

5-2013

## The Development of Campus Academic Leaders

Walter H. Gmelch  
*University of San Francisco*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/ijlc>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Gmelch, Walter H. (2013) "The Development of Campus Academic Leaders," *International Journal of Leadership and Change*: Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 7.  
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/ijlc/vol1/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Leadership and Change by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact [topscholar@wku.edu](mailto:topscholar@wku.edu).

---

# The Development of Campus Academic Leaders

## **Abstract**

What are universities and colleges doing to provide preparatory leadership experiences for our next generation of academic deans and department chairs? They typically come to the position without leadership training, without prior executive experience, without a clear understanding of the ambiguity and complexity of their roles, without recognition of the metamorphic changes that occur as one transforms from an academic to a leader, and without an awareness of the cost to their academic and personal lives. A radical change to developing academic leaders must be achieved if we are to respond to today's challenges. The purpose of this research is to explore how campuses can advance academic leaders through the three components of leadership development: conceptual understanding, skill development, and reflective practice. It also provides an overview of the strategy, structure, system, skills, and shared values one can use to develop campus leadership capacity. Through observations and data analysis, a dozen lessons emerged that can be generalized to most colleges and universities across the globe.

## **Keywords**

leadership, development, academic leaders, leadership capacity, dean, department chair

---

# The Development of Campus Academic Leaders

**Walter H. Gmelch** *Dean and Professor of Educational Leadership, School of Education, University of San Francisco*

## Abstract

*What are universities and colleges doing to provide preparatory leadership experiences for our next generation of academic deans and department chairs? They typically come to the position without leadership training, without prior executive experience, without a clear understanding of the ambiguity and complexity of their roles, without recognition of the metamorphic changes that occur as one transforms from an academic to a leader, and without an awareness of the cost to their academic and personal lives. A radical change to developing academic leaders must be achieved if we are to respond to today's challenges. The purpose of this research is to explore how campuses can advance academic leaders through the three components of leadership development: conceptual understanding, skill development, and reflective practice. It also provides an overview of the strategy, structure, system, skills, and shared values one can use to develop campus leadership capacity. Through observations and data analysis, a dozen lessons emerged that can be generalized to most colleges and universities across the globe.*

## Keywords

leadership development; academic leaders; leadership capacity; dean; department chair

## The Call for Leadership

Where have all the leaders gone? Have they ever been here? The corporate world complains that they have simply progressed from the Bronze Age of leadership to the Iron Age. *Institutions of higher education may still be in the Dark Ages.* Some estimate that only 3% of universities and colleges invest in developing their academic leaders – deans and department chairs. Inquiry into the development of academic leaders may shed some light to help illuminate the way to the Building Age of our leadership capacity in colleges and universities. This article investigates how to develop campus leadership programs in a more systematic and continuous manner. Its origin is based on a four-year campus program and research report. The results can be generalized to any college or university across the globe.

Scholars and administrators alike speak about a great leadership crisis in higher education. Blue ribbon commissions and executive reports from the American Council on Education (Eckel, Hill, & Green, 1998), Kellogg Foundation (Beinecke & Sublett, 1999) to the Global Consortium of Higher Education (Acker, 1999) call for bolder and better college and university leadership. The search for solutions to this leadership dilemma leads us to realize that academic leader development is the least studied and most misunderstood management process in America.

The transformation from faculty to academic leadership takes time and dedication, and not all academics successfully make the complete transition to leadership. Academics face personal challenges to respond to “the call” to academic leadership. Deans and department chairs typically come to the position without leadership training, without prior executive experience, without a clear understanding of the ambiguity and complexity of their roles, without recognition of the metamorphic changes that occur as they transform from an academic to a leader, and without an awareness of the cost to their academic and personal lives.

The literature is silent to the question of how campuses develop their deans and department chairs. In general, they experienced socialization processes similar to that received by other executives (individual, informal, random, and variable), but ironically in contrast to how universities develop students as professionals (cohort, formal, sequential, and specific time span) (Gmelch, 2000). Socialization of academic leaders appears to be left to chance. Institutions must realize the impact socialization techniques can have on the academic leaders' productivity and propensity to serve – or not to serve!

Becoming an expert takes time. Studies of experts in the corporate world who attain international levels of performance point to the 10-year rule of preparation (Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Romer, 1993). Malcolm

Gladwell (2008) documents the studies indicating that it takes 10,000 hours of practice to become an expert. In universities, seven years represents the threshold for faculty to attain the status of expert as recognized by tenure and promotion at the associate professor level, and another seven years for full membership in the academy. If it takes 7 to 14 years to achieve expertise in our academic disciplines, why do institutions assume academic leaders can be created with a weekend seminar? Leaders in higher education socialize and reward new PhD's for becoming internationally renowned experts in narrow fields and then complain that academics are neither willing, nor prepared, to be generalists and serve in a leadership capacity (Gardner, 1987).

Academic leaders represent the most unique management position in the country. While serving as a dean or chair, many academic leaders continue to also engage in scholarship and teaching. Where else in the leadership world do we expect our leaders to take their previous jobs into their new positions? In addition, there are limited opportunities in the field of education to develop leaders. While ACE once had the corner for 15 years on national training for department chairs, they temporarily terminated their national program in 2012. A few training opportunities are available through the annual KSU Chair Conference and IDEA workshops; via Webinars through Jossey-Bass, Magna, and other vendors; by disciplinary associations (e.g. CCAS, AACSB, AACTE); and through state university systems in Texas, California, and Missouri.

Even if these above mentioned venues become more prolific, they would still not provide the type of in-house education and training each institution of higher education must conduct to develop their leadership capacity. If only 3% of U.S. campuses are engaged in systematic academic leadership development, then we need to build campus capacity through on-campus expertise. Institutions need to invest and grow campus leaders.

Again, it takes time and commitment to develop leaders in higher education. The time of amateur administration is over. What are universities and colleges doing to provide preparatory leadership experiences for our next generation of academic deans and department chairs? A radical change in our approach to leadership development in higher education must be achieved if we are to respond to today's challenges.

Where are examples and guidelines for developing campus leadership programs? Scan the wasteland of published works, and no resource emerges to assist

universities and colleges with the specific purpose of development of academic leaders. Some related works were written over a decade ago, but they are more encyclopedic or generic and do not address the current need for campus leadership development.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of this research is to explore how campuses can advance academic leaders – deans and department chairs. This investigation will provide an overview of the strategy, structure, system, skills, and shared values one campus used to develop their campus leadership capacity. It is designed to provide IHEs (Institutions of Higher Education) with a deeper understanding of how campuses can provide development for their leaders.

## Academic Leader Development Theoretical Framework

Leadership development of deans and department chairs is a process that extends over many years. Research on business leadership development estimates it takes from two and a half up to ten years to master the executive position. Higher education scholars posit that an outside chair or dean will need a year and a half just to become socialized into the institution. Complete executive development is difficult to determine. One of the most glaring shortcomings in the leadership development area is the scarcity of sound research on how and when to train and develop leaders (Conger & Benjamin, 1999). Gardner (1987) contends that leadership development is a process that extends over many years.

Our research suggests three spheres are essential to developing academic leaders: (a) a *conceptual understanding* of the unique roles and responsibilities encompassed in academic leadership; (b) the *skills* necessary to achieve the results through working with faculty, staff, students, other administrators, and external constituencies; and (c) the practice of *reflection* to learn from past experiences and perfect the art of leading. This research uses these three spheres and their intersections as the analytical framework. Previously, it has been used to study new department chairs as they transition from faculty to administration (Gmelch & Miskin, 2004, 2011); new deans as they develop through the seasons of their career (Gmelch, Hopkins, & Damico, 2011); as well as the socialization process new school administrators go through (Ortiz, 1982).

<sup>1</sup> Related resources can be found in *Handbook for Leadership Development* (C. D. McCauley, R. S. Moxley, & E. Van Velsor, 1998); *Investing in Higher Education* (M. F. Green & S. A. McDade, 1991); *Learning to Lead in Higher Education* (P. Ramsden, 1998); or *Building Leaders: How Successful Companies Develop the Next Generation* (J. A. Conger & B. Benjamin, 1999).



**Figure 1.** Academic Leadership Development

### A Campus Model for Academic Leadership Development

Nearly 50,000 scholars currently serve as department chairs, and almost one quarter will need to be replaced and developed each year. Deans, on the average, serve six years. Skill development for chairs and deans, unfortunately, is woefully inadequate (Gmelch, 2000; Townsend & Bassoppo-Moyo, 1996). Of the over 2,000 academic leaders surveyed (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton, & Hermanson, 1996), only 3% claim to have any systematic leadership development programs on their campuses. Most training programs are episodic and opportunistic, with outside “experts” presenting a training session in an afternoon, while neither understanding nor respecting the unique culture and conditions of the campus where they are presented. The programs developed on campus focus primarily on management duties (legal and fiscal issues mostly) designed as prophylactic measures to keep the departments and colleges out of trouble and the newspapers.

This study investigates a campus program designed to develop department and college leaders, not managers, in a systematic and continuous manner. The impetus for the program came from deans searching for leadership opportunities for their department chairs. Rather than looking outside for experts to come in and “fix” the campus, the college deans joined forces and identified the expertise within their staff to develop academic leaders and designed the Academic Leadership Forum (ALF). The ALF program was designed, delivered, and evaluated using the 7-S model (Peters & Waterman,

1982; Stevens, 2001). The three “hard” Ss (strategy, structure, and systems) and four “soft” Ss (staff, style, skills, and shared values) provide a systemic method to build and evaluate components of the program.

### Strategy: Academic Leadership Forum’s Conceptual Framework

The ALF program was based on research in the area of leadership development. From the literature, three spheres of development have emerged as essential conditions for development of academic leaders: (1) conceptual understanding of the unique roles and responsibilities encompassed in academic leadership; (2) the skills necessary to achieve the results through working with faculty, staff, students, and other administrators; and (3) the practice of reflection to learn from past experiences and perfect the art of leadership development (Gmelch, 2002; Gmelch, Hopkins, & Damico, 2011). These three spheres and their intersections (Figure 1) served as the analytical framework for the Academic Leadership Forum.

**Conceptual Understanding.** Conceptual knowledge or understanding is the ability to conceptualize the leadership roles of department chairs and deans from a cognitive point of view – mental models, frameworks, role theory that will allow them to grasp the many dimensions of leadership. Two issues are most important here: (1) as professors move into leadership positions, the concept of the job shifts; and (2) institutions of higher education have unique challenges not typical of managers and leaders in other organizations. As academics move into the role

of administration, they initially think in terms of their human and structural frames of leadership; but as they gain comfort, confidence, and commitment, two new frames demand greater attention – the political and symbolic. Universities typically have taken the lead in teaching leadership to others, imparting a conceptual understanding of the phenomenon. It is now time to teach academics what we know about leadership. Chairs and deans also need to define leadership for themselves. What does it mean to build a community, empower others, and set direction (Gmelch et al., 2011)? While conceptual understanding of leadership roles is a necessary condition to lead, it is not sufficient without application of appropriate behaviors and skills – the second sphere of leadership development.

**Skill Development.** To perform their roles and responsibilities, chairs and deans need to hone their skills. They can “formally” learn to develop their leadership skills through clinical approaches such as seminars, workshops, and lecturettes. However, they must then practice their newly learned skills through simulations, cases studies, role-playing, action planning, and on-the-job training. Many training opportunities for academic leaders are designed to have institutions send their managers and executives off-site for a three-to four-day training program. While these are effective in instilling key ingredients for skill development, research has shown that it is more effective if work teams with their supervisors attend the same program, such that each supports and reinforces each other’s skill-building efforts (Conger, 1992). Thus, the AFL program included the team of deans, associate deans, and department chairs in a continuous improvement model.

**Reflective Practice.** Understanding the roles of academic leaders and possessing the requisite skills are not enough to be successful. Leadership development is an “inner” journey (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). Self-knowledge, personal awareness, and corrective feedback must be part of a leader’s development. Because credibility and authenticity lie at the heart of leadership, determining and identifying guiding beliefs and assumptions lie at the heart of becoming a good leader (Cashman, 2008). Schon (1983), in the book *The Reflective Practitioner*, asks: What is the kind of knowing in which competent practitioners engage? How is professional knowing like and unlike the kinds of knowledge presented in academic textbooks, scientific papers, and learned journals? Reflection-in-action is central to the art through which leaders cope with the troublesome divergent situations of practice. When

practitioners reflect in action, they become a researcher in the practice context.

### **Staff: Who Participates?**

The initial idea of one dean to develop his own leadership program, designed by another dean, evolved into three colleges joining together. Several factors helped formulate this partnership. First, the Colleges of Business, Education, and Engineering were similar as professional colleges; second, the number of deans, associate deans, department chairs, and associate chairs created a critical mass of the “right size” in terms of manageability and pedagogy; and, third, and perhaps the most critical factor, all three deans trusted each other and worked well together.

### **Structure and Systems: The Form and Substance of ALF**

After the three colleges agreed to participate in ALF, a steering committee consisting of the deans, administrative assistants, and one department chair from each college was formulated to design the structure of the forum and research design. The structure and resources consisted of the following: monthly three-hour forums on leadership topics identified by the participants; supplemental workshop and seminars offered by the university or community (e.g., systems thinking with Peter Senge); notebook of resources consisting of readings, handouts, web-based citations, books, and other materials; support stipend of \$250 per participant to use as they deemed appropriate to support their leadership development; peer support pairs called Partners in Academic Leadership (PAL), whereby, each dean and chair was paired with another in a different college; and participant commitment, which represented the most important resource to the success of the program.

### **Skills: What It Takes to be an Effective Academic Leader**

What skills are most important to be a successful academic leader? The answer to this question was left to the participants, as the first forum was dedicated to having the group develop their own agenda for the year. The topics the participants identified mirrored most leadership development programs (Conger & Benjamin, 1999) and had the advantage of being generated by the

participants themselves. The topics were focused on leadership, not management, and included vision and strategic thinking, performance coaching and counseling, faculty development, decision making, communication, conflict management, time management, working with the dean and provost, teamwork, community building, and leading change. Each PAL took responsibility for creating a learning experience or training session on one of the topics. This approach had the benefit of bringing PALs together around a common task and also tapping the resources available within the group and university without having to call in outside experts.

#### Shared Values: What Are Our Common Beliefs and Commitment?

In their book *Common Fire*, Daloz, Keen, Keen, and Parks (1996) posited that, due to the pace of contemporary lives, “hearth time” has been lost – time to sit in front of the fire, reflect, and engage in meaningful conversation. At home, families have lost “table time,” the time to sit together and share their experiences. In professional activities and community life, “plaza time,” during which we engage in conversations about our professions, also has been lost. In order to create “commons time” for deans and chairs, PALS was formed. As mentioned previously, each dean or department chair was paired with another dean or department chair from another college in the hope that academic pairs would: meet regularly, twice a month; share leadership experiences on “What went well, what got in the way, and what would I do differently?”; share common readings; attend and discuss outside seminars and workshops; and lead a guided experience or presentation on a leadership topic to the forum.

The research on support teams cautions against such a practice, since it demands the resource that leaders have least to spare – time (Kram, 1985), and some neither want nor need it (Boyle & Boice, 1998). However, the benefits seem to outweigh the risks, as another body of research found that support teams provided mutual psychosocial support; an ability to learn from each other (Boice, 1992); increased chances of creativity; and structured time for reflection. The keys to a successful PAL would be in its ability to encourage each other in a non-judgmental way; increased wisdom from one’s own challenges and experiences; truth from honest feedback; confidentiality from a trusted friend; and focus on an opportunity or problem.

The 7-Ss (Peters & Waterman, 1982) provided the basis for the development and research on the Academic Leadership program. Overall, the objectives of ALF

were: (1) to develop an understanding and clarity about the leadership styles, motives, and roles of department chairs and deans; (2) to acquire the key leadership skills required to be an effective academic leader; (3) to build a peer coaching system to support academic leaders; and (4) to help department chairs and deans deal with the professional and personal trade-offs inherent in their positions. The next section of this article assesses the effectiveness of the program and shares some lessons learned that might be generalizable to other college campuses.

## Methodology

The study utilized a pre/post design to examine differences in participant responses before and after participation in the ALF program. The following sections provide an overview of the methods used to collect and analyze the data.<sup>2</sup>

### Survey Instrument

The pre-and post-ALF surveys were designed based on a similar instrument used to survey academic leaders nationally (Gmelch & Miskin, 2004, 2011; Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton, & Sarros, 1999). This allowed for a high degree of reliability and validity, as well as an opportunity to draw comparisons between the ALF sample and the national sample. The pre-ALF survey consisted of five general sections: (1) background and demographic information; (2) job satisfaction as an academic leader (Cronbach standardized ( $\alpha = .90$ )); (3) stress ( $\alpha = .96$ ), including role conflict and ambiguity; (4) perceptions of preparation and training; and (5) measured levels of reflective practices including six subsections on leadership identity and self-evaluation.

**Focus Group Analysis.** Four months after the completion of the first year of the ALF program, staff from the Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) conducted two focus groups, one of department chairs and the other of deans and associate deans. Based on the theoretical framework that organized the ALF program, focus group questions concentrated on participants’ conceptual understanding, skill development, and reflective practice related to academic leadership.

Differences in quantitative data were examined using a Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks test (Green, Salkind,

<sup>2</sup>Complete analysis of the entire study and data is reported in *The Call for Academic Leaders: The Academic Leadership Forum Evaluation Report* by W. H. Gmelch, R. D. Reason, J. S. Schuh, & M. C. Shelley (2002). Ames, IA: Research Institute for Studies in Education.

& Akey, 2000). Data gathered during the focus groups were transcribed and examined for emerging themes. Interpretation focused on themes that emerged within teach transcript, a process Mishler (1986) called interpretive coding. Themes across the two transcripts also were examined, a process called inductive coding (Strauss, 1987). Finally, themes were verified (Krueger, 1998) by two professional staff members from RISE.

## Leadership Development Results

The ALF cohort consisted of 28 deans, associate deans, and department chairs from three colleges. To determine whether the ALF data were representative of national data, the demographic information was compared to the national sample of academic leaders ( $n = 828$ ). Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks tests were used to determine whether significant difference existed between the two samples. Results for the shared survey items found that, on all but three of the common items, no significant differences were found.

As previously stated, the theoretical grounding of the ALF program centered on three spheres of leadership development: the conceptual understanding of the unique roles and responsibilities of academic leadership; the skills necessary to achieve results; and the practice of reflection to encourage learning from past experiences and perfecting the art of leadership. The data reported in this article also focuses on these spheres.

### 1. Conceptual Understanding

Three items on both the pre-and-post-surveys measured conceptual understanding and the ability to conceptualize the leadership roles of the department chairs and deans. Further, ALF participants completed a leadership inventory, based on the ideas of Bolman and Deal (1991), consisting of four items designed to evoke the understanding of their management/leadership style.

**Professional identity.** Before completing the ALF program, nearly half of the participants (47.6%) believed themselves to be “equally a faculty and an administrator.” One-third of the respondents (33.3%) considered their professional identity to be solely “academic faculty members,” while only 19% indicated solely an administrator. No department chairs indicated they were only an administrator. Following their participation in ALF, 74% of the respondents indicated they were “equally” faculty and administration, while approximately one-fifth (21%) indicated they were solely administration. Only one respondent (5%) marked faculty as their sole professional identity.

The Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks test showed a significant change in ALF participants’ perceptions of their professional identity ( $Z = -2.236, p < .05$ ), indicating a change in their conceptual understanding of the academic leadership position. ALF participants’ sense of identity moved away from a solely academic faculty member orientation to an identity of academic faculty member balanced with an administrative role. These results indicated that ALF respondents moved toward an understanding of academic leadership as a dual-identity role, equally administrator and faculty member. Focus group data also demonstrated an increasingly sophisticated understanding of the academic leadership role.

**Frames of Leadership.** Respondents to the ALF surveys indicated their perceptions of their own leadership/managerial styles on a series of questions that asked respondents to rate their skills, descriptors, and traits related to success as academic leaders. These ratings can be summed to produce a composite “frame of leadership” for each participant. Based on the composite score, the self-perceived strengths of each could be traced in four areas: structural, human resources, political, and symbolic leadership (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Leaders with a structural frame tend to value organizational goals, rules, policies, and hierarchies. Those in the human resources frame are likely to recognize the interdependence between people and organization and focus on fit between individuals and the organization. Political frame leaders tend to use power, coalitions, and bargaining in their work lives; while academic leaders in the symbolic frame use images, rights, and rituals.

On the pre-survey participants indicated highest scoring in the human resource frame followed by the structural frame, symbolic frame, and the political frame. While no statistically significant differences were found between the pre- and post-survey results, the symbolic and political frame increased in both actual magnitude and in relation with the other frames. The structural frame decreased in importance. Bolman and Deal (1991) and Tierney (1989) highlight the importance of symbolism in leadership, especially leadership that transforms an organization. The movement from the structural and human resource frames toward the political and symbolic observed in ALF participants should be considered promising for the organization. Tierney suggested that symbolic communication is essential to communication of organizational values, which is essential to transformational leadership. Further, the movement toward political and symbolic leadership

indicates a more sophisticated conceptual understanding of leadership (as opposed to management) following completion of the ALF program.

Academic leaders must be able to conceptualize their leadership roles. In summary, the results indicated that participation in the ALF program encouraged development in this sphere of leadership.

- Following the ALF program, participants' motivation to serve in academic leadership positions moved from transactional motivations (career advancement, financial gain, power) to transformational (contribute to organization, influence faculty development, personal growth).
- Following the ALF program, participants' professional identity shifted to a more balanced understanding of academic leadership.
- Participation in ALF appeared to move respondents to a more sophisticated conceptual understanding of their leadership style, as "symbolic" and "political" leadership frames assumed more importance for respondents while the leadership areas of "structural" and "human resource" lessened in importance.

### **2. Academic Leadership Skills**

Participation in ALF appeared to positively affect preparedness and effectiveness as an academic leader. Further, the ability to find balance in a busy work life improved, while scholarship and other "faculty related" skills suffered.

- ALF "bridged the gap" between a lack of training reported by participants and a feeling of preparation for and effectiveness in academic leadership positions. During focus group sessions, participants reported little training in academic leadership before assuming their positions. Participation in ALF provided some of the necessary training to prepare them and increase their effectiveness.
- ALF appeared to improve participants' perceptions of preparedness and effectiveness in leadership tasks. Respondents reported increased preparedness and effectiveness in 32 of the 36 tasks addressed in the survey.
- The importance placed on, and the ability to maintain, professional balance increased following completion of the ALF program. Respondents in

the focus groups reported a greater ability to balance their own professional needs with the needs of the institution.

- Even with greater ability to balance competing needs, ALF participants reported their scholarship suffered after assuming a leadership position. Approximately two thirds of the respondents reported they were "dissatisfied" with the level of their scholarship.

### **3. Reflective Practice**

The ability to reflect upon and grow from past experience is imperative to improved academic leadership. The ALF program provided opportunity for participants to reflect on their experiences, often with the assistance of a mentor or fellow leader.

- ALF participants appreciated and utilized the networking opportunities available to them through the program to learn the requisite skills of their position. Respondents reported highly favorable reactions to the networking component of ALF.
- Perhaps one of the most salient findings of the ALF study related to the increased job satisfaction. ALF participants left the program more highly satisfied with their academic leadership position. They reported statistically significant increases in satisfaction with "pace of work," "workload," and "overall job satisfaction."

The study also provides personal strategies academic leaders have practiced to advance their leadership training through the three components of leadership development – conceptual understanding, skill development, and reflective practice.

## **Lessons Learned**

Finally, through observations and data analysis, a dozen lessons emerged. These should not be viewed as a blueprint. Each campus's unique cultural, political, and social climates must be taken into consideration when designing campus leadership programs. The following, however, are lessons many campuses may learn from this investigation.

- 1. Cohort groups in leadership development are essential.** Leadership by its very nature is relational, and success depends on the ability to work and interact with others within institutional settings.

2. **Leaders thrive when they have mentors and support networks for guidance and reflection.** The most significant “surprise” from ALF came from the power of PALs in promoting reflective dialogue, building a partner support network, combatting the “lonely crowd,” and creating a sense of “we are in this together.”
3. **Leadership development must entail continuous learning opportunities.** As educators, we know that learning in distributed periods of training is retained longer than in one-time programs. To be truly successful, a leadership program must adopt a systems approach that builds on continual, progressive, and sequential development and constructive feedback.
4. **Leaders can create and deliver their own learning opportunities.** Although well-known leadership gurus and knowledgeable higher education experts can provide insight into the latest leadership theories, many times these outside experts only have superficial knowledge and understanding of a host university’s culture of idiosyncratic relations that dictate current practice (Conger & Benjamin, 1999).
5. **Institutional leadership development requires a supportive culture.** The literature on institutional change suggests that another critical “success strategy” includes receiving commitment from senior administrators (Eckel et al., 1998). The ALF program, while not dependent on central resources, did receive enthusiastic support from the president and provost.
6. **Programs must be built around a single, well-delineated model of leadership development.** One of the biggest problems most leadership development programs must overcome is a vague concept of what they are trying to accomplish (Conger & Benjamin, 1999). A model of leadership development must be consistent in order to contribute to program coherency, academic integrity, and participant learning.
7. **Leadership programs must capitalize on “small wins” during the developmental process.** One potential explanation for the success of the ALF program can be found in the concept of “small wins,” as described by Weick (1984). Weick contends a small win is a “concrete, implemented outcome of moderate importance” (p. 43). When small wins build on another, allies are galvanized and opposition to the initiative decreases. In the case of ALF, the structure of the program made for a number of short-term interventions that happened frequently and built on each other, creating routine reinforcement of the concepts learned by the participants.
8. **Leadership development must occur within a context.** Leadership development does not take place within a vacuum (Beinecke & Sublett, 1999), as its nourishing flourishes best within a context among trusted colleagues acting as mentors, partners, and coaches.
9. **Time and space for reflection are indispensable.** Reflection-in-action is central to the “art” by which practitioners deal with uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflict inherent in the changing leadership environment (Schon, 1983). Chairs’ and deans’ isolation in their respective positions works against reflection-in-action; thus, their art of leadership tends to remain private and inaccessible to others.
10. **Moral, ethical, and spiritual dimensions are necessary to complete the leadership journey.** Self-knowledge, personal awareness, and corrective feedback must be part of a leader’s development. Moral, ethical, and spiritual dimensions are necessary to complete the leadership journey. Leadership development is very much about finding one’s voice (Kouzes & Posner, 1987).
11. **Leaders must leave campus occasionally to gain national and global perspective and vision.** One of the basic tenants of Peter Drucker’s *Effective Executive* is that executives are limited in their view because they work “within” an organization. Many innovative ideas exist outside an institution’s ivory tower. Since many academics haven’t left the walls in decades, they need to “boundary span” outside their institutions to achieve a global view of their profession and society.
12. **Leaders must stay long enough to make a difference and sustain the change.** Studies of institutional change found that, in order for a change to be sustained, leaders must be in a position of influence long enough to cultivate and support the change effort (Eckel et al., 1998). With the current turnover of presidents, provosts, and deans, have institutions of higher

education created campus centers or institutes in order to institutionalize their faculty and academic leader development programs?

In conclusion, developing faculty into academic leaders is both a *privilege* and *responsibility* of university administrators and institutions of higher education. The privilege is advancing colleagues and programs, while the responsibility rests in developing our most valued resource, people. Through campus leadership programs, institutions benefit from building academic leadership teams, creating connections of leadership across campus, building in institutional renewal, promoting “purposeful” leadership diversity and pluralism, tapping hidden talent, maximizing individuals’ potential, and retaining campus talent. Achieving these individual and institutional benefits requires time, commitment, and dedication. The future of universities and colleges depends on answering “the call to leadership” with commitment and vision.

## References

- Acker, D. G. (1999). *Proceedings of the inaugural conference of the global consortium of higher education and research for agriculture*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Beinecke, J. A., & Sublett, R. H. (1999). *Leadership lessons and competencies: Learning from the Kellogg National Fellowship Program*. Battle Creek, MI: Kellogg Foundation.
- Boice, R. (1992). Lessons learned about mentoring. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austing (Eds.), *New directions for teaching and learning: No. 50. Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 51-66). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyle, P., & Boice, B. (1998). Systematic mentoring for new faculty teachers and graduate teaching assistants. *Innovations in Higher Education*, 22, 157-179.
- Cashman, K. (2008). *Leadership from the inside out*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Conger, J. A. (1992). *Learning to lead: The art of transforming managers into leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A., & Benjamin, B. (1999). *Building leaders: How successful companies develop the next generation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Daloz, L. A., Keen, C. H., Keen, J. P., & Parks, S. D. (1996). *Common fire: Lives of commitment in a complex world*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). *On route to transformation. On change: An occasional paper series of the ACE Project on leadership and institutional transformation*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Ericsson, L. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practices in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100(363-406).
- Gardner, J. W. (1987). *Leadership development*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers. The story of success*. New York, NY: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Gmelch, W. H. (2000). Leadership succession: How new deans take charge and learn the job. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(8), 68-87.
- Gmelch, W. H. (2002). *Deans' balancing acts: Education leaders and the challenges they face*. Washington, DC: AACTE Publications.
- Gmelch, W. H., Hopkins, D., & Damico, S. (2011). *Seasons of a dean's life: Understanding the role and building leadership capacity*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (2004). *Chairing the academic department*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (2011). *Department chair leadership skills*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.
- Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Hermanson, M. (1996). *The 1996 national survey of academic deans in higher education*. Pullman, WA: The Center for Academic Leadership.
- Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Sarros, J. C. (1999). The academic dean: An imperiled species searching for balance. *Research in Higher Education*, 40, 717-740.
- Green, M. F., & McDade, S. A. (1991). *Investing in higher education*. American Council on Education, Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Green, M. F., Salkind, N. J., & Akey, T. M. (2000). *Using SPSS for Windows: Analyzing and understanding data*. Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). Improving the mentoring practice. *Training and Development Journal*, 39(4), 40-43.
- Krueger, R. A. (1998). *Analyzing and reporting focus group results*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McCauley, C.D., Moxley, R. S., & Van Velsor, E. (1998). *Handbook for leadership development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mishler, E. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ortiz, F. I. (1982). *Career patterns in education*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Peters, T., & Waterman, R. J. (1982). *In search of excellence. Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York, NY: Warner Books.
- Ramsden, P. (1998). *Learning to lead in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Schon, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

- Stevens, M. (2001). *Extreme management*. New York, NY: Warner Books.
- Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tierney, W. G. (1989). Symbolism and presidential perceptions of leadership. *Review of Higher Education, 12*, 153-166.
- Townsend, B. K., & Bassoppo-Moyo, S. (1996). *If I'd only known: Administrative preparation that could have made a difference*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Weick, K. E. (1984). Small wins: Redefining the scale of social problems. *American Psychologist, 39*, 40-49.
- Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2002). *College deans: Leading from within*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education, Oryx Press.