

Performance Management in Higher Education – Development versus Control

L. MORRIS^{*}, P. STANTON^{**} and S. YOUNG^{***}

Abstract

Since the late 1980s higher education in Australia has been the focus of major restructure and reform in a search for greater efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. A key component has been performance management of academic staff with performance appraisals being the main process used. This paper examines enterprise bargaining agreements of universities to explore the status of performance management. It asks a number of questions such as: What do performance management systems look like? Are they linked to strategic goals? What feedback mechanisms are used? Do they have a developmental or monitoring/ control focus? It concludes that universities express a strategic link to performance management with the result that individual academic performance is increasingly being linked to organisational goals. However the use of performance management as a developmental or monitoring/control tool is less clear. This is apparent as performance appraisals are being used to reward staff in areas that were traditionally considered as standard working rights and conditions.

Introduction

Since the late 1980s higher education in Australia has been the focus of major restructure and reform in a search for greater efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. Policies have been introduced designed to increase efficiency and reduce costs through amalgamations, downsizing and changes in delivery and accountability. A key component of higher education reform both in Australia and overseas has been the search for improved quality assurance and management and within that context a focus on academic accountability. Universities in Australia introduced the concept of measuring academic performance in 1988 and formally introduced performance appraisal for developmental purposes in 1991 (Lonsdale 1998). Since that time a number of reviews and audits have highlighted the central role of performance management of staff in achieving good quality outcomes.

From the late 1980s, the neo-liberal agenda has been the driver of managerialism and New Public Management policies which successive governments have adopted and used internationally and in Australia to alter funding, structures and work practices across the whole public sector (Young 2004). Running parallel with these policy and management

^{*} Leanne Morris is Senior Lecturer in Human Resource Management in the Faculty of Business and Law, Deakin University.

^{**} Pauline Stanton is an Associate Professor in Human Resource Management in the Graduate School of Management at LaTrobe University.

^{***} Suzanne Young is a Senior Lecturer in Management and Governance and Director of Executive Education in the Graduate School of Management at LaTrobe University

changes in higher education were changes in the industrial relations arena which have encouraged an emphasis on efficiency and productivity through decentralisation and bargaining at the enterprise level. More recently industrial relations has become a vehicle of change in the higher education sector (Barnes 2006) as government industrial relations policy has included a greater focus on the individual and individual agreement making (O'Brien Valadkhani, Waring and Dennis 2007).

These parallel changes in the Australian university environment have major implications for the work of academics yet it is surprising that since the early 1990s there is a paucity of research on the performance management (PM) of academics within universities. This article explores the status of performance management by examining the current Enterprise Bargaining Agreements (EBAs) of 37 Australian universities. First, the article examines the literature incorporating performance management and its use in Australian universities. Second, using the literature and recommendations from the Hoare Report (1995) as an analytical framework, the article analyses the key components of the EBAs. And finally conclusions are drawn incorporating further areas for research.

Background

Performance appraisal (PA), once associated with a basic process involving an annual report on a subordinate's position has now become a general term for a range of activities that organisations now undertake to assess employees, develop their competence and distribute rewards (Fletcher 2001). In many cases performance appraisal has evolved to become part of a wider approach to integrating human resource management strategies, known as performance management (Fletcher 2001). In this regard Connell and Nolan (2004) define performance management (PM) as a strategic approach to integrating human resource activities and business policies. Notwithstanding this, in practice performance management can have three different foci or objectives: to manage organisational performance; to manage employee performance; or as a system for integrating the management of organisational and employee performance (Fletcher 2001). Hence, critical success factors for an holistic and integrated performance management system includes its alignment with the organisation's strategic goals, its credibility within the organisation and its integration with other HRM functions such as reward systems, learning and development, and career progression and promotion (ANAO 2004-5 p14).

Performance management consistently emerges as one of the key components in the research into high performance and high commitment work places (Zacharatos, Barling and Iverson 2005) and there is evidence that effective PM is linked to improved financial performance (McDonald and Smith 1995; Rheem 1996). However, recent research and anecdotal evidence suggests that despite its promise many managers, practitioners and employees in a wide range of industries are dissatisfied with and cynical about performance management processes (Nankervis and Compton 2006). Their dissatisfaction often focuses on the application of the performance appraisal tool and the often judgemental process of performance review (Parker, 2003). In particular the perception of "procedural justice" - the equity and transparency of the process and "distributive justice" - the fairness and appropriateness of reward and recognition are often a source of discontent (Gabris and Ihrke 2000). The lack of managerial skills and abilities in the performance review process is also often problematic (Lawler 1994). While the inability of performance appraisal to motivate staff was identified in early research (Meyer,

Kay and French, 1965, Pearce and Porter 1986) more recent research by Fletcher (2001) has shown that most UK organisations express dissatisfaction with their performance appraisal system, due to its failure to deliver valid performance ratings and its failure to develop and motivate people.

Accordingly, the PA tool can be viewed positively as a developmental experience if linked to career progression and training and development, or negatively as an exercise in monitoring and control. In examining these two approaches, Simmons (2001) questions whether organisations can accommodate these potentially opposing aims. And this dichotomy has particular implications for the higher education sector in reconciling organisational desire for control and compliance with employee expectations of development and support (Hendry et al. 2000). Commentators such as Townley (1990), Henson (1994), Holley and Oliver (2000), Barry, Chandler and Clark (2001), and Simmons (2002) advocate a developmental approach to performance appraisal in universities. They argue that the traditional emphasis on 'control' is inappropriate, unworkable and unacceptable in knowledge-based organisations such as universities. Performance appraisals with a developmental focus are more appropriate, allowing academics to determine which aspects of their roles require development and support. Applying a performance appraisal system which best befits an organisation based on hierarchical authority and direction (Simmons 2002) is inappropriate for those organisations which are knowledge based, have flatter hierarchies and use employee flexibility to compete effectively (Fletcher 2001).

Whilst while performance management might arguably benefit both organisations and employees (Nankervis and Compton, 2006) it is suggested that if those responsible for managing the performance of academics want to maximise the contribution and commitment of their academic staff, then they will need to implement a performance appraisal system for academics that uses criteria that are relevant, valid and developmental (Simmons 2002, p 98).

Performance Management in Australian Universities

Performance management was introduced in Australian Universities within the domestic and international context of a New Public Management and managerialist paradigm. The discourse centred on introducing efficiency, cost reduction, responsiveness and accountability across the public sector (Dunford, Bramble and Littler 1998, p.386). Funding cut backs, amalgamation of instrumentalities and services, including universities, deregulation and decentralisation were tools of this approach. Universities had to operate within this ideology and adapt to the changing foci of government in areas including ideology, fiscal and industrial relations environments (Young 2004).

Performance appraisal was originally introduced into Australian universities in 1988 under an Industrial Award of the Australian Industrial Relations Commission (AIRC). Considerable debate ensued as to its underlying purpose and whether the aim was the development of academic staff or greater monitoring and control of academic staff (Ryan 1991). As Lonsdale (1990, p.101) suggested, "Much needs to be done to ensure that their application in the higher education context occurs in a manner which is sensitive to the unique characteristics of the academic enterprise". In 1990 it was decided by the AIRC that an amendment to the Award should be made which saw performance appraisals, designed for developmental purposes, incorporated into the University Industrial Award. This was implemented in 1991. However,

despite this developmental focus Ryan (1991, p.91) noted, "...the term developmental appears in the rhetoric and methods advocated by managerialists and developmentalists alike often obscures the different ideologies and intentions guiding the two approaches".

Lonsdale (1998) argued that the development of performance appraisals and performance management in universities internationally occurred through successive generations. The **first generation** reflected a narrow performance appraisal approach which involved formal assessment by supervisors and feedback provided to subordinates. This approach was usually authoritarian in nature, individualistic, non-aligned to strategic goals and reflected a monitoring and control oriented approach to staff management. He suggested however, that the approach surrounding the introduction of performance appraisal into higher education in Australia was a '**second generation**' approach with two clear characteristics. The first was that the key objective of staff appraisal was for developmental purposes, and second, that appraisal schemes needed to be consistent with the values of the scholarly purposes of the university, a view that emerged from the National Steering Committee on Staff Appraisal in 1995.

Clearly a more strategic approach to managing performance was beginning to occur at this time. However, this approach was underpinned by some assumptions: first, that staff appraisal is the appropriate mechanism for identifying the needs of academic staff and is effective in doing so; second, that the identification of developmental needs leads to successful development activity by academic staff; and third, that staff development activity leads in turn to improved performance (Lonsdale 1998, p.305). From the results of a two year national study on the outcomes of performance appraisals in Australian universities, Lonsdale (1998, p.305) concluded that, "staff appraisal for 'developmental purposes' turned out to be unsuccessful". He suggested that the failure of performance appraisals to deliver the expected performance improvements and subsequent organisational outcomes compelled universities to re-consider their previous approach to managing performance. The findings of the Higher Education Management Review Committee (Hoare 1995) and the Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy (West 1998) suggested that given the increasingly competitive and commercial environment in which universities operated they needed a more strategic focus in the way they nurtured and managed staff. Since that time there has been increasing evidence that universities have attempted to do so by enhancing staff productivity and organisational effectiveness through changes to their performance management system via their enterprise agreements (Lonsdale 1998). This resulted in what Lonsdale terms his "third generation" approach where Australian universities sought to introduce more holistic performance management systems.

Lonsdale (1998) suggested that this "third generation" approach is reflected in a central recommendation in the Hoare Report which stated that the aims of any performance management system should not only be "based on agreed performance and developmental objectives for the individual" but also should be based on key principles. These principles include:

- the need to have a clear relationship between the performance of an individual staff member and the strategic direction of the department, school or faculty, or the university.

- to inform and provide feedback to staff on the level of their performance and skill development. This feedback could include comment from supervisors, colleagues, staff, students or other appropriate persons.
- to identify areas of future development for staff and formulate action plans for career development; and
- to generate data for making decisions on matters such as probation, increments, tenure contract renewal, and the management of diminished or unsatisfactory performance.

This review was commissioned by the then Minister for Employment Education and Training to examine the higher education system with “the objective of developing excellence in management and accountability for the resources available to the sector” (Hoare 1995, p1). The Hoare Report addressed a range of specific issues including employment and personnel practices and recommended, as part of workplace reform, that all universities should phase in a comprehensive approach to performance management based on agreed performance and developmental objectives for the individual. As far as possible, it was suggested that the consideration of these matters, currently undertaken in a disparate manner, should be brought together” (Hoare 1995 cited in Lonsdale 1998, p.307). Clearly the stated purpose here moved from a narrow focus on performance appraisal to recognition for the need to develop performance management systems in universities that were strategic, developmental and administrative and were also aligned, integrated and credible within the organisation.

In developing such a system Enterprise Bargaining has provided a mechanism for individual universities to do so in a way that suits their own needs. University Enterprise Bargaining Agreements (EBAs) have been negotiated collectively at the local level by the National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU) since 1994. Since that time the academic sector has had four bargaining rounds in which academic performance has been a key component. This industrial environment has given universities an opportunity to determine their own form of performance management. Despite the fact that it has been the covert policy of the NTEU to engage in pattern bargaining and if possible have similar clauses in agreements across universities, it is possible that these systems can vary considerably between universities.

A number of questions concerning the current status of performance management in Australian universities emerge. These include, what do performance management systems look like in Australian universities today? Are they linked to strategic goals if so how and what kind of feedback mechanisms do they include? Do they have a developmental focus or they more concerned with monitoring and control? Are they becoming more integrated and streamlined with other HRM policies? Importantly are there different types of performance systems emerging in universities with different foci? One way to begin to answer these questions is to explore the role and status of performance management in Enterprise Bargaining Agreements. As EBAs are legally binding documents the inclusion of performance management clauses and how and where they are expressed can give valuable insight into the importance that the university places on PM systems and the approach that the university takes to the performance management of its staff. This paper examines the Enterprise Bargaining Agreements of Australian universities to identify similarities and differences in the approach that Australian universities are taking in the performance of their academic staff.

Methodology

This research involves examining university documentation and is part of a larger study of performance management of academics in Australian universities. In Australia the universities' priorities in regard to PM can be uncovered from examining EBAs and university HR policies and procedures. The limitations to the approach used in this article is that the research only examines the priorities of universities in regard to PM and the content of PM systems as articulated in EBAs. Other limitations of the analysis were that the mechanisms EBAs used to glean any of the information were not examined nor were university policies or performance management systems. This will form part of the next stage of the research.

For this research 37 EBAs were accessed directly through the university websites. As EBAs are public documents the agreements were readily accessible. Using content analysis the documents were analysed by identifying the section headed "Performance Management" or the most similar nomenclature. It needs to be noted that several universities chose to separate or spread elements often regarded as coming under the umbrella of performance management across the EBA. It did not always appear as a discreet section, however, where possible the information was gleaned from the introduction to the section in general and/or the section related to performance management. Two universities chose to write only one and two lines respectively on performance management in the EBA, and in doing so refer the reader to relevant university policies for more detail. Those policies were not accessed for this analysis.

The clauses on performance management were analysed using a key recommendation from the Higher Education Management Review 1995 (now referred to as the Hoare Report) as the framework. These four recommendations are stated earlier in the article.

Considering each in turn, first, to identify the link between strategic objectives and staff performance, the EBAs were examined to see if there was a stated relationship between the work of the individual and the organisation's strategic focus and to explore the nature of that relationship. Second, the provision of effective feedback mechanisms was explored by ascertaining if the EBAs stipulated any element of feedback and if so, was it to occur at the level of performance and/or skill development. Third, to identify areas of future development for staff and formulate action plans for career development the EBAs were examined using two criteria; did the EBA include future development of staff and if so, did it include action plans or mechanisms to facilitate this development? Finally, generation of data which can be used for other matters was explored by ascertaining if, in their purpose or introduction the EBAs identified any of the following five areas: probation, increments, tenure, contract renewal and the management of underperformance. In addition the EBAs were examined to see if there were other uses identified for the data. Finally integration and linkages between key areas were examined.

Findings

Identifying the link between strategic objectives and staff performance

An examination of the thirty seven EBAs was undertaken to see if they identified the link between the performance management of staff and the strategic direction of the university and is displayed numerically in Table 1. This was done by identifying statements such as:

“...The Performance Development Framework supports staff to develop to their full potential to achieve personal and professional goals congruent with the strategic and operational objectives of the university.”

“...ensure that the professional development policy and practice within the University is directly linked to organisational development and the realisation of the University's vision, mission and goals; and give strategic guidance to providers of professional development activities.”

TABLE 1: Link between performance management and strategic direction

	Yes	%	No	%
Strategic Relationship	27	73	10	27

Seventy-two percent (27) universities could be said to link individual performance with organisational performance in the sense that their EBAs had a clear statement with this intent. However, twenty-seven percent (10) of university EBAs made no mention of strategic links. The second part of this analysis examined the nature of the relationship and whether the relationship between the employer and the academic could be loosely described as ‘developmental’ or ‘monitoring/control’, the results of which are shown in Table 2. Examples that we considered ‘developmental’ included:

“A performance development and review program encourages the development and maintenance of a culture of continual improvement within a productive, positive and harmonious work environment where staff and supervisors work in partnership to achieve personal and professional goals aligned with the university’s strategic and operational objectives”;

and;

“The university’s development as an innovative scholarly and global university meeting the needs of the 21st century is inextricably linked to the development of all of the university staff.”

And,

“Both the university and academic staff members accept the responsibility for performance enhancement and career development.”

‘Monitoring/control’ responses included:

“All staff members are requested to participate in performance planning and monitoring as required in the university’s policy”;
and

“All academic staff employed on a full-time or part-time basis...will be required to undertake a performance review on an annual basis”; and

“The Career and Performance Development Scheme ... is the formal and periodic setting of that staff members performance objectives and the assessment of performance and development needs.”

Other similar statements included “The university will continue to use the performance appraisal scheme as one mechanism for individuals to contribute to organisational productivity and performance.”

TABLE 2: Nature of relationship between employer and employee exhibited by the performance management system

Nature of Relationship	Number	%
Developmental	21	57
Monitoring/control	16	43

Using these categories, of the thirty seven universities analysed fifty-seven percent (21) were categorised as having a developmental focus and forty-three percent (16) as having a monitoring/control approach.

Of the twenty one universities which were categorised as having a developmental focus, twenty of them also identified a strategic link between organisational directions and staff performance. Of the twenty seven universities which had a clear statement of strategic links, twenty also had a developmental focus. There were nine universities which had neither a strategic nor developmental focus identified in their EBA. Of the ten universities with no statement of strategic link to performance management nine of these also were categorised as having a monitoring/control approach. This information is summarised in Table 3.

TABLE 3: Matrix identifying links between performance management and strategic direction and relationship between employer and employee

	Strategic link	No strategic Link	Total
Developmental	20	1	21
Monitoring/control	7	9	16
Total	27	10	37

Provision of effective feedback mechanisms:

As Table 4 shows staff feedback mechanisms were identified in the performance management systems of seventy-eight percent of university EBAs (29 out of 37). Since staff feedback is a key component of performance management this is hardly surprising, but whether it is

effective is not able to be ascertained. Of these twenty nine EBAs, two provided feedback only on performance with no mention made of any skill development.

TABLE 4: Performance management's provision of feedback

	Yes	%	No	%
Provide feedback	29	78	8	22

Identify areas of future development for staff and formulate action plans for career development:

Of all four items in the Hoare report's recommendations this section was the most strongly reported as displayed in Table 5. Sixty-eight percent (25) of universities identified the need to identify future development for staff in their EBAs. However, only twenty-two percent (8/25) of that group mentioned, in the broadest interpretation possible, any form of action plan to put this into operation. Although one university specifically identified that the development of staff should be in the teaching area.

TABLE 5: Performance management system used to identify future development needs and action plans to do so

	Yes	%	No	%
Identify future development	25	67.5	12	44.5
Mention action plans	8	22		

Data for making decisions on other matters including, probation, increments, tenure, contract renewal and management of diminished or unsatisfactory performance and integration of policies:

An examination of the EBAs revealed that universities used the data collected from performance management systems for a variety of uses including five key criteria identified in the Hoare Report. Table 6 shows these.

TABLE 6: Major uses of performance management data

USES FOR DATA	YES	%
Probation	7	19
Increments	10	27
Tenure	4	11
Contract renewal	2	5
Management of diminished or unsatisfactory performance	17	46

The most popular usage of the data was management of diminished or unsatisfactory performance (46%). Other uses of the data were for increments in salary (27%), review of probation (19%), awarding of tenure (11%) and renewal of contract (5%). Interestingly, not one university included all five of these criteria but two universities included four out of the

five listed above. Also twelve universities had none of the five criteria and six universities only had one of the five listed. Two universities specifically stated that performance management data was not to be used for the management of poor performance or for disciplinary reasons.

Some universities offered several other uses for the data other than those listed in the Hoare report. These included: promotion (12), rewards (13), including bonuses and loadings (3), performance-related pay (1) and unspecified rewards (9); Outside Study Program and study leave (4), conference attendance (2), conference travel (1), secondment (2), leave without pay for developmental purposes (2) and research grants (2); and fellowships (1), special studies (1), work priorities (1), scholarship (1), internal recognition (1) staff exchange (1), job rotation (1), job evaluation (1), VC Awards (1). Some EBAs include both academic and general staff so it is likely that some uses relate specifically to general staff and some to academic staff.

Discussion

The findings from this study clearly show that the majority of Enterprise Bargaining Agreements in Australian universities express a strategic link to performance management, with the result being that individual academic performance is increasingly being linked to organisational goals. What we do not know is how well this sits with a workforce that traditionally guards its right to practice its “academic freedom” that is, to seek and find new knowledge in many different directions, which is not necessarily linked to university strategy.

It is also clear that although most universities appear to have a developmental approach to performance management there are a number that have a narrower focus with an emphasis on monitoring and control. We have not explored the reason for this. In this regard questions for further research arise: Is it due to the ideology of the university or council? Does it represent the weakness of the NTEU in the bargaining process? What cannot be ignored is the managerialist focus of successive governments in the federal arena and their increasing control over universities alongside what we could call “negative” pronouncements on academic work, research and freedom. This is likely to be even more significant due to the direct involvement of government into industrial relations in higher education through the Higher Education Workplace Relations Requirements (HEWRR) placing restrictions on the content of Enterprise Agreements and university policies in order to access a funding pool of \$260 million (Barnes 2006). How this influences the performance management approaches stated in the EBA clauses in the future is worth further exploration.

Reward is a contentious area in education and over ten years ago the Karpin Report (1995) suggested management schools should manage the performance of staff by the use of key performance indicators, 360 degree feedback and developmental plans for academics. This would then be linked to an incentive scheme and performance bonuses. This was supported also by the Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy discussion paper (West 1998, p 36) which stated, “The most direct incentives for good teaching are to pay gifted teachers more or provide them with other benefits in the form of enhanced conditions of employment”. However, despite the move to enterprise bargaining which ostensibly gave universities the freedom to introduce performance related pay systems little appears to have been done formally. More recently the Hon Julie Bishop MP Federal Minister for Education, Science

and Training has argued the case for the benefits of pay-for-performance for teachers. In March 2007 at an address to the Australian Higher Education Industrial Association (AHEIA) she prodded university management to take up opportunities presented to them by government in saying “The HEWRRs provide universities with an increased ability to attract, retain and reward high quality staff by allowing for performance-based agreements and working arrangements tailored to individuals” (Bishop 2007). Universities failure to systematically use the enterprise bargaining process to push pay-for-performance could be due to the strength of the academic union which in principle opposes the use of performance related pay (PRP) (Heneman 1992) and supports existing formal salary structures in universities as a means to limit administrative discretion and perceived favouritism. This desire for similar treatment is often articulated as an attempt to preserve worker unity, maintain good morale and a cooperative workplace (Lazear 1989). Or it could be that the financial restrictions and constraints that universities work within, including restrictions on fees and student places, make pay restructuring and the uncertainty that accompanies it undesirable and risky. In a similar vein it may be due to the fact that the rhetoric by the federal government has not been matched by any increases in overall funding and the zero sum nature of government funding of the sector means that any movement to such a system simply means reallocating wages from base pay to variable pay.

Instead of an overhaul of the payment structures in academia, what we might be witnessing is management seeking greater discretion over a range of rewards, some of which are linked to salary, in an attempt to improve productivity and to motivate academics. Grant (1998) argued that many Canadian universities have merit plans as part of their formal salary structure including things such as conditions and criteria for tenure and promotion, market supplements, equity funds to remedy salary anomalies, and non-salary benefits. While it might not be possible (or may be possible but universities may be unwilling) for Australian universities at this point in time to introduce merit pay, it might be possible through the use of these ‘other’ uses of performance data to achieve the same end. It appears that Australian universities are endeavouring to reward staff through a range of measures, albeit that in the past these measures such as conference attendance, conference travel and outside study programs were considered as rights of academics.

Conclusion

The framework used in this paper has summarised performance management approaches in four ways and raised questions centred on the linking of the performance management system to strategic goals, the types of feedback mechanisms used, the contrast between its use as a developmental or monitoring and control tool, and the integration with other HRM policies. This paper has used an examination of universities EBAs to explore such questions and uncover the importance that the university places on PM systems and the approach that the university takes to the performance management of its staff.

Although strategic objectives are clearly stated in the majority of performance management statements, the contrast between the use of performance management as a developmental or control tool is less clear. The introduction of performance management systems per se can be regarded as an outcome of managerialism with its emphasis on efficiency and control, and individual appraisals at the expense of collective negotiation. In this vein, the linking of performance management to what has been considered ‘normal’ work practices such as

increments and study leave can be considered as part of managerialism attempts to control, even though motherhood statements in relation to strategy and developmental approaches may be also be made.

Whilst the majority of performance management systems stipulate feedback as a tool this is hardly surprising but whether it is effective is yet to be ascertained. What is interesting is how performance is judged and by whom, and what type of skill development is seen to be applicable for academics? Similarly, the development of staff is a clear priority of the majority of performance management systems. This raises questions as to how it is to be funded, and who judges the development needed and in what areas?

The next stage of the research project is to revisit ANOA's (2004) assertion of the importance of alignment, integration and credibility to performance management techniques. Alignment has been broadly explored in the relationship between EBA clauses and statements of strategic intent and this has been found to be quite favourable. However, further research is warranted in how these EBA clauses are implemented in universities. A statement of strategic intent in itself may simply be rhetoric. The questions that require addressing are: how are performance goals linked to strategic objectives and what objectives are they linked to? This is important in addressing Hoare's (1995) assertion that appraisal schemes needed to be consistent with the values of the scholarly purposes of the university. The appraisal process and the performance objectives are clear indicators of such values.

The importance of process is linked to credibility. Again this needs further research. Questions in this regard that come to mind are: Is the system accepted by academics? Are the individual goals negotiated and accepted by staff? Is the ranking of performance performed objectively? In regard to integration, the research can be expanded to examine performance appraisal's links to human resource planning, recruitment and selection, and succession planning.

Through an examination of Australian universities EBAs we can see the different views of and approaches to performance management. The increasing use of the performance management system to reward academic staff in ways that were traditionally considered standard working rights and conditions has been an important point uncovered in this research. Even though universities in general state that they link performance management to strategic objectives, and that performance management is developmental, and involves feedback on performance and skill development, the next stage of the research will attempt to match such pronouncements to practice through examining policy and process.

References

- ANAO (2004-5). Australian National Audit Office. *Audit Report No 6*, Canberra.
- Barnes, A. (2006). Trade Unionism in 2005. *Journal of Industrial Relations* 48(3): 369- 384.
- Barry, J., Chandler, J. and Clark, H. (2001). Between the ivory tower and the academic assembly line, *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(1): 87-101.

- Bishop J. (2007). Speech to Annual Conference of The Australian Higher Education Industrial Association (AHEIA), 15 March 2007
<http://www.dest.gov.au/ministers/media/bishop/2007/03/b00115032007.asp> Date accessed 6/7/2007
- Bratton, J. & Gold, J. (1999). *Human Resource Management*. (2nd ed). Macmillan Business, London
- Connell, J. & Nolan, J. (2004). Managing Performance: Modern Day Myth or a Game People Play. *International Journal of Employment Studies*. 12,(1): 43-63.
- Dunford, R. Bramble, T. & Littler, C., (1998). Gain and pain: The effects of Australian public sector restructuring. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 21(4): 386-402.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 74, 473-487.
- Gabris, G. & Ihrke, K. (2000) Improving employee acceptance toward performance appraisal and merit systems: The role of credible leadership *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 20(1): 41-53.
- Grant, H. (1998). Academic contests? Merit pay in Canadian universities. *Industrial Relations*. 53(4):647- 665.
- Hendry, C., Woodward, S. & Bradley, P. (2000) Performance rewards: cleaning out the stables. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 10 (3), 46-61.
- Heneman, R.L. (1992). *Merit Pay Linking Pay Increases to Performance Ratings, Readings* Mass. Addison Wesley.
- Henson, S.L. (1994). No escape from judgement: appraisal and PRP in higher education, *Occasional Papers in Organisational Analysis*. 2, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth
- Hoare, D. (1995). *Report of the committee of inquiry: Higher education management review*. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Holley, D. & Oliver, M. (2000). Pedagogy and the new power relationships. *International Journal of Management Education*. 1(1): 11-22.
- Karpin, D. (Chair) (1995). Enterprising Nation: Renewing Australia's Managers to Meet the Challenge of the Asia-Pacific Century. *Report of the industry task force on leadership and management skills*. Canberra, Australian Government Printing Service.
- Lawler, E. (1994). Performance management: The next generation. *Compensation and Benefits Review* 26(3): 16-20.
- Lazear, E.P. (1989). Pay Equality and Industrial Politics. *Journal of Political Economy*. 97(3): 561-580.

- Longenecker, C.O. & Ludwig, D. (1990) Ethical dilemmas in performance appraisal. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 961-969.
- Lonsdale, A. (1990). Achieving institutional excellence through empowering staff: An approach to performance management in higher education in Moses, I. (ed.) *Higher Education in the Late Twentieth Century: Reflections on a Changing System*, Sydney, Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia.
- Lonsdale, A. (1998). Performance appraisal, performance management and quality in higher education: Contradictions, issues and guiding principles for the future. *Australian Journal of Education*. 42 (3): 303–320.
- McDonald, D & Smith, A. (1995). A proven connection: Performance management and business results. *Compensation and Benefits Review*. 27(1):59-62
- Meyer, H.H., Kay, F., & French, J.R. (1965). Split roles in performance appraisal. *Harvard Business Review*. 43, 123-129.
- Nankervis, A. & Compton, R. (2006). Performance management: Theory in practice? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*. 44(1):83-101
- O'Brien, M., Valadkhani, A., Waring, P. & Denniss, R. (2007). The Australian Labour Market. *Journal of Industrial Relations*. 49 (3) 311-326
- Parker, L. (2003). Performance Anxiety. *HR Monthly*. December.
- Pearce, J.J & Porter, L. W. (1986). Employee responses to formal appraisal feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 71:211-218
- Rheem, H. (1996). Performance management programs: Do they make a difference? *Harvard Business Review* September – October: 3-4+.
- Ryan, A. (1991). Separating developmental and managerialist reviews – Quarantines, transitions and codes of practice, in Abbott, J and Lonsdale, A. (eds.) *Academic Staff Appraisal and Performance Management: The Australian Experience*, Eastern Park, Geelong, Institute of Educational Administration.
- Simmons, J. (2002). An “expert witness” perspective on performance appraisal in universities and colleges. *Employee Relations*. 24(1): 86-100
- Townley, B. (1990). The politics of appraisal: lessons of the introduction of appraisal into UK universities. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 1 (2): 27-44
- West, R. (1998). Higher Education Financing and Policy Review Committee. *Learning for life: final report: Review of higher education financing and policy*. Higher Education Financing and Policy Review Committee. Canberra, Department of Employment, Education, Financing & Policy Review Committee.

Young, S. (2004). *An Analysis of Outsourcing in the Victorian Public Health Sector*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Bowater School of Management and Marketing, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia.

Zacharatos, A., Barling, J & Iverson, R. (2005). High-performance work systems and occupational safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 90(1): 77-93.