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Abstract
The University of Luton became in 1994 the first university to secure recognition as an Investor in People, and in September 1997 it was successful in gaining reapproval for a further period of three years. This article sets out to explain why the University decided to apply for recognition, how it prepared for the assessment visits, and what the long-term organisational benefits have been.

Background
Investors in People (IIP) is a national scheme established for the purpose of encouraging organisations to value their staff as a key resource in improving their business performance. The scheme emphasises the importance of learning, and of creating within individual organisations the conditions under which competitiveness within the global knowledge-based economy can be fostered. The scheme is managed by Investors in People UK, a national government agency, and is promoted and supported through the network of Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs). The system operates through trained assessors, who are contracted as consultants by IIP UK. The assessors visit the organisations seeking recognition as investors in people, and make recommendations to regional committees of IIP UK about whether the organisations should be awarded IIP status.

The principles underlying the IIP initiative are very straightforward. It is concerned with the internal communication of institutional strategy, with how corporate aims and policies are reflected in individual employees’ experience of staff development and training, and with how employees are encouraged to take up developmental opportunities. In short, IIP addresses an agenda familiar to all institutions of higher education: the management of change and continuous improvement within an inexorably declining resource base, and the wholesale adoption of new working practices and technologies. Under these circumstances, the responsiveness of staff development and training to changing needs becomes a key determinant of institutional success.

In 1993-1994, the University of Luton took the decision to apply for recognition as an Investor in People. The following potential benefits were among the factors contributing to the decision:

• the reaffirmation it would provide of the central importance to the University’s success of a coherent human resource management and development strategy. IIP recognition would confirm the value the University places on the contribution of all staff to the overall quality of students’ educational experience. The University is predominantly a teaching institution, and all staff have a role to play in ensuring that students’ learning needs are given institutional priority;

• the value to the University of calibrating its own human resource management and development practices against a national standard recognised in all sectors of the economy. Recognition would provide the University with an external benchmark of good workplace management, facilitating continuous improvement and responsiveness to changing external circumstances;

• IIP approval would symbolise the University’s commitment to matching corporate objectives to the personal development of individual members of staff, enriching jobs and enhancing job satisfaction;

• the value of securing critical external advice on how the University’s human resource management and development practices might be improved;

• the favourable impression of the University’s management capability that would be formed among external stakeholders, particularly those commercial enterprises with which the University was planning to do business as a provider of educational services. Certification would offer to the organisations making use of the University’s services a guarantee that the staff with whom they did business were knowledgeable about the institution’s provision and strategy, and that they could enter into commitments on the basis of a realistic understanding of what the University could deliver.
An additional particular consideration in 1993-1994 was the institution’s then recent success in securing university status. Luton College of Higher Education was the first (and as it transpired the only) institution to be designated a university under the procedures of the Higher Education Quality Council. The application process provided an unprecedented opportunity for corporate team-building, heightening awareness among staff at all levels of institutional policies and priorities. The growth of the University over the preceding three or four years had already familiarised members of staff with the importance of the contribution of training and development to the successful management of change. Indeed, the institution and its many new staff had grown together, fostering a high commitment and sense of ownership among staff of the strategies and procedures that had been adopted. It is undoubtedly the case that staff’s understanding of the significance of the institutional context within which they are working, an enduring characteristic of the University, set the University apart from many other higher education institutions and was an important factor in contributing to its IIP success.

The principal disadvantage of applying for IIP recognition in 1993-1994 was one of perception: the IIP standard was not, at that stage, well-established, particularly within the higher education sector, and indeed it was considered to be a rather eccentric and marginal initiative to take. In being distinctive, therefore, the University ran the risk of positioning itself outside the mainstream of the higher education community and potentially compromising the regard with which it was held by other members of the sector. Furthermore, the IIP approval procedure is administered through TECs, which at that time had not been established long enough to command universal esteem and which, subsequently, have been judged to possess too variable a performance profile to have been regarded as a successful initiative. For example, by TEC area, the proportion of organisations with over 50 employees recognised as IIP varies from 10 per cent to 30 per cent (DEFE, 1998a).

Two other disadvantages relate to resources. First, a not insignificant fee accompanies each application, on a scale which varies according to the number of employees and sites to be visited by the assessors. The fee is pitched at a level which obliges cost-conscious institutions to consider very carefully the cost of the assessment against its potential benefit. Second, the opportunity costs of applying are significant: the evidence has to be assembled; the case for recognition has to be articulated; the assessors’ visit, which extends over several days, has to be planned and organised; and a range of staff at all levels of the organisation have to submit themselves to interview by the assessors. The work is comparable in scope, although smaller in scale and therefore quantity, to that required by the institutional audit of quality assurance systems conducted by the national Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), with the major difference that the IIP assessment includes all non-teaching staff as active participants.

Approval is given for a three-year term, and the University decided in 1997 to apply for renewal of its IIP approval on several grounds. First, it was prompted to use renewal as the occasion to review internally the effectiveness of its human resource management and development strategies. Second, it was encouraged to proceed to renewal by the local TEC, which regarded the University’s success as making a significant contribution to its own performance targets. Finally, the University had acquired a certain prestige as the first university to acquire IIP status, and the prospect of being the first university to secure IIP re-recognition provided a moderate incentive to continue. The prospect of being the first university to fail to be re-recognised was, conversely, not regarded as a palatable option.

The process of application
The procedures adopted by IIP for applying for recognition are familiar to higher education institutions in the UK, as they are very similar to the institutional audit procedures adopted by the QAA. Essentially, an institution is asked to demonstrate its achievement against certain expectations of human resource policy and practice (the IIP “standards”), which are tested by the IIP assessors through a visit for the purpose of gathering documentary evidence and interviewing a sample of staff. Unlike QAA practice, it is usual for only one or two assessors to visit the institution, and interviews with staff are conducted on a one-to-one basis. The staff to be interviewed are nominated by the institution from within the categories selected by the assessors. There is therefore no expression of the concept of external peer group review at the operational level of the visit itself; instead, the process is regarded as evidence-based and therefore objective, the role of the assessors being to search for confirmation that the stipulated criteria have been fulfilled. At a subsequent
stage of the procedure the principal assessor does, however, have to defend before a regional panel his/her recommendation about the approval or otherwise of an applicant organisation.

Documentation
At the outset of its IIP relationship, the University adopted the position that it would begin the assessment process by preparing a self-study document, addressing the elements of the IIP standard through the narrative of the document. A supplementary portfolio of existing papers provided the documentary evidence justifying the claims in the self-study. The decision to adopt this approach to the documentation was made for several reasons.

First, the pattern of critical self-evaluation followed by a visit from external specialists was one with which the University was familiar from the requirements of the national external quality assurance bodies to which it had related, and it had found the preparation of a submission document a useful discipline for the purposes of reviewing existing provision and of securing intellectual ownership by all relevant members of staff.

Second, the existence of an institutional statement had been judged to have two particular benefits for staff: the process of preparing the critical self-evaluation had been found to be valuable in encouraging staff to participate in a consultative capacity; and the final document served as a briefing paper for staff as well as for the external assessors.

Third, the University wished to facilitate the assessors’ engagement with the institution: higher education was a sector of the economy new to the IIP assessors, with its own particular working practices, and it was believed important that, in advance of the visit, they should be sensitised to the culture in which they would be immersed. In compiling the portfolio of evidence, it was felt important that the assessors’ attention should be drawn to the distinguishing features of the organisational culture of higher education, so that their judgements would not be influenced inappropriately by expectations drawn from other sectors of employment. Aware that it was the first university to present itself for recognition, it was anticipated that higher education’s particular set of characteristics - the intangible values of quality and standards assuming precedence over the relentless pursuit of the quantified bottom line, the celebration of diversity, its emphasis on critical reflection and contestation, and its simultaneous embrace of exogenous influences and corporate targets - would sit uncomfortably in the mindset of assessors more familiar with the perhaps more quantifiable priorities of commercial organisations.

Fourth, the self-evaluation was regarded as supportive of, and complementary to, the academic planning process required by HEPCE, because in part it adopts a resolutely bottom-up approach to institutional policy, inviting such questions as: do all staff know what the mission and the objectives of the institution are, how are they informed about them, how do they shape the institution’s human resource development strategy, and what in practice is staff’s expectation and experience of that strategy? Both the academic planning and the IIP processes begin from the mission, the needs of students and the developmental needs of curriculum, but the IIP process is helpful in its insistence upon requiring confirmation that the academic planning process is understood and sustained by members of staff at all levels across the institution (Daniel, 1997).

Fifth, the IIP assessment slices an institution in a different way to that accomplished through academic quality assurance system, and enables the University to test out the effectiveness of its approach to human resource management. In broad terms, the University aspires to the operating principle of centrally planned, locally managed, and embodies:

- decentralised decision taking, as is appropriate to an institution of higher education, enabling academic staff to pursue their own subject interests and, with the support of their managers, to innovate and take subject-related risks;
- good communications and monitoring, enabling the University to develop and implement strategy as a corporate body and to learn from the experience of its constituent parts;
- giving employees new and wide-ranging responsibilities within a project-oriented working cycle: empowerment leading to personal development within a flatter, more permeable, staffing structure;
- expecting employees, particularly in the professional support areas, to become highly trained, to work flexibly and relatively autonomously, and through a clear accountability system to accept responsibility for the successful operation of their own spheres of work.

Reassessment
The University approached reassessment in a similar way to initial approval, preparing a
critical self-appraisal as a preface to its
collection of evidence, and briefing staff on
the significance of the event. However, in
some respects, reassessment posed a greater
challenge than initial approval. The
organisational culture had developed in the
intervening three years, as the warm
afterglow of becoming a university had faded.
Heightened corporate awareness had given
way to a developing sense of departmental
and subject identity, and to the effects of the
new challenge of managing the institution in
a steady state (in terms of student numbers)
with a declining unit of resource.

Similarly, the IIP standards had
themselves been refined (Investors in People
UK, 1997). Through experience of
implementing the standards, the assessors
had become clearer about what counted as an
appropriate application of the criteria, and
the assessors were therefore that much
sharper about the evidence they were looking
for. The rules of the game had thus been
changed, and there was a risk that the
changes were perhaps not to the University’s
advantage judging by the not altogether
encouraging track record of institution-wide
applications from other universities.

Outcomes and benefits
The main benefits to the University arose
during the preparations for recognition: the
external consultants contracted by the TEC
drew attention to contemporary
developments in human resource
management; the process of compiling the
portfolio of evidence identified lacunae in the
University’s existing systems; and the
exercise served to raise among staff as a
whole the profile of the University’s mission,
strategic direction and associated staff
development programme. The preparations
also provided the opportunity to expose
frankly the challenges facing the University,
leading to a list of substantial agenda items to
incorporate as priorities in its forthcoming
strategic plans.

One outcome was that the IIP approval
procedure obliged the University to
foreground the professional support staff,
thereby redressing the balance of attention
which the QAA’s processes necessarily give
to academic staff. Having been explicitly
confronted with the question, the University
could do little other than acknowledge that
the value it placed on the contribution of
academic support staff to the overall quality
of students’ educational experience was not
as demonstrably high as the value it placed
on the contribution of the teaching staff. The
problem had two elements. First, internal
magazines, newsletters and briefing papers
had very little impact on the academic
support staff, particularly those in manual
roles, and the University had not compensated
for this by identifying other channels of
communication more suited to the audience.
Second, the institution had given priority to
the career structure of academic staff, giving
less attention to enhancing the increasingly
inadequate support staff career structure
inherited substantially from the period
before 1989 when the then college was under
the control of the local authority. As a result
of these findings, the University took two
initiatives: first, as a short-term measure, to
inaugurate a system of team briefings,
departmental meetings and open staff
meetings to improve the internal
communication of ideas and information in
writing and orally, both within departments
and laterally across the University; and
second, to begin the task of reviewing and
simplifying its salary structures, in order to
provide appropriate reward and progression
opportunities for all colleagues. The overall
aim of these initiatives was, through
teambuilding between academic and support
staff, to foster the conviction that everyone
makes a difference to the effectiveness of the
University as a place of learning, and that
there are no preconceptions about the best
solutions to the University’s response to
national developments.

The expectation that information about the
University would be communicated to all
members of staff had the further effect of
concentrating the University’s attention on
the staff management role of heads of
department and other supervisory staff.
Previously, during the rapid expansion of
student numbers, the University had not had
occasion to problematise the work of heads of
department or their contribution to
successful institutional development. IIP
helped, however, to expose and crystallise
their pivotal role in contributing to the
formulation of, and implementing, staffing
policies designed to support the quality of the
student experience and other corporate
priorities. Fostering research and scholarly
activity is one obvious example which all
heads acknowledged as a core part of the
University’s business, and one with which
the academic heads were comfortable; but
other aspects of people management, perhaps
less immediately attractive or rewarding yet
applicable across the range of academic and
support departments, are also an integral
part of a head’s job, including promoting a
customer service ethos, encouraging external
income generation, securing compliance
with statutory requirements and,
occasionally and regrettably, operating staff disciplinary procedures.

Two general points arose from the University’s consideration of the implications of IIP within a devolved system. First, the managerial tools of planning, financial management, staffing and communications help to deliver quality and cost-effectiveness within the constraints posed by external financial and quality assurance exigencies, but the professionalism needed to manage this complexity within the departmental rivalries, mutual suspicions and corporate-subject tensions characteristic of universities, is too demanding to be left unsupported by structured management development programmes (Bone and Bourner, 1998). Action was therefore taken to enhance the corporate staff development programme to embrace a more systematic middle managers’ development scheme, addressing institutional themes, including people and financial management, and furthermore reinforcing the establishment of strong value-added strategic alliances building trust and sustaining corporate advantage (Quayle and Murphy, 1999).

Second, the University began the process of reviewing the consistency of job descriptions across the institution, in order to confirm that key elements of accountability were present and to satisfy itself that anomalies were justified.

Similarly, IIP offered the University an opportunity to monitor the institution-wide implementation of certain corporate human resource management policies, for example, annual career review, departmental staff induction, the release of staff to attend corporate staff development events, peer observation of teaching, the appointment of visiting lecturers, and the facilities offered to part-time, visiting and other guest lecturers. It enabled the University to introduce corrective action, with particular emphasis on systems of accountability from heads to the wider academic community coupled with the dissemination of better guidance to heads about the annual cycle of reporting. All heads of department are now asked to report regularly on the measures they have taken to enhance the knowledge and skills of the staff for whom they are responsible.

Having given priority to the development of its research capability, preparations for IIP confirmed that it was now timely for the University to redress the balance more towards its mainstream teaching function. After debate, the career post of principal teaching fellow was established at the principal lecturer level for members of the academic staff whose interests and aspirations lie more firmly with the pedagogical challenges of delivering subjects than with subject scholarship as an end in itself, or with subject or departmental management issues. The principal teaching fellows lead pedagogical developments within their departments and faculties and, collectively, take the institution forward in adopting new approaches to teaching and learning in the context of the massification of higher education and the increasing pervasiveness of information and communications technology. In the meantime, and anticipating the establishment of the Institute and Learning and Teaching, the university established a refresher course in pedagogical techniques for existing academic staff alongside a more extensive teaching induction programme for new lecturers.

A benefit of IIP experienced by all staff was that it provided the occasion for them to consider the specific contribution their own jobs make to the larger framework of corporate development and priorities, encouraging them to set their responsibilities within a wider canvas and to reflect critically on how their own departments related to the work of the University at large. This coherence to the organisational development planning of the University had, in turn, the advantage of raising the expectations of staff by bringing to their attention the opportunities for continuing professional development (Quayle and Murphy, 1999). Conversely, it emphasised to staff the implications of the determination of the University to be regarded as a learning organisation.

Furthermore, attainment of the standard incidentally also provides staff with a lever to be used where the University’s actions do not match their perceptions of the service they should be receiving. Inevitably and appropriately, the positive engagement of the staff in the University’s application for IIP recognition has stimulated a greater awareness among staff about how the various components of the University’s staff development offerings fit together, and about the opportunities open to them personally, whether through their own departments or through the University’s large corporate staff development programme.

A specific example of the benefits the University as a whole gained from its IIP engagement was provided by the decision to review the position of visiting lecturers and to group them into clear categories, each with its own distinctive expectations and entitlements. The ensuing debate led to the creation of the
category of Luton associate lecturers, comprising individuals who make a regular and significant teaching commitment to the University: a University-wide appointments procedure was established for them, and expectations set about induction and mentoring arrangements and about their level of access to physical resources. They are encouraged to attend departmental meetings in their subject discipline, and to participate in the University’s career review and professional development procedures.

**Weaknesses of the process**

Notwithstanding the substantial benefits that are to be derived from engaging with IIP, the process itself invites some major challenges within a higher education environment.

First, IIP presents a major language barrier to higher education staff. Routine use of the words “management” and “staff” to describe dichotomous, almost oppositional, roles; use of the word “standards” in an unfamiliar way, yet imprecise enough to defy unambiguous articulation; the expectation of communication but not necessarily consultation with staff; indeed, the application of the word “invest” itself to members of staff within an academic community: all these usages need to be translated into user-friendly terminology in order to command the support of staff for an application. The language that is used by IIP can prompt one of two unhelpfully extreme emotive reactions. It can be seen as conclusive evidence that universities are indeed being incorporated as full constituents of the enterprise economy, with a division of labour to match: that it is a misconceived attempt to import into the not-for-profit sphere employment practices that have been introduced into commercial business with dubious success. Alternatively, it can be seen as conclusive evidence that IIP is not for universities: that its precepts have no resonance with the employment practices supporting the new collegialism (Harvey, 1995) characteristic of modern universities. For these reasons, it is vital that universities appoint correspondents to act as gatekeepers to mediate and interpret IIP terminology into language which resonates with the established and successful culture of higher education.

Second, and irrespective of the terminology used, a residual feeling remains among academic staff of the irrelevance of the exercise to the University. The hierarchical view of organisations embedded in IIP is not that experienced by academic staff, and indeed most would regard entertaining that view as a betrayal of the values of the university sector.

Academic staff will tend to have a greater academic responsibility towards the wider critical community of their discipline (Winter, 1995), irrespective of where they are employed, than with colleagues from other disciplines or employed in another functional capacity within the university, and the assumption of corporate loyalty explicit in IIP thus sits uneasily with the basis of an academic’s professionalism. Furthermore, for them, opportunities for staff development and training are an unquestioned professional norm which the institutional autonomy enjoyed by universities is expected to protect.

Third, the assessment visit itself potentially weakens a university as a single community of employees through the combined effects of the following bundle of propositions: that support staff are more likely to be seen and interviewed by the assessors than academic staff; that many support staff arguably tend to perceive their employment at a university as a short-term job rather than as a long-term career, and therefore they will be unlikely to provide evidence of a strength of commitment to its corporate aims and development; and that their professional training teaches academic staff to be more articulate in defence of their own practices than academic support staff. In general, support staff are rendered more vulnerable through the visit than academic staff, expressed in the nervousness which many betrayed prior to their interviews. The exposure of difference made the event and the underlying process potentially divisive.

Lastly, while the University learned through its preparations for the IIP process, it derived no unexpected benefits from the assessment visit itself or the subsequent report. Stimulated by the applications, the University had identified in advance of the visit the areas of possible weakness, and had initiated remedial action. The visit and report were therefore perceived by staff as somewhat anticlimactic.

**Discussion**

The overall IIP process provided the opportunity for the University to engage in the furtherance of its human resource management and development strategies at three levels:

1. reviewing the appropriateness of its overall practices and policies when set against national standards of good practice;
2. monitoring the extent to which policies were being implemented at departmental level;
anticipating a more fundamental shift in its staffing strategies in the light of increasing student numbers combined with continuing resource exigencies, and in particular fostering an acceptance among all staff, both academic and professional support, of their responsibilities for upholding and enhancing the quality of students’ overall educational experience.

The process gave the University the occasion to reconceptualise its corporate human resource development strategy, and to map the strategy for consistency against its institutional development plans and the imperatives of the changing environment in which the University was operating. The preparations for the visit also provided the opportunity to expose frankly the challenges facing the University, leading to a list of substantial agenda items to incorporate as priorities in its forthcoming strategic plans.

The principal outcome of the assessment was to confirm the pivotal significance of the role of heads of department and other supervisors in staffing matters, as the link between the direction of institutional development and the careers of individual members of staff. The adoption of a planned and systematic approach to individuals’ development and training needs, embracing both departmental and institutional elements, is a vital element of a head’s work, and the IIP preparations helped to identify variations among departments in their implementation of policy, and to encourage all departments to adopt the human resource management practices of the best. As a result, the University has become more sensitive to the importance of the professional relationship between heads and the staff in their departments, and has introduced a management development programme for heads as well as a more systematic monitoring procedure through the committee system. For Luton, therefore, the answer to the question posed by Keep et al. (1996) – how can universities accomplish the task of becoming sophisticated employers, identifying innovation, high commitment and high levels of skill? – is: through the agency of well-trained heads of department and other supervisory staff. This conclusion is also shared by Dearlove (1997), who sees a “vital role for leadership from the middle” of universities.

The IIP assessment process also identified systematic disparities in the treatment of academic and professional support staff, to the disadvantage of the latter. Predictably, academic staff tended to know more about the institution, to be more generously supported for training and development activities, and in general to be more engaged in the corporate life of the University. But, while acknowledging the essential need for academics to engage fully with their peers in the wider academic and professional communities, such historical discrepancies are not a good guide to optimal practice within a mass system of higher education. Two opposing trends are discernible: there is greater functional differentiation between teaching and professional support staff; yet all staff are acquiring a direct and increasingly significant complementary role in sustaining the quality of students’ overall educational experience. The traditional relationship between subject departments and students can no longer be assumed within a more flexible higher education system, implying the need for all staff with whom students engage to understand how their particular responsibilities mesh with the institution as a whole. Effective institution-wide teamwork entails a more active stance towards improving the skills of all staff. Indeed, just as Scott (1995) sees IIP as an indicator of the learning society, as a radical enlargement of education and training in non-educational settings, so may an individual organisation’s IIP activities be regarded as an indicator of a learning organisation.

It may be objected that IIP is merely an ideological device, resting its claim for legitimacy on the “objectively necessary” goals of economic growth and success (Salter and Tapper, 1994), and threatening the basis of academic freedom and institutional autonomy by its unquestioning importation of inappropriate managerial imperatives and working practices leading, ultimately, to the incorporation of higher education into the private sector of the economy. Luton’s experience is that such objections are not well founded: while academic reputation and financial solvency are two overriding institutional objectives, IIP does not, of itself, demand the adoption of a particular managerial style. An institution’s success is founded on the ability of staff to negotiate the fulfilment of students’ needs and the pursuit of subject development within constraints posed by financial, stakeholders’ and institutional factors. For such negotiations to be focussed through heads of department is an entirely appropriate response within the context of a higher education community, and indeed serves to emphasise the privilege that academics share with few other workers of their own power over the determination of their professional attitudes and behaviour (Trowler, 1997). Viewed from this perspective, IIP simply presents a radical
opportunity to encourage staff to anticipate changing circumstances by widening and deepening their personal development, performance and job satisfaction. It thus prepares them to adapt as service needs fluctuate, to monitor the quality of what they are doing, and to take responsibility for the initiative they use in their own work areas.

Conclusions

Perhaps most importantly, IIP is, as the new Labour Government has acknowledged with its renewed commitment to IIP (DfEE, 1998b), consistent with contemporary thinking about the central contribution of good human resource management practice to an organisation’s success. At a time of diminishing resourcing, it is vital that institutions find a way of reconciling the conflicting demands of scholarship, excellent teaching, better service to students and other clients, and knowledge transfer to the outside community, by working more smartly and more purposefully. IIP can help to raise the profile of staffing issues within a university, stimulating institutions to reflect critically about their management of change, and in particular on motivating and deploying staff to meet both departmental and institutional aims.

For universities, the challenge, particularly for heads of department and other middle managers, is to provide the conditions under which, within a changing mix of the collegial and the professional, and with uncomfortable trends towards managerialism and proletarianism, the academic enterprise can continue to flourish (Dearlove, 1997). This is the human resource management challenge, and it is the value of IIP that it obliges institutions to confront corporately the issues of operating within a climate of raised expectations and constrained resources and, in so doing, to begin the task of identifying a professional and contemporary set of human resource management and development strategies.

The response of Luton’s staff to the IIP application — initial scepticism about the relevance of the initiative and about the University’s ability to meet the standards, to a quiet pleasure at the successful outcome — tells its own story, and it was reassuring to receive confirmation from external peers about the overall progress towards becoming a learning organisation. Whether Luton’s experience is generalisable to other institutions in the sector is, however, more difficult to judge: its particular recent history has raised the collective awareness of staff development systems to a level which may not have found expression in other universities, its task-orientated culture may not find a ready resonance elsewhere, and its compact physical accommodation facilitates communication and decision taking. The University has, however, benefited significantly both internally and externally from its IIP applications, and is now able to take a collective, integrated approach to the next change management phase of its human resource management and development strategies.
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