in anticipating the potential advantages of expanding taught Masters in the process of meeting the educational needs of business and the professions. In the present century it was one of the first to lead the way in reforming its governance arrangements (see Creagh and Verrall 2008). These observations augur well for the future development of City University London.
Methodology
The author was invited to bring up-to-date the history of the City University by Professor David Rhind (the Vice-Chancellor) in March 2007. The proposal was that it would cover the period 1978-2008; John Teague’s published history having covered the years up to 1978. The idea was that it should be in less detail than the previous publication, and therefore considerably shorter. Academics and ‘visitors’ were recognised as the primary readers.

The research got underway in October 2007. The first task was to study all the annual reports from 1977/78 and to make notes under a series of headings. The first summarized environmental events that created forces for change in the Higher Education Sector. Subsequent headings related to the adaptive changes introduced by the University, including: mission; strategic aims; policies; appointments; structural changes; estate changes; new products and services; staff and student trends; financial trends; performance indicators. This approach indicates that the underlying framework for the history was one where the University was seen as operating in a continually changing environment, and the reactive and proactive actions taken were intended to improve its effectiveness relative to its competitors.

This historical overview then focused on particular events and individuals and searched for more information via documents (e.g., minutes of committees), reports of working parties, draft manuscripts, brochures and internet sites of Schools/Departments, and so on. In addition interviews were carried out with the major players in the University, for example: Vice-Chancellors, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Deans, Directors of key functions. Virtually all respondents were told in an email some days before the semi-structured interview was carried out by the author: “Essentially what I am trying to do in these interviews is to identify those critical events that have made a difference to the University. It would be helpful if you would think of the University as a whole as well as that part for which you are, or were, responsible. A useful ‘trigger question’ to ponder over before our meeting would be: While you have been at the University were there any particular individuals, working party reports, events, crises and achievements that you would expect to be mentioned in a history of the University?” The interviews helped to ensure that the selection and interpretation of the historical events reflected the thinking of several individuals who had occupied, or were occupying, several significant roles within the University. Actual individuals interviewed are listed in the acknowledgements below.

The most difficult part of the research was not collecting the data but imposing a structure on the findings, so that they could be presented in a short publication that would inform as well as ring true with the majority of readers. The main conceptual tools facilitating this task was to think in terms of (1) the organization/environment fit model, where the organization is continually seeking to adapt to changes in its environment (Katz and Kahn 1966), and (2) a leadership model, where powerful individuals intervene in strategically significant elements to improve the organization/environment fit (Williams 2009). The combination of these two conceptual tools means that leadership in
a university reflects the joint efforts of individual academics (or professional specialists) and those with the power to make things happen (e.g., by finding the necessary finance, creating new positions) such as Vice-Chancellors and Deans.
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APPENDIX 2

CHANCELLORS AND PRO-CHANCELLORS (1978-2008)

Chancellors (The Rt Hon Lord Mayors of London) Pro-Chancellors

(Professor Raoul Franklin, Vice-Chancellor, 1978/1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chanceller</th>
<th>Pro-Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978/79</td>
<td>Sir Kenneth Cork</td>
<td>Rt Hon Lord Alport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979/80</td>
<td>Sir Peter Gadsden</td>
<td>Rt Hon Lord Mais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>Col Sir Ronald Gardner-Thorpe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981/82</td>
<td>Sir Christopher Leaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/83</td>
<td>Sir Anthony Jolliffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>Dame Mary Donaldson</td>
<td>Rt Hon Lord Howie of Troon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>Sir Alan Traill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>Sir Allan Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>Sir David Rowe-Ham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/88</td>
<td>Sir Greville Spratt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/89</td>
<td>Sir Christopher Collett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/90</td>
<td>Sir Hugh Bidwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91</td>
<td>Sir Alexander Graham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/92</td>
<td>Sir Brian Jenkins</td>
<td>Sir John Leahy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td>Sir Francis McWilliams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td>Sir Paul Newall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td>Sir Christopher Walford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>Alderman John Chalstrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Sir Roger Cork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>Alderman Richard Nichols</td>
<td>Sir Paul Newall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Professor David Rhind, Vice-Chancellor, 1998/2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chanceller</th>
<th>Pro-Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>Lord Levene of Portsoken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>Alderman Clive Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>Sir David Howard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>Sir Michael Oliver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>Alderman Gavin Arthur</td>
<td>Sir David Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>Alderman Robert Finch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>Alderman Michael Savory</td>
<td>Sir David Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>Alderman David Brewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Sir John Studdard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Professor Malcolm Gillies, present Vice-Chancellor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chanceller</th>
<th>Pro-Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Alderman David Lewis</td>
<td>Sir John Studdard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>Alderman Ian Luder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Internal staff marked with an asterisk)

1977/78
Chairman: Pro-Chancellor Rt Hon Lord Alport
Mr N F Althaus, Prof J G Ball, Mr C F R Barclay, Dr D W Barrett, Mrs H Brigstocke, Sir Robin Brook, *Professor C F Cullis, Mr J G W Davies, *Prof G E Dunn, *Prof L Finkelstein, *Vice-Chancellor Prof E W Parkes, *Mr D Heath, Dr W A Holmes Walker, Mr K Holtom, Sir Edward Howard, The Rt Hon Lord Howie, Dr O A Kerensky, *Mr K R Kirton, The Rt Hon Lord Mais, Mr S McGrath, Mr C T Norman Butler, Mr R W Snowden, *Mr J H Stewart Jones, Councillor Miss J Streather, *Mr D M Sykes, *Mr E C Talboys, *Prof J Treasure, Mr A O Van Oss, Mr M Wilcox, The Bishop of London.

1997/98
Chairman: Pro-Chancellor Sir Paul Newall
*Mr A Agrawal (student), *Prof C Baden-Fuller, Mr A A Benjamin, *Ms S Boorman (student), Mr C R E Brooke, *Prof S Byng, Dr N Carey, Mrs M L Carrington, Mr R Chappell, *Dr F Charlwood, *Dr R Comley, *Dr J Cowley, Mr F Dickenson, *Prof M Dockray, *Mrs B Duncan, Mr R B C Farthing, *Vice-Chancellor Prof R N Franklin, Mr A H P Gillett, *Ms R Glazier (student), *Prof C T H Grammenos, *Prof C R Haines, *Prof J Hampton, *Mr R Hicks, Alderman and Sheriff D H S Howard, Dr J Jenkins, Mrs M P Ludlow, Ms C M Makin, Dame Pauline Neville-Jones, Mr E Pearson, Sir Peter Petrie, Mr C R Reeves, Mr R H Rooley, Councillor D Sawyer, Mr M F Stonefrost, Mr D Turner, *Dr C Vielba, *Ms C Wood (student).

2006/07
Chairman: Pro-Chancellor Alderman Sir David H S Howard
Tom Abbott, The Hon Mr Apurv Bagri, Mr Steve Bundred, Mr Michael Cassidy, Mr Kevin Everett, Ms Cherry Freeman, Mr Andrew Halper, *Dr Oliver Kerr, Ms Ann Minogue, Mr Kieran Murphy, Ms Carolyn Regan, *Vice-Chancellor Prof David Rhind, Mr Mark H Robson, *Ms Henrietta Royle, Prof Dr Hein Schreuder, *Dr Kevin Swindin, *Prof Mary Watts, *Prof Julius Weinberg, Mr Rob Woodward.

2007/08
Chairman: Pro-Chancellor Alderman Sir David H S Howard
The Hon Mr A Bagri, *Prof D Bolton (from 1/8/08), Mr R Bright (from 1/8/08), Mr S Bundred, , *Mr N Cumlajee, Mr K Everett, Ms C Freeman, *Vice-Chancellor Prof M Gillies, Mr A Halper, *Mr G Kalia, *Dr O Kerr, *Prof P Kunzlik (from 1/8/08), *Mr A Lack, Ms A Minogue, Mr K Murphy, Ms C Regan, *Ms H Royle, Professor H Schreuder, *Dr K Swindin, *Prof M Watts, *Prof J Weinberg, Mr R Woodward.
APPENDIX 5

FORMAL RESEARCH CENTRES OR GROUPS AT 2008

The following is the list of centres/groups formally established by a School as a distinct entity. They exist to develop and promote areas of research expertise that involve a number of staff working in the same field.

**Cass Business School**
- Actuarial Research Centre
- Alternative Investments Research Centre
- Cass Private Equity Centre
- Centre for Banking Studies
- Centre for Charity Effectiveness
- Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy
- Centre for Econometric Analysis
- Centre for Financial Regulation and Crime
- Centre for Leadership, Learning and Change
- Centre for New Technologies, Innovation and Entrepreneurship
- Centre for Professional Service Firms
- Centre for Research in Asian Management
- Centre for Research in Corporate Governance
- Centre for Research in European Financial Markets and Institutions
- Emerging Markets Group
- Film, Media and Entertainment Research Group
- Mergers & Acquisitions Research Centre
- Pensions Institute
- Research Centre for Real Estate Finance
- Risk Institute
- The Change Management Consortium
- The Costas Grammenos International Centre for Shipping, Trade and Finance

**School of Community and Health Sciences**
- Applied Vision Research Centre
- Centre for Allied Health Professions Research
- Centre for Food Policy
- City eHealth Research Centre
School of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences
- Centre for Aeronautics
- Centre for Energy and the Environment
- Centre for Risk Management, Reliability and Maintenance
- Centre for Systems Research
- Control Engineering Research Centre
- Engineering Structures Research Centre
- Geotechnical Engineering Research Centre
- Information and Biomedical Engineering Centre
- Measurement and Instrumentation Centre
- Research Centre for Mathematics

School of Informatics
- Autonomous and Intelligent Systems Group
- Centre for Health Informatics
- Centre for Human Computer Interaction Design
- Centre for Interactive Systems Research
- Centre for Software Reliability
- giCentre
- Music Informatics Group
- Programming Language and Systems Group
- Software Engineering Group

The City Law School
- Law and Economics Research Group

School of Social Sciences
- Autism Research Group
- Behavioural Neuroendocrinology Research Unit
- Centre for Comparative Social Surveys
- Centre for Competition and Regulatory Policy
- Centre for Gender Research
- Centre for International Communications and Society
- Centre on Race, Ethnicity and Migration
- City Health Economics Centre
- Coaching Psychology Unit
- Cognitive Neuroscience Research Unit
• Communication and the City Group
• Criminology Research Group
• Developmental Psychology Research
• Econometrics and Economic Theory
• Financial Economics Research Group
• International and Macroeconomics Group
• History of Economic Thought and Heterodox Economics
• Memory and Cognition Research
• Memory Research Unit
• Social Research Methodology Centre
APPENDIX 6

FACTS AND FIGURES AT 1977/78, 1997/98, 2006/07 (i.e., the final year of each Vice-Chancellorship), and 2007/08 (i.e., the first year of the current Vice-Chancellorship)

1977/78
Total student numbers (full-time equivalent): 2566
Full-time 80%, Part-time 20%
Undergraduate 76%, postgraduate taught 17%, postgraduate research 7%

Alumni: 2325 (known breakdown: 2,112 Male; 158 Female)

Total staff numbers (1979/80): 915
Annual turnover: £8.6 million
Parliamentary grant: £6.2 million (72% of turnover)

1997/98
Total student Numbers (not full-time equivalent): 9059 (excludes those in validated institutions)
Full-time 74%, 26% part-time
Undergraduate 57%, postgraduate taught 41, postgraduate research 2% (full-time only)

Alumni: 39,133 (known breakdown 24,536 Male; 14,218 Female)

Total staff numbers: 1,273
Academic 37%, research 10%, senior admin, library and computing staff, 14%, clerical 27%, technical 3%, manual 9%

Annual turnover: £70 million
Funding Council income: £19 million (27% of turnover)

2006/07
Total student numbers (full-time equivalent) 10,932 (excludes those in validated institutions). Total of all students: 23,835, from 156 different countries.
Full-time 84%, Part-time 16%
Undergraduate 64%, postgraduate taught 33%, postgraduate research 3%
UK 68%, other EU 11%, non-EU 21%
Male 46%, female 54%

Alumni: 90,293 (known breakdown 48,875 Male; 40467 Female)

Total staff numbers: 2,145 from 70 countries
Academic 34.3%, research 9.6%, senior admin, library and computer staff 28.3%, clerical 26.9%, technical 0.9%
Annual turnover: £148 million  
Funding Council income: £33 million (22% of turnover)

2007/08  
Total student numbers (full-time equivalent): 12,937 (excludes those in validated institutions). Total of all students: 23,530.  
Full-time 85%, Part-time 15%  
Undergraduate 64%, postgraduate taught 33%, postgraduate research 3%  
UK 68%, other EU 11%, non-EU 21%  

Alumni: 117,665 (known breakdown: 55,812 Male; 60,824 Female)  
Total staff numbers: 2126 from 70 countries  

Annual turnover: £159 million  
Funding Council income: £34 million (21% of turnover)
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