



## WHAT WORKS - A REPORT FROM THE COMMUNITY

# DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONAL LEADERS

### What Works in Developing Institutional Leaders— A CCAS Perspective

We believe institutional leaders must have a sense of our identity and mission, and of the intellectual life of the community. Activities toward that end:

- ◆ weekly three-hour sessions during the entire year for first-year faculty to introduce them to our institutional history (led by emeriti faculty) and our plans for the future (led by senior staff); this is followed by a formal mentoring program for all second-year faculty
- ◆ a year-long seminar for second- and third-year faculty led by different campus leaders who share their individual visions about the institutional future, in the context of discussing responsibilities of their specific office
- ◆ a buddy system, “project learn,” which is required for tenure, through which faculty across all disciplines visit and evaluate each other’s classes, participate in an integrating seminar, and present a paper
- ◆ a program through which a faculty member responsible for the interdisciplinary general education course teaches a seminar related to the course for faculty across the campus; participants who complete readings and a paper receive a stipend.

We recognize the wealth of experience, expertise and commitment in our community. To ensure that the best ideas are captured, explored and woven into institutional planning efforts in the most collegial manner, we:

- ◆ intentionally create planning teams and short-term task forces that include both junior and seasoned faculty, whether the topic is developing new programs, considering new graduation requirements or spaces. Seasoned faculty are intended to model for junior faculty what responsible committee leadership means for our community, with standard rules of operation:
  - ◆ there are round tables with no back rows
  - ◆ everyone is allowed to express his/her ideas; everyone is allowed to change his/her mind
  - ◆ formal and regular communications to affected constituencies are required
  - ◆ institutional mission and goals must drive the discussion and planning
- ◆ ensure that institutional mission and goals remain at the center of the planning process
- ◆ provide formal instruction to the planning task force regarding the negotiating and collaborating responsibilities of planning teams.

Further, as each group begins its work, specific instructions on how groups function effectively— negotiate, collaborate, and deal with difference— are provided.

Report from PKAL Session  
at the 2002 Council of Colleges of  
Arts & Sciences (CCAS)

This is not to pretend that the universities have either wholesale solutions to humanity’s ills or a monopoly on skills to address them. Universities are human creations, full of human imperfections, with as much sloth, envy, malice, and neglect as any other community and rather more than their share of pettiness, arrogance, and pride. But it is to assert that the universities, with all their imperfections, represent the crucible within which our future will be formed.

Boiling, steaming, frothing at times, a new amalgam must somehow be created within them if we are to surmount our social problems and rediscover the civic virtues on which our society depends. And as leaders in every field of endeavor are educated within their walls, as knowledge is increased within their laboratories, new works created within their studios, and professional practice developed and refined within their facilities, so the universities provide each new generation of leaders, educated, influenced, and shaped within the culture of the campus.

It is this emerging community— analytical and affirming, critical and creative, inclusive and inquiring, engaged and enabling— that will be the new university.

— Frank H.T. Rhodes, “The New University,” *Challenges Facing Higher Education at the Millennium*. Oryx Press, 1999.

## WHAT WORKS - A REPORT FROM THE COMMUNITY

# DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONAL LEADERS

---

Recognizing that leaders are made, not born, to enhance interest in and capacity for formal leadership within our faculty we have:

- ◆ a **faculty-fellows** program for early career faculty, a formally-mentored opportunity to work in an administrative or departmental office to observe leadership in action
- ◆ a **chair-shadow** program, an opportunity for an individual nominated by his/her department to shadow (ten hours each week for a semester) a chair from another department in his/her division, involved with all discussions from budgets to faculty development; there is a required report and a stipend is paid by the home department
- ◆ an **academic associates** program, an opportunity for six faculty (nominated by their chairs) to meet once a month with the senior academic officer and her staff to discuss budgets, hiring policies, strategic planning, faculty development issues, etc.; the associates attend meetings of the vice presidents, deans and department chairs and of the board of governors

Other deans reported that they have:

- ◆ have a process (Symlog) through which faculty can have their leadership qualities evaluated by their peers
- ◆ have established a three-year leadership institute for women faculty and administrators
- ◆ ask new faculty to develop their own plans to work toward tenure, given departmental and institutional expectations, and assist them in realizing their goals
- ◆ delegate small, but critical projects to emerging leaders, evaluate and support their work
- ◆ make the search for emerging leaders an integral part of the mentoring program that connects first-year and senior faculty. ■

A session sponsored by PKAL at the 2002 annual CCAS meeting focused on the question of the role of senior administrators in identifying faculty poised for leadership at the institutional level.

