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- Formal internal leadership development programs focused on networking and skills development
  - University of Missouri System: LDP/PALI
  - Montana State University: DEAL (Developing Excellence in Academic Leadership)
  - University of Wyoming: UW LEAD
Participated in: Leadership Development Program of the President’s Academic Leadership Institute
University of Missouri System

• Year-long commitment: ~35 participants from four campuses.
• 360° evaluation prior to participation year.
• Run by external consultants (Triangle Associates).
• Began with a four-day retreat (team-building exercises, 360° evaluation review, leadership styles discussion, personal and personnel management, personal reflection and goal-setting).
• Four additional half-day sessions: strategic budgeting, dealing with difficult people, leading change, and decision making.
• Additional ‘alumni’ events and coaching offered.
PALI’s LDP

PROS:
• NETWORKING—built support systems.
• SKILLS DEVELOPMENT.
• Enhanced understanding of leadership styles.
• Team-building within a campus and a university system.
• Campus deans paid travel/lodging; remainder covered centrally.
• VALUE ADDED: Better leaders/managers; less burnout.

CONS:
• EXPENSIVE ($80,000+ for 35 participants)
• Buy-in from the top critical—Manuel Pacheco, then Elson Floyd—then budget cuts.
DEAL: Developing Excellence in Academic Leadership
Montana State University

- Initial brainstorming with HERS participants; personal leadership development piece for Department Heads, Associate Deans, and Center Directors.
- Start-up funds used for jump-start; advisory team created → Triangle Associates consultants brought in to facilitate design.
- Academic year—8 workshops; once afternoon per month commitment; internal and external facilitators.
- Began with Bozeman campus; expanded to other MSU campuses.
- Topics: budgeting, conflict management, time management, leadership styles, negotiation, resource development, communication, effective meetings, leading change...
DEAL

PROS:
• Filled an LD hole in campus programs—SKILLS DEVELOPMENT.
• NETWORKING and team building.
• Central funding raised by advisory team—no cost to deans.
• Relatively inexpensive—$13-15,000 per year for 25 participants.
• VALUE ADDED: Better leaders/managers; less burnout.

CONS:
• No stable funding source—went ‘hat in hand’ year after year.
• No central home: DEAL’s home = L&S Dean’s Office!
• Required staff time, three key leaders’ time invested.
UW LEAD
University of Wyoming

• Requested funding for this program as dean’s start-up.
• Time of great upheaval on campus—BUT deans were interested! Needed a steady supply of leaders...
• Moved forward with planning—five dean advisory team.
• Began in September 2014—32 participants.
• Academic year length—eight workshops; one afternoon per month commitment; internal and external facilitators.
• Topics: leading from strengths, leading change, budgeting, conflict management, negotiation, running effective meetings, resource development, time management...
UW LEAD

PROS:
• SKILLS DEVELOPMENT.
• NETWORKING and team building.
• Paid from start-up initially; no cost to deans.
• Relatively inexpensive—~ $15,000 per year for 32 participants.
• VALUE ADDED: Better leaders/managers; less burnout.

CONS:
• Stable funding source?
• Home needed—now administered from A&S Dean’s Office.
• Requires ‘someone’ or a committed group to carry it across the finish line.
LESSONS LEARNED:

• Internal programs are very valuable.
• Can be done for a relatively small investment with committed deans behind it.
• Support from the top (President, Provost) essential.
• Topics and facilitators should be fluid and reflect campus climate; some external speakers needed.
• Watch for hijacklers!
• Worth your time and effort in skilled AD’s and DH’s.
Work with Associate Dean

• Weekly one-on-one meetings.
• Tasks that build the A.D.’s portfolio for future Dean applications.
• Opportunities for A.D. to lead some discussion at monthly college administrative leadership meetings.
• A.D. attended the CCAS New Deans/Associate Dean Workshop.
• Dean’s Office Team will participate in Gallup StrengthsFinder assessment and training.
Meetings with Junior Faculty

- Informal “check in” with each person about her/his research, teaching, and/or service accomplishments.
- Discussion of an entry in David Perlmutter’s “Know the Vital Players in Your Career” Chronicle of Higher Education series.
- Open discussion of topics of interest to junior faculty.
- Closing “check out” where I list any action items we have generated.
Meetings of “UnBox Committee”

• Committee of people with reputations for creative problem solving and/or innovation idea generation.
• Representatives from several categories: tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track adjunct lecturers, professional staff, administrative staff, and students.
• No tenured faculty members to reduce power differential.
• Primary purpose of the committee is to generate new college initiatives; also discussed professional development and leadership opportunities.
Faculty Fellow Program

Sponsored by the Potter College of Arts & Letters (PCAL) Dean’s Office. Now in second year.

Presentation Overview:

• Contexts for program’s creation
• Program structure and activities
• Benefits and challenges to faculty fellow
• Reflections on post-faculty fellow experiences
• Lessons learned and suggestions
Contexts for Faculty Fellow Program

- Leadership development in higher education
- Institutional (WKU)
- College (PCAL)
Program’s Structure and Activities

- **Structure**: one college faculty member each academic year is reassigned one course per semester to the dean’s office to serve as Faculty Fellow.

- **Activities**: based upon the Faculty Fellow’s interests and skills combined with the college’s needs.
Benefits to the Faculty Fellow

• see broader picture of college-level operation
• understand better how own unit fits into the college and university structure and plan
• meet faculty colleagues, department heads, and upper-level administrators
• begin to understand university budgeting process, including how faculty hiring fits
• collaborate with dean’s office staff on ongoing college projects
• represent college at university-wide meetings and events
Challenges Experienced by the Faculty Fellow

• adapting to administrative schedule while still teaching 2-2 and coordinating departmental internship program
• managing hybrid role for the year
• learning about the pace of change at the college level
• tracking one new project to conclusion beyond term as faculty fellow
• realizing other projects were not going to be able to be completed as planned
Reflections on Post-Faculty Fellow Experiences

• participating in new, university-wide initiative (Faculty Leadership Year)
• acting more assertively as a departmental citizen
• providing context to students and colleagues about college and university operations
Lessons Learned and Suggestions

• review internal communication strategies and preferences; decide how to include FF consistently

• consider physical space available and what option would best serve dean’s office’s needs and FF’s needs

• provide FF with college-specific items

• determine how current FF can best be involved in selection/orientation of new FF

• conclude FF experience formally

• consider how to “count” or credit the FF experience in annual review process
Discussion Questions

- What are the roadblocks to establishing these kinds of leadership programs?
- What types of programs can be created at different levels of investment? (Consider not only financial investment but also institutional investment and organizational investment.)
- How can we most successfully identify faculty members who would be a good fit for leadership cultivation?
- How can we recruit faculty members in a way that encourages them to think of our program as an opportunity instead of as remediation?