

1-1-2000

Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change

Kathleen E. Allen
University of Maryland

Alexander W. Astin
University of California - Los Angeles

Helen S. Astin
University of California - Los Angeles

John Burkhardt
W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Christine M. Cress
Portland State University

See next page for additional authors

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/elp_fac

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Citation Details

Astin, A.W., Astin, H.S., (contributing authors in alphabetical order, Cress, C.M.). (2000). Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change. Ann Arbor, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

This Technical Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Leadership and Policy Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Authors

Kathleen E. Allen, Alexander W. Astin, Helen S. Astin, John Burkhardt, Christine M. Cress, Robert A. Flores, Phillip Jones, Nance Lucas, Bonnie L. Pribush, William C. Reckmeyer, Bettye Parker Smith, and Kathleen A. Zimmerman-Oster

Leadership Reconsidered:

Engaging Higher Education in Social Change



W.K. KELLOGG
FOUNDATION

Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change

Alexander W. Astin and Helen S. Astin

Contributing Authors

Kathleen E. Allen
John C. Burkhardt
Christine M. Cress
Robert A. Flores
Phillip Jones
Nance J. Lucas
Bonnie L. Pribush
William C. Reckmeyer
Bettye Parker Smith
Kathleen A. Zimmerman-Oster

Foreword by William C. Richardson, Ph. D.
President and Chief Executive Officer
W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Table of Contents

Foreword	iv
Acknowledgements	vii
Preface	viii
Higher Education and the Need for Change	1
Principles of Transformative Leadership	8
Students Have the Power to Lead	17
The Leadership Role of Faculty	32
The Leadership Role of Student Affairs Professionals	50
College Presidents as Leaders of Institutional Change	69
We Have the Power and the Opportunity to Transform Our Institutions	87
References	98
About the Authors	101

Foreword

In a society which places such high value on invention and expansion, the idea of a legacy is often dismissed as being outmoded, unenlightened, or possibly even a bit elitist. Yet much of what we have, including our very opportunity to anticipate and shape progress, has been secured for us by individuals and institutions that have preceded us along this great, common way.

Social change results only when people take it upon themselves to get involved and make a difference.

At the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (WKKF), we are very conscious of the legacy provided by our founder, an innovative businessman and philanthropist, and of the stewardship that has been provided for his Foundation since it was created in 1930. W.K. Kellogg said, seven decades ago, “I will invest my money in people,” and that commitment has inspired his successors through the years to build the capacity of communities and institutions through investments in leadership. The fundamental belief that social change results only when people take it on themselves to get involved and make a difference now characterizes the work of the Kellogg Foundation throughout the world:

Programming activities at the W.K. Kellogg Foundation center around the common vision of a world in which each person has a sense of worth; accepts responsibility for self, family, community, and societal well-being; and has the capacity to be productive, and to help create nurturing families, responsible institutions, and healthy communities.

We believe that effective leadership is an essential ingredient of positive social change. No society can continue to evolve without it, no family or neighborhood holds together in its absence, and no institution prospers where it is unavailable.

This book examines the role of higher education in creating leaders for a diverse and democratic society. It is the work of a team of leadership scholars and educators, under the direction of Alexander and Helen Astin, who are committed to the belief that leadership holds the key to transforming our institutions, our students, and our society to reflect the values captured in the WKKF vision statement: opportunity, responsibility, equity, access, participation, and justice.

Foundation grantees, staff, and trustees have had an unusual opportunity to examine leadership in many conditions and contexts. In recent years we have been able to see the power of leaders and leadership to transform institutions and confront the challenges faced by communities and organizations around the world. So closely identified with other expressions of the human spirit – hope, commitment, energy, and passion – leadership has often escaped precise definition. And yet, we respect its power to transform and are quickly able to sense its absence. We have, in short, come to believe in leadership because of the impact it can have on people and events. And we believe that the capacity to lead is rooted in virtually any individual and in every community.

We have learned other things about leadership as well. As a social “construct” which derives from observations made about specific interactions within a society, it is defined differently in each social circumstance. Leadership is thus a property of culture and reflects the values – both stated and operating – of a specific society.

The process of leadership can thus serve as a lens through which any social situation can be observed. Leadership – especially the ways in which leaders are chosen, the expectations that are placed on them, and how they manifest their authority – can provide remarkable insights into any community or group. It can tell us about how the group identifies itself, who and what matters to the group, how things are done, and what stories will be told about outcomes. Within the last few years, we have come to appreciate that the study of leadership within a given social context can open up new possibilities for transformation and change. In this way, leadership can be more an active tool than a passive lens, allowing individuals, communities, institutions, and societies to narrow the gap between what they value and what their actions express, recognizing that

*The capacity
to lead is rooted
in virtually any
individual and in
every community.*

Students will implicitly generate their notions and conceptions of leadership from what is taught intentionally and unintentionally across the educational experience.

leadership is an integral part of the drama that plays out between the two. Strengthening higher education institutions and the effectiveness of their individual leaders is of great importance to the work of the Foundation, but it is not our central concern. Kellogg support for institutions of higher education is premised on their role in serving communities and society at large, not merely on their preservation and enrichment as institutions. While institutional pressures and practices are important, it is the role that higher education might play in the greater social environment that inspires our support.

While there have been many calls in recent years for American higher education to reform itself by becoming more “efficient,” others have suggested that educational reforms should be seen as part of a fundamental transformation of the values and vision of American society as a whole. This book is based in part on the premise that the juxtaposition of these two perspectives poses one compelling question: will the transformation of our society occur merely as an aggregation of “conditions” – global economic trends, markets, and politics – or will it instead represent an expression of our highest values?

The transformation we seek does not have to rely solely on institutional-level commitments. This book argues that each faculty member, administrator, and staff member is modeling some form of leadership and that students will implicitly generate their notions and conceptions of leadership from interactions inside the classroom and in the residence hall, through campus work and participation in student activities, and through what is taught intentionally and unintentionally across the educational experience. There are opportunities to make a difference that are within the reach of every one of us engaged in the process of higher education.

Of all the questions about the future of leadership that we can raise for ourselves, we can be certain in our answer to only one: “Who will lead us?” The answer, of course, is that we will be led by those we have taught, and they will lead us as we have shown them they should.

William C. Richardson, Ph. D.
President and Chief Executive Officer
W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for their encouragement and financial support in undertaking this project and preparing this monograph. Dr. Betty Overton-Adkins, director of Higher Education programming, and Dr. Richard Foster, vice president for programs, were most supportive of this project and we appreciate their encouragement.

Mary Lynn Falbe of the Foundation was of great assistance in making sure that we had everything we needed while we were meeting together at various sites around the country. We are also very appreciative of Jennifer Lindholm, a doctoral student at UCLA, for being our “super assistant” in keeping wonderful minutes during our last meeting at UCLA and for being so generous with her time, good humor, and skill in the production of this manuscript.

Preface

This book was prepared over a period of two years. Most of us have worked together previously as members of an advisory committee for “College Age Youth,” a W.K. Kellogg Foundation initiative to develop leadership abilities in college undergraduates at 31 institutions. That program demonstrated that colleges and universities can provide highly effective environments for the development of future leaders (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999).

The idea of writing a book that could address the application of transformative leadership to higher education was first conceived in November 1997. However, work on the book did not begin until the Spring of 1998. For this project, we chose to address four major constituent groups that form a major part of what we have come to call the academic community: students, faculty, student affairs professionals, and the CEO. The volume begins with a foreword by William Richardson, president and CEO of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. He provides an overview of the Foundation’s perspectives, its hopes for this project, and its aspirations for making a difference in higher education and the larger society through its funding decisions.

In the introductory chapter, we include a brief commentary explaining why we believe there is a need for rethinking leadership practices in higher education. Chapter 2 follows with a description of the principles of transformative leadership. In developing these principles, we have drawn heavily on *A Social Change Model of Leadership Development* (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). In many respects, the principles outlined in Chapter 2 represent an extension and elaboration of the concepts and principles presented in that earlier work. Each of the next four chapters (3-6) is specifically written for a particular constituent group: students (3), faculty (4), student affairs professionals (5), and presidents and other administrators (6). These chapters analyze the roles and expectations for each group and suggest how members of that particular group

can begin to practice the principles of transformative leadership both individually and collectively. Given the diverse roles and responsibilities of each of these four constituencies, the approach to applying these principles varies somewhat from chapter to chapter. Nevertheless, inasmuch as transformative leadership, at its very core, is based on human interactions, we encourage you to examine each constituent-group chapter regardless of how you see your particular campus “role.” As you read, begin to think of ways in which you can work in conjunction with other constituent groups and individuals on campus in applying the principles we describe in Chapter 2.

The book concludes with a chapter entitled, “We Have the Power and Opportunity to Transform Our Institutions.” Our intent in writing this chapter is to encourage individual members of the academic community to develop specific plans of action for exercising transformative leadership on the campus. Toward this end, we identify some of the personal and institutional resources that can be used to capitalize on the numerous opportunities that our campuses offer for us to engage in this transformation process. We also offer suggestions for creating an institutional climate that facilitates and reinforces individual and collective efforts to practice transformative leadership.

The ideas presented here should be seen as a starting point rather than as a prescription or solution for transforming our institutions. As such, we believe that the usefulness of the leadership principles in facilitating change will be maximized if you first read about and discuss them with members of your peer group and the larger academic community. For example, we can imagine small groups getting together, reading the material, discussing the ideas, and making a collective decision to act on those ideas. By modeling the Principles of Transformative Leadership (Chapter 2), you can begin the process of transformative change. In many ways what we propose is difficult and challenging work, but it is the kind of work that can benefit you; your institution; and ultimately, our society.

Alexander W. Astin
Helen S. Astin

January 2000

Chapter 1

Higher Education and the Need for Change

May you live in interesting times...

—CHINESE PROVERB

This old Chinese proverb seems to have been written for today. Turbulence, conflict, change, surprise, challenge, and possibility are all words that describe today's world and that evoke myriad emotions ranging from fear and anxiety to excitement, enthusiasm, and hope. Clearly, the problems and challenges that we face today – global warming, religious and ethnic conflict, the maldistribution of wealth and opportunity, the decline of citizen interest and engagement in the political process, the increasing ineffectiveness of government, and the shift from an industrial to a knowledge-based society and from a national to a global economy – call for adaptive, creative solutions that will require a new kind of leadership (Heifetz, 1994; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1999). To cope effectively and creatively with these emerging national and world trends, future leaders will not only need to possess new knowledge and skills, but will also be called upon to display a high level of emotional and spiritual wisdom and maturity.

Higher education plays a major part in shaping the quality of leadership in modern American society. Our colleges and universities not only educate each new generation of leaders in government, business, science, law, medicine, the clergy, and other advanced professions, but are also responsible for setting the curriculum standards and training the personnel who will educate the entire citizenry at the precollegiate level. College and university faculty also exert important influences on the leadership process through their research and scholarship, which seeks both to clarify the meaning of leadership and to identify the most effective approaches to leadership and leadership education.

To cope effectively and creatively with these emerging national and world trends, future leaders will not only need to possess new knowledge and skills, but will also be called upon to display a high level of emotional and spiritual wisdom and maturity.

Even though the United States is generally regarded as having the finest postsecondary education system in the world, there is mounting evidence that the quality of leadership in this country has been eroding in recent years. The list of problems is a long one: shaky race relations, growing economic disparities and inequities, excessive materialism, decaying inner cities, a deteriorating infrastructure, a weakening public school system, an irresponsible mass media, declining civic engagement, and the increasing ineffectiveness of government, to name just a few. In a democracy, of course, citizen disengagement from politics and governmental ineffectiveness not only go hand in hand, but also cripple our capacity to deal constructively with most of the other problems.

The problems that plague American society are, in many respects, problems of leadership. By “leadership” we mean not only what elected and appointed public officials do, but also the critically important civic work performed by those individual citizens who are actively engaged in making a positive difference in the society. A leader, in other words, can be anyone – regardless of formal position – who serves as an effective social change agent. In this sense, every faculty and staff member, not to mention every student, is a potential leader.

A major problem with contemporary civic life in America is that too few of our citizens are actively engaged in efforts to effect positive social change. Viewed in this context, an important “leadership development” challenge for higher education is to *empower* students, by helping them develop those special talents and attitudes that will enable them to become effective social change agents.

This is both an individual and an institutional challenge. Students will find it difficult to lead until they have experienced effective leadership as part of their education. They are not likely to commit to making changes in society unless the institutions in which they have been trained display a similar commitment. If the next generation of citizen leaders is to be engaged and committed to leading for the common good, then the institutions which nurture them must be engaged in the work of the society and the community, modeling effective leadership and problem solving skills, demonstrating how to accomplish change for the common good. This requires institutions of higher education to set

their own house in order, if they expect to produce students who will improve society.

Colleges and universities provide rich opportunities for recruiting and developing leaders through the curriculum and co-curriculum. Co-curricular experiences not only support and augment the students' formal classroom and curricular experience, but can also create powerful learning opportunities for leadership development through collaborative group projects that serve the institution or the community (Burkhardt & Zimmerman-Oster, 1999). These projects can be implemented through service learning, residential living, community work, and student organizations.

If higher education is indeed such a central player in shaping the quality of leadership in America, then one might reasonably ask, where have we gone wrong? The short answer to this question is that the concept of leadership and the educational goals of leadership development have been given very little attention by most of our institutions of higher learning. In the classroom, faculty continue to emphasize the acquisition of knowledge in the traditional disciplinary fields and the development of writing, quantitative, and critical thinking skills, giving relatively little attention to the development of those personal qualities that are most likely to be crucial to effective leadership: self-understanding, listening skills, empathy, honesty, integrity, and the ability to work collaboratively.

Most of these qualities exemplify aspects of what Daniel Goleman (1997) would call "emotional intelligence." One seldom hears mention of these qualities or of "leadership" or "leadership skills" in faculty discussions of curricular reform, even though goals such as "producing future leaders" are often found in the catalogues and mission statements of colleges and universities. And while there have been some very promising developments in the co-curricular area – for example, an increased emphasis on programs for student leadership development that can have lasting impacts on students, institutions, and communities (Astin & Cress, 1998; Thoms & Blasko, 1998) – the general education programs in most institutions are still notably lacking in requirements or other content that focuses either directly or indirectly on leadership. And despite the mounting evidence that student engagement in community

The educational goal of leadership development has been given little attention in higher education.

service substantially enhances the development of leadership skills (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Eyler & Giles, 1999), service learning remains an essentially marginal activity on most campuses. Even in our faculty hiring and review practices, leadership, collegueship, and service to the institution and to the community continue to receive little, if any, weight.

If we want our students to acquire the qualities of effective leaders, then we have to model these same qualities.

On a more practical level, our students are probably going to be influenced at least as much by what we academics *do* as by what we *say* in our classroom lectures and advising sessions. In other words, we are implicitly modeling certain leadership values in the way we conduct ourselves professionally: how we govern ourselves, how we deal with each other as professional colleagues, and how we run our institutions. If we want our students to acquire the qualities of effective leaders, then we have to model these same qualities, not only in our individual professional conduct, but also in our curriculum, our pedagogy, our institutional policies, and our preferred modes of governance.

What we are really suggesting here is that a genuine *commitment* on the part of our higher education system to renewing and strengthening the quality of leadership in American society will require that we be willing to embrace significant changes in our curricula, teaching practices, reward system, and governance process and, most importantly, in our institutional practices, values, and beliefs. Only then can we expect that our students will be capable of and committed to improving society when they leave our campuses.

Leadership Reconsidered

Practically all of the modern authorities on leadership, regardless of whether they focus on the corporate world or the nonprofit sector, now advocate a *collaborative* approach to leadership, as opposed to one based on power and authority (Bennis, 1989; Heifetz, 1994). And while the conceptual model presented in the next chapter likewise proposes that *collaboration* should be a fundamental ingredient in any effective leadership process, the traditional approach to academic governance taken by most colleges and universities makes it very difficult to model *collaboration*.

Most institutions of higher learning in the United States are organized and governed according to two seemingly contradictory sets of practices. On the one hand, what we have come to call “the administration” in many respects resembles the traditional industrial or military model of leadership, with chain of command structures comprising leadership positions that are hierarchically arranged. Internally, there is a hierarchical academic command structure headed by the president, followed by vice presidents, deans, and department chairs. Although the job titles may be different, a similar hierarchical structure is usually found in the nonacademic chains of command (student affairs, fiscal affairs, development, administrative services, etc.). As would be expected, those who find themselves at the bottom rungs of these nonacademic hierarchies – clerical employees or physical plant maintenance workers, for example – have relatively little power or autonomy and generally work under the direction of their immediate superiors. However, when we get to the “bottom” rung in the professional hierarchy, we find something very different: individual faculty members, who on paper appear to fall “under” chairs, actually enjoy a great deal of autonomy in their work and seldom “take orders” from anyone (especially chairs!). Although faculty also participate in the formal governance process by means of collegial structures such as committees and the academic senate, their primary work of teaching and research – the work that gains them tenure and professional status – is individualistic in nature. Faculty “leaders,” in turn, are often those who have gained the most visibility and status through their scholarship.

In short, in American higher education we typically find two approaches to leadership: a hierarchical model where authority and power is assumed to be proportional to one’s position in the administrative pecking order, and an individualistic model where “leaders” among the faculty tend to be those who have gained the most professional status and recognition. We could also include here as a third model the “collegial” approach exemplified by the faculty committee structure, but such committees are typically advisory in nature and seldom given any real leadership responsibility for policy setting or decision making. Indeed, the fact that committees are generally ineffective and that their reports so often gather dust on library shelves may be one reason why faculty generally dislike their “administrative” work (Astin, Astin, & Associates, 1999). In other words, while committees and task forces offer the possibility of collegial or collaborative leadership (see Chapter 6), in practice these leadership opportunities are seldom realized.

Higher education has the potential to produce future generations of transformative leaders who can devise more effective solutions to some of our most pressing social problems.

A similar combination of hierarchical structure and individualism describes the “leadership climate” for college students. Student government and most other student groups are typically organized hierarchically, with a president, vice president, treasurer, and so forth. Under this arrangement, “leaders” are defined as those holding certain hierarchically organized positions, an approach that implicitly disempowers most of the other students. At the same time, students tend to emulate the faculty’s individualistic approach by identifying most other “leaders” as those students who either have formal leadership positions or have excelled individually in competitive sports or, less frequently, academics.

The tradition of individualism that characterizes the faculties of most American colleges and universities is one reason why research tends to be valued more than teaching: the quantity and quality of an individual professor’s performance is easier to rate and rank when it comes to scholarship, given that writing is public and teaching and advising is generally very private (another manifestation of individualism). Moreover, individualism also makes *collaboration* difficult because it tends to breed competitiveness. This competitiveness is particularly intense at the departmental level, where different departments compete with each other for funding and faculty positions, and at the institutional level, where different institutions compete with each other for the brightest students, top faculty, and funding.

While real *collaboration* would ordinarily be very difficult to achieve in an environment that places such a high value on hierarchy and individualism, it is our view that a collaborative approach to leadership in academe – an approach that operates primarily through committees, task forces, and similar group structures – is still possible, *depending* on the particular values and beliefs that members of the academic community bring to their group work. These values are spelled out in detail in the next chapter.

In short, if higher education must assume some of the responsibility for the poor quality of leadership that currently characterizes much of American society, it also has the potential to produce future generations of transformative leaders who will be able to devise more effective solutions to some of our most pressing social problems. The real question is

how members of the academic community can collectively work together to transform themselves and their institutions with the aim of giving leadership development the priority it deserves. To address this challenge, we present in the next chapter a suggested set of core leadership principles and values that faculty, students, administrators, and staff may wish to utilize as they consider how to go about the very critical and difficult work of institutional transformation.

Chapter 2

Principles of Transformative Leadership

In this chapter we set forth our conception of the values and principles that we believe to be critical to transformative leadership. We begin by first providing a definition of leadership, and then move to a consideration of the group and individual principles underlying effective leadership. Next we discuss how these individual and group principles can be integrated in the actual practice of leadership. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implicit and explicit values that guide the implementation of these principles.

What is Leadership?

*Leadership is a
purposive process
which is inherently
value-based.*

We believe that leadership is a process that is ultimately concerned with fostering change. In contrast to the notion of “management,” which suggests preservation or maintenance, “leadership” implies a process where there is movement – from wherever we are now to some future place or condition that is different. Leadership also implies intentionality, in the sense that the implied change is not random – “change for change’s sake” – but is rather directed toward some future end or condition which is desired or valued. Accordingly, leadership is a purposive process which is inherently value-based.

Consistent with the notion that leadership is concerned with change, we view the “leader” basically as a change agent, i.e., “one who fosters change.” Leaders, then, are not necessarily those who merely hold formal “leadership” positions; on the contrary, all people are potential leaders. Furthermore, since the concepts of “leadership” and “leader” imply that there are other people involved, leadership is, by definition, a collective or group process.

In short, our conception of leadership comprises the following basic assumptions:

- Leadership is concerned with fostering change.
- Leadership is inherently value-based.
- All people are potential leaders.
- Leadership is a group process.

These assumptions, in turn, suggest a number of critical questions that must be addressed in any treatise on leadership effectiveness:

- What values should guide the leadership process?
- Toward what end(s) is the leadership effort directed?
- How do individuals initiate change efforts?
- How are leadership groups formed?
- How should leadership groups function?
- What alternatives to the traditional “leader-follower” model are most likely to be effective?
- What are the most effective means of preparing young people for this kind of leadership?

Since this book is specifically about leadership development within higher education in the United States, our basic definitions and assumptions can be further refined to reflect this particular focus:

- The basic purposes of leadership development within the American higher education system are: (a) to enable and encourage faculty, students, administrators, and other staff to change and transform institutions so that they can more effectively enhance student learning and development, generate new knowledge, and serve the community, and (b) to empower students to become agents of positive social change in the larger society.
- While some members of the higher education community maintain that higher education should ideally be “value free,” we believe that any form of education, including leadership education, is inherently value-laden. Value considerations thus underlie virtually every

educational decision, including criteria for admissions, course requirements, pedagogical techniques, assessment procedures, resource allocation and governance procedures, and hiring and personnel policies. The real issue is *which* values should govern these decisions.

- Even though there are many opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to serve in formal leadership positions, our conception of leadership argues that *every* member of the academic community is a potential leader (i.e., change agent). The challenge for leadership development in higher education is thus to maximize the number of faculty, students, administrators, and staff who become committed and effective agents of positive social change.
- Higher education offers many opportunities for the formation of leadership groups involving faculty, students, and staff through its schools, colleges, departments, committees, and various administrative service units. Leadership-development programs and experiences for students can capitalize on the power of the student peer group through the classroom, residential living, and various co-curricular activities.

Any form of education, including leadership development, is inherently value-laden.

What is Effective Leadership?

At the outset we want to emphasize that the conception of effective leadership presented here is only one of many possible approaches. We have arrived at these principles on the basis of: (a) our understanding of the best scholarly work in the field; (b) our personal experience with leadership and leadership-development activities in the field of higher education; and (c) our group discussions and debates. While our conception of effective leadership was developed primarily to serve as a unifying framework for the writing of the various topical chapters (i.e., Chapters 3-6), it should by no means be viewed as some sort of final theory of effective leadership or leadership development. Rather, we regard it as a working framework that is subject to regular revision and refinement based on the experience of those who use it. Faculty, administrators, student affairs practitioners, and students may well find certain elements in the framework to be more applicable or relevant than others. Moreover, different types of institutions may need to make some modifications in accordance with their institutional missions.

The Values of Leadership

In the broadest sense, we see the purposes of leadership as encompassing the following values:

- To create a supportive environment where people can grow, thrive, and live in peace with one another;
- To promote harmony with nature and thereby provide sustainability for future generations; and
- To create communities of reciprocal care and shared responsibility where every person matters and each person's welfare and dignity is respected and supported.

Leadership values are reflected, first and foremost, in the *ends* toward which any leadership effort is directed: What are we trying to change and why? What is the nature and scope of the intended change, and who will benefit? We believe that the value ends of leadership should be to enhance equity, social justice, and the quality of life; to expand access and opportunity; to encourage respect for difference and diversity; to strengthen democracy, civic life, and civic responsibility; and to promote cultural enrichment, creative expression, intellectual honesty, the advancement of knowledge, and personal freedom coupled with social responsibility.

Values also underlie the leadership *process*: Given our view that leadership is a group process whereby individuals work together in order to foster change and transformation, effective leadership necessarily requires: (a) that the group function according to certain principles and values, and (b) that individual members of the group exemplify certain qualities and values that contribute to the effective functioning of the group. These group and individual qualities are summarized below:

Group Qualities

- *Collaboration*. This is the cornerstone of an effective group leadership process. While groups can also function in a “leader-follower” or “command and control” mode, we believe that *collaboration* is a more effective approach because it empowers each individual, engenders trust, and capitalizes on the diverse talents of the group members.

- *Shared purpose.* This requirement addresses the fundamental goal of the group effort: What are the desired changes or transformation toward which the leadership effort is directed? What needs to be changed and why? The group's purpose thus reflects the shared aims and values of the group members. In many respects reaching agreement on a common purpose can be the most difficult challenge for any leadership group, and in the early stages of group functioning a good deal of time and effort may be consumed in pursuit of this goal.
- *Disagreement with respect.* This principle recognizes that differences in viewpoint among individual group members are both inevitable and desirable, but that such differences must be engaged civilly in an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust.
- *Division of labor.* Any collaborative effort requires that each member of the group make a significant contribution to the overall effort, and that all members be clear not only about their individual responsibilities but also about the responsibilities and contributions of the other individual members.
- *A learning environment.* The most effective group leadership effort is the one that can serve as a collaborative learning environment for its members. Members come to see the group as a place where they can not only learn about each other, themselves, and the leadership effort, but also acquire the shared knowledge, interpersonal competencies, and technical skills that the group will require to function effectively.

Individual Qualities

- *Self-knowledge.* This quality means being aware of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate one to seek change and transformation. It also implies an awareness of the particular talents and strengths, together with the personal limitations, that one brings to the leadership effort.
- *Authenticity/integrity.* This quality requires that one's actions be consistent with one's most deeply felt values and beliefs. It is perhaps the most critical factor in building trust within the leadership group.

- *Commitment.* This quality implies passion, intensity, and persistence. It supplies the psychic and physical energy that motivates the individual to serve, that drives the collective effort, and that sustains that effort during difficult times.
- *Empathy/understanding of others.* The capacity to “put yourself in the other person’s place” is critical to effective *collaboration*, building trust and resolving differences in viewpoint. It also requires the cultivation and use of what is probably our most neglected communication skill: *listening*.
- *Competence.* In the context of any group leadership activity, *competence* refers to the knowledge, skill, and technical expertise required for successful completion of the transformation effort.

Individual and group qualities of transformative leadership are mutually reinforcing.

Integrating Individual and Group Qualities

An important aspect of the ten individual and group qualities described above is that they are interactive and, therefore, mutually reinforcing. Indeed, the quality of any group leadership activity will be enhanced if every member understands that *each of the ten qualities reinforces every other quality*. In this section we discuss how and why these interactions contribute to the overall leadership effort. Since there are many different two-way interactions that are possible (45, in fact), we will select only some of the more critical ones for discussion.

Interactions Among Group Qualities

Collaboration, which means working together in a common change effort, clearly requires that the members of the leadership group agree on a *shared purpose*. And genuine collaboration is obviously most likely to occur if there is a clear-cut *division of labor* involving every member of the group. (By the same token, it will be easier to devise a meaningful division of labor if there is a clearly defined purpose and a collaborative spirit within the group.) *Disagreement with respect* is also most likely to be encouraged in a collaborative framework and when a common purpose has been identified. It should also be noted here that disagreement (controversy, conflict, confrontation) can often lead to creative new solutions to problems, particularly if it occurs in an atmosphere of respect,

collaboration, and shared purpose. Finally, the capacity of the group to arrive at a common purpose and to effect a meaningful division of labor will be greatly strengthened if the group comes to see itself as a collaborative *learning environment*.

Individual and Group Qualities of Transformative Leadership

Individual	Group
Self-knowledge	Collaboration
Authenticity	Shared purpose
Empathy	Division of labor
Commitment	Disagreement with respect
Competence	Learning environment

Interactions Among Individual Qualities

Self-knowledge obviously enhances *authenticity*, since it is difficult to be honest and open with others – to be true to your most deeply felt beliefs and values – if you are not clear about what these beliefs and values really are. *Empathy* is similarly enhanced by self-knowledge, since understanding of others ordinarily requires some understanding of oneself. At the same time, neither self-knowledge, authenticity, empathy, nor competence is of much value without *commitment*, the quality that motivates the individual and supplies the energy and passion to sustain the collective effort. Finally, *competence* reinforces commitment, since it is easier to commit to a cause if you also feel that you can make a real contribution.

Individual Qualities Reinforce Group Qualities

More specifically: the *collaborative* group leadership process is facilitated when the individual participants are *self-aware*, *competent*, *empathic*, and *committed*, and behave *authentically*, i.e., in ways that are congruent with their personal values. *Self-knowledge* (or *self-awareness*), of course, is a critical ingredient in forging a *shared purpose* for the leadership group: What, then, are our shared values and purposes? And what *competencies* do we possess that might be brought to bear on the transformation effort? Similarly, the *division of labor* that is so basic to true collaboration

requires *self-knowledge* – an understanding of one’s special competencies and limitations. It is also much easier to devise a meaningful division of labor when the individual group members possess the relevant *competencies* needed for the transformation effort. Likewise, the kind of *respectful disagreement* that can often lead to innovative solutions requires both *authenticity/integrity* – that individuals be willing to share their views with others even when there is a good chance that others may hold contrary views – and *commitment*, a willingness to “stick to it” in the face of disagreement and controversy. *Empathy/understanding* of others also makes it much easier to disagree with others respectfully. Finally, the capacity of the group to serve as a *learning environment* is greatly enhanced when the individual members are *self-aware*, *committed*, and willing to be *authentic* with each other.

Group Qualities Reinforce Individual Qualities

More specifically: the individual’s experience with the leadership group is most likely to enhance *self-awareness*, *commitment*, *empathy*, and *authenticity* when the group operates *collaboratively* with a *common purpose* and clear *division of labor* and when it treats dissenting points of view respectfully. For example, an individual’s self-awareness and *competence* are more likely to be enhanced when critical feedback from the group is presented with respect and *civility*. It is also much easier for an individual to “hear” critical commentary and to develop empathic skills when *disagreements* are aired in a *collaborative* and *respectful* (rather than competitive or hierarchical) context. Similarly, when the individual is a member of a collaborative group that has identified a *shared purpose*, it is much easier (“safer”) to behave with authenticity. *Collaboration* with a *shared purpose* also enhances the individual’s commitment because it serves as a reinforcer: like-minded people working together toward a common goal strengthen each other’s individual commitment toward that goal. Finally, the creation of a *collaborative learning environment*, where individuals can acquire needed knowledge and skills and learn about themselves and other group members, facilitates the development of *competence*, *self-knowledge*, and *empathy*.

Values in Action: The Goals and Aims of Transformative Leadership

The final step is to link the ten group and individual qualities of effective leadership to the value-based goals of the leadership effort: Is the effort succeeding? Are the observed changes consistent with the group's shared values? Is the institution (or system) becoming more equitable, more just, and more democratic? Are we strengthening our capacity to promote creativity, *collaboration*, citizenship, service to others, cultural enrichment, intellectual honesty and *integrity*, the advancement of knowledge, *empathy* and respect for diversity and difference, personal freedom, and social responsibility? Are we becoming more effective in promoting these same qualities in our faculty, staff, and students?

Our view of effective leadership assumes that these or similar values would be embodied in the leadership group's *shared purpose*. Further, the group's capacity to realize such values through its efforts at transformation will depend in part on its individual members' levels of *self-knowledge* and *competence* and on their ability to function *collaboratively*, with *authenticity* and *empathy*, and to express *disagreement*, criticism, and controversy with *respect*. Conversely, the leadership group will find it very difficult to fulfill such value aims if it functions competitively, if it cannot decide on a *shared purpose*, if it fails to effect a meaningful *division of labor*, or if its members disagree with each other disrespectfully. At the same time, if the group enjoys some initial success in its transformation effort (i.e., if positive change occurs), *collaboration*, *commitment*, and *shared purpose* are reinforced.

In the next four chapters we discuss the implications of these leadership principles for students (Chapter 3), faculty (Chapter 4), student affairs professionals (Chapter 5), and college presidents (Chapter 6).

Chapter 3

Students Have the Power to Lead

We begin our in-depth discussion of the leadership principles from a student perspective, in part because students are ultimately higher education's most critical stakeholders, and in part because leadership education is still an emerging rather than an established component of the undergraduate experience.

Many students may wonder why this focus on leadership should concern them at all. Those of a cynical bent could readily question the legitimacy of leadership as a suitable academic topic, pointing out that many of today's most visible leaders are hardly the kinds of people whose behavior or accomplishments inspire respect. Those of a practical bent might argue that leadership is a quality that is useful in only a few fields and that becomes important only after many years in the workforce, reminding us that employers aren't beating down their doors with attractive job offers for "leaders." Those of an optimistic bent would probably also recognize the value of leadership in the long term, but assume that it takes many years of experience to develop the expertise to become a bona fide leader.

Leadership development should be a critical part of the college experience.

Why is Leadership Development Important for Students?

Our belief that producing more effective leaders is essential to building a better society and better world suggests that leadership development should be a critical part of the college experience. While this kind of argument may appeal to that relatively small minority of students who already see themselves as future leaders in fields such as public service, business, or the military, others might legitimately wonder: what relevance does leadership development have for us? Our answer to this

question is that leadership development is important and useful because it can enrich the undergraduate experience, and because it can empower students and give them a greater sense of control over their lives.

Leadership development is important and useful because it can enrich the undergraduate experience, empower students, and give them a greater sense of control over their lives.

Recent national surveys of college freshmen (Sax, Astin, Korn, & Mahoney, 2000) suggest that the typical student entering college shows a good deal of “readiness” to embrace many of the leadership principles discussed in Chapter 2. Thus, while a little over half (54 percent) of the freshmen entering college in the fall of 1999 rate themselves above average in competitiveness, more than two-thirds (70 percent) rate themselves above average in *cooperativeness*. At the same time, better than half of the freshmen rate themselves above average in three other important qualities: *self-understanding* (55 percent), *understanding of others* (63 percent), and *leadership ability* (57 percent). Moreover, fully three-fourths of the students (75 percent) performed volunteer work during their last year in secondary school, whereas only one student in three (32 percent) believes that “realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in our society.”

Students’ Roles and Responsibilities

Most full-time college students spend a significant amount of their time attending classes and carrying out class assignments. Depending on other factors in their lives – marital status, age, place of residence, and financial resources – students may also spend substantial amounts of time working, socializing, performing volunteer work, engaging in team sports, or participating in various types of student organizations. What students often fail to realize is that *such activities almost always provide an opportunity to exercise leadership and to develop leadership skills*.

The key to understanding this assertion is to recognize that these activities inevitably involve *other people*, whether they be other students, faculty or staff, members of the community, or coworkers. That is, since we have conceived of leadership as a group process which is predicated on group values such as *collaboration* and *shared purpose*, any sustained activity that regularly brings the student into contact with other people represents a potential opportunity to apply the leadership principles and

to develop leadership skills. And even if students are not particularly interested in developing leadership skills, virtually any of these group activities can be viewed as an opportunity either to *provide service to others*, to *enrich their group experience*, or to *initiate some desired change*. Regardless of how students might be motivated – to develop leadership skills, to serve others, to bring about some desired change, or simply to have a more interesting group experience – we believe that the principles of transformative leadership outlined in Chapter 2 can be useful in helping them realize their goal. In the sections that follow, we will attempt to provide some examples of how these principles can be applied to the student’s academic and co-curricular life.

The Academic Experience

While there are several ways in which the academic experience affords opportunities for students to interact with each other, with faculty, and even with members of the community (e.g., through service-learning courses), surely the most frequent opportunities are provided in the classroom. Indeed, for many adult, commuter, and part-time students, the classroom may provide the *only* opportunity for meaningful interaction with other students.

Traditionally, the students’ classroom role has been narrowly viewed in terms of the “learner,” where students sit, listen, and passively receive information and instruction from a faculty member. However, in recent years this traditional conception of the students’ role has been undergoing a transformation toward a new paradigm that embraces both students and faculty as teachers and learners. This shift has the potential to impact profoundly the students’ experience inside the classroom. Students are expected to engage each other and their professors actively in a dynamic learning environment where discovery, the creation of meaning from new knowledge, and cooperative learning are valued. When students see themselves, or are viewed by others, as both learners and teachers, they take more responsibility for their own learning and help create more favorable learning environments for themselves and others. Moreover, an increasing amount of classroom work is being done in group- or team-based settings where group members collectively define objectives and processes for class projects and tasks. Within these

When students see themselves as both learners and teachers, they take more responsibility for their own learning and help create more favorable learning environments for each other.

team settings, students are expected to communicate effectively with each other, to work from a common agenda, to value diversity within the group, and to work collaboratively.

In short, the newly emerging emphasis on “active” versus passive learning provides opportunities to develop the individual qualities of *competence* and *commitment*. Moreover, the move from individualistic or competitive learning to group learning facilitates the development of group qualities such as *collaboration* and *shared purpose* and the ability to air differences in an atmosphere of *respect*.

With the possible exception of some very large lecture classes, most college classes provide a variety of opportunities to apply or try out some of the leadership principles outlined in the previous chapter (even in large lecture classes, the discussion groups – usually led by teaching assistants – can provide similar opportunities). In particular, the classroom can be a proving ground for cultivating the qualities of *authenticity*, *empathy*, *self-knowledge*, and *disagreement with respect*. Students who are interested in using the classroom in this manner might want to ask themselves the following types of illustrative questions:

- *Empathy*

Do I get impatient with students who are slow to learn?

Do I get irritated when the professor takes class time to go over material with the slower learners?

Do I take time to listen carefully to those whose mastery of English is limited?

- *Self-knowledge*

During class, how *aware* am I of my emotional responses to what’s going on in the class (Am I feeling bored, impatient, confused, inadequate, superior, etc.)?

When it comes to the subject matter, am I honest with myself about what I *don’t* know or am confused about?

- *Authenticity*

When I speak in class, do I always say what I *really* believe?

Am I willing to admit when I don't know something, or don't understand?

- *Disagreement with respect*

When I express a difference of opinion with other students, do I try to make them look bad? Or, do I assert my position without putting down them or their ideas?

Some of the richest opportunities for developing leadership qualities are provided by *group* activities that occur in connection with some college courses. Such opportunities may arise as part of group class projects, collaborative learning, service learning, or out-of-class study groups (which can sometimes be carried out electronically). Since the leadership-development possibilities provided by these group activities are in many respects similar to the possibilities inherent in co-curricular activities, let's now move to a consideration of the co-curriculum.

The Co-Curricular Experience

Since many students spend a considerable amount of time in living quarters where there are other students – residence halls, fraternity or sorority houses, and various types of off-campus housing – these diverse settings ordinarily offer many opportunities to develop friendships, negotiate conflicts, and participate in group projects or other kinds of living/learning activities. An even wider range of opportunities to engage in collaborative work is available in student activities and organizations: athletics, student government, ethnic student organizations, subject matter clubs, volunteer activities, and so on. Virtually all such activities are rich with possibilities for developing leadership skills. Take, for example, community service. Approximately two-thirds of the college student population is now engaged in community service activities (Levine & Cureton, 1998). Among other things, this kind of involvement can enable students to: (1) reach a greater depth of understanding of course concepts through practical application (i.e., service learning), (2) gain experience that is directly applicable to employment after college,

(3) achieve a greater awareness of community needs and societal issues, and (4) create more meaningful relationships with faculty, student affairs educators, and other students. Recent longitudinal studies suggest that one of the strongest effects of participation in community service during the undergraduate years is to enhance the student's leadership skills (Astin & Sax, 1998).

Regardless of whether the group involvement is occurring in connection with a course or an extracurricular activity, students are likely to encounter a number of opportunities to cultivate most, if not all, of the leadership qualities discussed in the previous chapter. When participating in such activities, students could ask themselves many of the same "classroom" questions listed above, as well as questions like the following:

- Are we really clear about what the group is supposed to be doing? Are we all in agreement about this? (*shared purpose*)
- Am I putting out enough effort? Am I doing my fair share? (*commitment*)
- Are we all working together, or are some of us competing with each other? (*collaboration*)
- Am I clear about what I'm supposed to be doing in the group effort? Am I clear about what the others are expected to do? (*division of labor*)
- Do I know what I need to know in order to play my part in the group? Have I done my "homework"? (*competence*)

Students who are members of almost any kind of organization can hone their leadership skills by striving to create an environment where these questions can be discussed. For part-time, adult, and other students who may not be members of a student organization, opportunities to apply most of the leadership principles can be found in community and neighborhood organizations, on the job, or even in the home.

Obstacles and Possibilities

Clearly, today's students lead busy lives that can make it difficult for many of them to focus on broader campus or societal concerns, much less to become deeply engaged in the kinds of leadership activities that we believe are central to responsible citizenship. We have tried to show how the college campus can be a powerful learning ground for students to experiment with and develop their leadership capabilities, but it will take concerted attention and extended *commitment* on the part of each student to become agents of positive change. Perhaps the major obstacle to capitalizing on such opportunities is the student's *beliefs* about the nature of leadership and its relevance to students' daily lives.

Too often, students (not to mention faculty and staff) assume that the only "student leaders" are those who hold formal titles or who are high achievers. However, as we have stressed repeatedly, leadership involves considerably more than holding some kind of formal student office, earning academic honors, or being a star athlete. Rather, leadership occurs when people become concerned about something and work to engage others in bringing about positive change. Student leadership, in other words, is inherently about purposeful change, regardless of who is officially in charge or who receives credit. Student leaders are not born. Rather, they are individuals who have associated themselves with other like-minded students and have taken the trouble to acquire the knowledge, skills, tools, and capabilities that are needed to effect change through the group. *Any student who seeks to become a change agent can do this.*

Too often, students assume that only those who hold titles or are high achievers can be leaders.

Helping people become better leaders is easier at those colleges or universities that already have formal leadership offerings, of course, but the priority that students are able to give to their own leadership development can be affected by many other factors as well. Today's students can be anxious and frustrated about many aspects of their collegiate experience: busy schedules that leave them feeling that they have too much to do and not enough time to do it, unremitting pressures to do well academically, poor teaching, disconnects between academic learning and practical realities, inadequate advising, a general lack of meaningful contact with faculty, and – in many large public institutions – the perception of a large impersonal bureaucracy that doesn't really care about students.

Paradoxically, these frustrations can create multiple possibilities for encouraging student interest in leadership. Although it can be discouraging for those who are able to see the need for change before a crisis arises, most people become engaged in transformation efforts because they feel the heat rather than see the light. Since many of today's students are preoccupied with multiple and often conflicting responsibilities, they probably do not consider their potential as change agents, either as individuals or as a collective. Consequently, a feeling of extreme frustration or repeated disappointments may be needed to generate sufficient heat to motivate them to engage in change efforts.

Given that the typical college or university provides a great many opportunities for students to participate in group activities that can facilitate the development of leadership skills, the greatest obstacle to participation may be the student's disempowering *beliefs*. While beliefs can sometimes be liberating – “We can really make a difference if we work together” – most beliefs tend to be limiting: “It's impossible to get anything done around here,” “Students are too busy looking out for themselves to get involved,” “Students have no real power,” “No one will listen to us,” and so on. Some of these limiting beliefs no doubt reflect “realities” such as a general lack of time or the fact that many required tasks have to be completed in finite periods of time during the academic year (in contrast to most reform efforts, which are typically seen as more long-term and as having uncertain outcomes). Other reasons for student disengagement from group efforts are more complex and cultural in origin, ranging from the individualistic nature of student life and the passive role that students are encouraged to play in many aspects of the collegiate experience to the belief that it is not the students' responsibility to lead change efforts unless they happen to hold formal leadership positions.

Perhaps the most limiting beliefs, however, are those based on feelings of disempowerment – where students assume either that they lack the requisite expertise and experience to effect meaningful change or that their institutions do not value student input or involvement in shared governance. Table 1 lists some of the limiting beliefs that can prevent students from taking advantage of opportunities to initiate or participate in change efforts or to otherwise develop leadership skills. We have arranged these beliefs according to Ken Wilber's (1998) fourfold scheme, which interfaces interior/exterior with individual/group. Since beliefs are

interior events, they are located in the two left-hand quadrants, with the individual student's beliefs appearing in the upper-left (psychological) quadrant and students' shared beliefs appearing in the lower-left (cultural) quadrant. The two right-hand quadrants show the *exterior* correlates of these beliefs, with the individual student's *actions* appearing in the upper-right (behavioral) quadrant and the collective *group behavior* and associated institutional *programs* appearing in the lower-right (social) quadrant.

The first step in contending with such limiting beliefs, of course, is for students simply to become *conscious* of them and of their constraining effects on individual and group behavior. The self-defeating nature of such beliefs can often be revealed simply by discussing them openly with other students.

Table 1: Constraining Beliefs		
Individual Internal Beliefs	Individual External Actions	Implications for Individual Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't have time to get involved • Faculty don't value my contributions • I can't "lead" because I don't hold a formal leadership title 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual students are not engaged in campus life • Individual students are passive learners in the classroom • Individual students self-select out of leadership opportunities 	
Group Internal Beliefs	Group External Actions	Implications for Group Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This campus doesn't care about students • Students do not have enough experience to lead major campus-change efforts • The senior campus leaders (president and vice presidents) are not responsible for making major decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students and student groups are not involved in shared governance • Fragmentation exists among student groups 	

In many respects, what we might call “liberating” beliefs are simply the *absence* of limiting beliefs, i.e., students suspend judgement, so to speak, concerning who they are and what they can accomplish. Truly liberating beliefs, on the other hand, have to do with possibility and *commitment*. “I am capable of...,” “I am going to...,” “We can...,” “We will...” The most important liberating beliefs are those that see students in the role of major stakeholders; that acknowledge students’ intrinsic rights, capabilities, and responsibilities to shape matters which affect them; and that recognize that there are ample opportunities to become engaged. Some liberating beliefs are more personal in nature, such as the notion that “I am in charge of my own life” and that “I can begin exercising leadership by actively shaping my own future.” Others are more professional in scope: “College is an ideal learning lab where I can safely explore, develop, and practice the skills I will need to become successful.” Table 2 displays some of these more empowering beliefs, together with their associated individual and group actions and behaviors.

Table 2: Empowering Beliefs		
Individual Internal Beliefs	Individual External Actions	Implications for Individual Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can manage multiple roles and tasks so that I can make a difference on campus • As a campus citizen, I have a responsibility to help shape matters that affect me • Individual students have the ability to shape their futures • Each student has the capacity to engage in leadership processes without formal titles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual students are engaged in a wide array of activities inside and outside of the classroom • Individual students take the initiative to become involved in the life of the campus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual students have opportunities for leadership development through formal and informal programs and experiences
Group Internal Beliefs	Group External Actions	Implications for Group Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are viewed as major stakeholders • Students are viewed as change agents • Student leadership can make a difference on campus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students build coalitions with other campus groups to advance a shared vision and purpose • Students actively participate in shared campus governance • Students involve and prepare other students for leadership responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students and student groups model collaborative leadership • Students learn how to work interdependently to effect change • Students learn how to influence and shape the future of their campuses

Implementing the Leadership Principles

Since students make up the largest single constituency of any college or university, they certainly have the potential to change the institutional culture on their campuses by internalizing the core principles of effective leadership and applying these principles in their decision making and interactions with others. A powerful way for students to initiate this cultural shift is to encourage their peers to model the core principles.

In classroom settings, students can incorporate these principles as standards for interacting with each other in group or team projects, study groups, and discussion sections. Academic courses can often provide excellent opportunities for leadership development. For example, when the professor in a mechanical engineering course divides students into teams with the assigned task of creating a solar car, students can begin by discussing how applying the principles of *shared purpose*, *collaboration*, *commitment*, *group learning*, and a *division of labor* will assist them in achieving their final goal. Too often, students view such group projects begrudgingly because they believe that some are more committed than others, even though everyone receives the same grade. Such problems can often be overcome by practicing the principles of *authenticity*, *disagreement with respect*, and *division of labor*. Applying these and other principles would thus serve to facilitate a shift in these internal negative beliefs by challenging and empowering everyone to discover new ways of working together and communicating concerns openly, thereby facilitating group learning and active involvement from everyone.

Students have the potential to change the institutional culture.

Individual students have the power to raise questions and to examine the leadership process on their own campus. Students can raise questions as to why they do not have a more active voice in their institutions' governing committees and boards. Instead of believing that it is impossible to change these structures or that students are not qualified to participate in governing bodies, students should recognize that they have the capacity to provide leadership and to facilitate major campus changes.

Collaboration requires a joint *commitment* on the part of students to advance their *shared purpose*. All too often, students and student groups work in isolation of one another, when in fact they may be trying to accomplish similar purposes. Members of different student groups often believe either that they have less in common than they actually do, or that they are in competition with each other for financial resources and membership. In reality, student groups that are able to join forces and

share resources with each other will generally reap more benefits and achieve greater success together than they can by continuing to operate independently and competitively. An individual student or student group can start the collaborative process by taking the initiative to engage others with the aim of discovering commonalities that can serve as a basis for accomplishing change and working on shared issues.

Students can build bridges between the disparate cultures on campus.

Students are also uniquely positioned to build bridges that connect the various disparate cultures on campus: faculty, student affairs staff, administrative staff, and students. Traditional structures for bringing multiple groups together (e.g., the campus senate) are not typically viewed as empowering or effective in working on large-scale campus changes. Students, by virtue of their sheer numbers and capacities to organize, can play a leadership role by bringing stakeholders together to work on a shared agenda. To take just one example: if students are concerned about the lack of diversity on campus, then they have the power to organize a meeting or retreat of concerned faculty, staff, students, and other campus stakeholders. The old, limiting or disempowering belief would be that someone in the administration should take care of this issue. The alternative, empowering belief would allow students to take the initiative and to use their leadership potential to begin collective work that would address such problems. (For a detailed discussion of issues related to the formation and functioning of leadership groups, see Chapter 6.)

Taking steps to implement these core leadership principles would result in positive changes and would forge a new kind of leadership within higher education. Students would begin to develop and to model for each other the kind of leadership that is also needed to solve some of society's most pressing problems. Engaging in this type of leadership would also generate an increased sense of personal worth and personal excellence. Students would come to see that interdependency is related to excellence, and that we need each other to build communities and institutions that result in positive social change. Transforming the college campus means transforming ourselves, transforming our communities, and transforming our world.

The “Transformed” Campus

What would a campus look like if these core principles of leadership – *self-knowledge, competence, authenticity, commitment, collaboration, shared purpose, empathy, division of labor, and respectful disagreement* – were to permeate the student culture and define the norms for interacting with others? Would class projects that involved group or team work function differently? Would the student government reach out to students and other campus and community constituencies in a different way? How would interactions between students and faculty change? Would individual student groups begin to work more closely with each other in order to define and advance their *shared purpose*?

It is hard to escape the conclusion that students’ lives would be positively impacted if these core principles were infused in their activities on the campus. It also seems likely that students’ overall perspective on higher education would change dramatically, since they would be engaged in major change efforts at every level of the institution. Rather than simply attending classes and participating in a few student organizations or community-service activities, students would be empowered to advance the larger educational mission and values of their institution. On an individual level, students would have many opportunities to see how these core principles (*collaboration, authenticity, shared purpose, commitment, etc.*) affect them personally and how they bring greater meaning to their learning experiences and social interactions.

Embracing and applying the leadership principles would also serve to enhance residential life. Students would feel more committed to creating and sustaining community agreements that would result in more dynamic living and learning environments for all students. Students would take more responsibility for shared governance within their residence halls and would personally work to resolve conflicts with civility, rather than expecting residence life staff to handle those problems for them. Residence halls and other student living environments would be viewed as laboratories for continued learning, self-discovery, and greater meaning through interactions with others. Instead of passively “receiving” the residence life policies and rules during the first meeting of the year, students and staff would work as a group to define the basic principles and forge common agreements – their *common purposes* – that

would create dynamic living and learning environments. Students would be committed to the process of working *collaboratively*, *empathically*, and *authentically* with each other to create a community where everyone is valued and included.

By embracing the principles of the model, students would also come to expect more of themselves in the classroom, as they moved from passive or unengaged learners to more self-aware and committed learners who are actively involved in shaping positive learning environments for themselves and others. Students would share with faculty more of the responsibility for structuring and managing classroom environments. More importantly, students would be actively engaged with faculty in discovery and inquiry processes rather than seeing themselves simply as passive vessels for receiving information and knowledge.

Similar transformations would occur with out-of-class activities. Students would be less inclined to participate in a variety of co-curricular activities merely to build their resumes. Instead, co-curricular activities would be perceived as opportunities for students to transform their campuses; to develop leadership skills; and to discover greater meaning in, and connections between, their formal (classroom) and informal (out-of-class) learning activities. Such changes would also affect how faculty and student affairs educators would view student involvement. Rather than seeing campus activities simply as a form of avocational recreation or as a means of enhancing student retention by giving students a greater sense of affiliation with their college, faculty and staff would encourage students to become involved as a means of strengthening the overall campus climate for student learning and development. In other words, student involvement in campus activities would come to be viewed as a way of effecting institutional transformation.

Conclusion

The students of today are the leaders of tomorrow. While our universities and colleges fulfill many functions and play many roles in American society, their fundamental purpose is to ensure that students are appropriately prepared for their evolving private, public, and professional

responsibilities. This means they need to develop the requisite knowledge, skills, tools, and attitudes to become good citizens, good parents and spouses, good neighbors, and good employees. Focusing on traditional degree-specific requirements as a major part of higher education's educational mission makes a lot of sense, but it is not enough. Our rapidly changing society desperately needs skilled leaders who are able to address complex issues, build bridges, and heal divisions. Moreover, our students, regardless of their particular career interests or the positions they may eventually hold, also need to learn general life skills.

Leadership is one of the most essential of those skills. Beyond their experiences during college, students will be regularly presented with opportunities to exercise "leadership" in the broad sense that we have defined it. Some of these opportunities will be of a very personal sort, with families and friends; others will be more public in scope, in the communities they help to create. Still others will be professional in nature, as part of their careers. Common to all of these opportunities is the recognition that: (1) *leadership is no longer the province of the few, the privileged, or even the merely ambitious*, and (2) *leadership skills are needed in virtually all areas of adult life*. Leadership skills are increasingly among the qualifications needed by employers of all kinds, from private corporations and nonprofit organizations to government agencies and academic institutions. Virtually all of our social institutions are hungry for people who are self-aware, authentic, innovative, empathic, committed, comfortable working collaboratively, and able to lead constructive change efforts.

Leadership is no longer the province of the few, the privileged, or even the merely ambitious.

Fortunately, leaders are not born and leadership abilities can be consciously developed. Students, as the prime stakeholders in the collegiate community, have both the right and the responsibility to serve as active contributors to the entire learning enterprise and not simply to be passive consumers of campus services. Learning and applying the principles of effective leadership will encourage students to become more deeply involved in and *committed* to shaping the educational experience – for themselves and for others – to the highest possible standards, to care about the common good, to develop the capacity to become enlightened change agents, and to experience meaningful opportunities to practice leadership as members of the campus community and beyond.

Chapter 4

The Leadership Role of Faculty

“Universities, it seems to me, should model something for students besides individual excellence ... They should model social excellence as well as personal achievement ... If institutions that purport to educate young people don’t embody society’s cherished ideals – community, cooperation, harmony, love – then what young people will learn will be the standards institutions do embody: competition, hierarchy, busyness, and isolation.”

—JANE THOMPSON, DUKE UNIVERSITY

College and university faculty are in a position to provide the kind of leadership that could transform their institutions toward greater “community, cooperation, and harmony.” To set the context for discussing the leadership role that faculty might play in institutional transformation, we begin this chapter with a brief overview of the role of the faculty and what it means to be a member of the academic profession.

The Work of the Faculty Member

Many faculty prefer to characterize their choice of the academic profession as a calling, a sense of mission and purpose that not only generates a feeling of self-worth and satisfaction in their daily lives, but also nurtures their desire to be associated with an institution that is rooted in idealism and hope. Faculty are indeed the stewards of our institutions of higher learning, in part because they tend to have the greatest longevity: the average faculty member spends between 30 and 40 years as a member of the academic profession.

The academic profession is a profession more of choice than of chance. When asked to report their reasons for choosing an academic career, about three-fourths of faculty members indicate that they were attracted by the opportunity to work with ideas, the freedom to pursue their intellectual interests, and the opportunity to teach others. The fact that the academic profession also provides for great autonomy, freedom, and flexibility is an added attraction to people who choose academic careers (Sax, Astin, Korn, & Gilmartin, 1999).

A recent survey carried out by the American Association for Higher Education (Rice, 1996) provides further clarity about this calling for faculty: newly appointed faculty say their choice of an academic career is based primarily on the “joy of teaching,” the opportunity to interact with students, and the opportunity to participate in shaping society’s next generation.

Faculty can be a powerful force in the development of young people.

College teaching is a time-honored profession that includes sharing part of one’s self with students. It allows faculty the opportunity to mentor and contribute to the development of students in their roles as learners. As teachers, faculty believe that they can facilitate the learning process by instilling in students a thirst for continuous learning and a quest for answers to complex problems. They see themselves as encouraging students to create their futures by preparing them for a range of unforeseen challenges that lie ahead. That the faculty can indeed be a powerful force in the development of young people is attested to by the fact that so many former students identify faculty members as their primary mentors and guides.

The faculty calling is also predicated on the opportunity to be a member of a community of scholars, a community in which the intellectual talents and creativity of its different members are combined in the pursuit of knowledge. This search for knowledge through collegiality is a key aspect of the profession that continues to attract new generations of scholars to the academy. In particular, it is that desire to collaborate with other like-minded people, coupled with a great deal of autonomy to pursue one’s specific scholarly or creative interests, that proves to be such an inviting aspect of a faculty career.

Faculty are also called to serve society as agents of societal transformation. The environment in which we live is in a constant state of transition and it is the scholarly work of faculty and their intellectual expertise that provide much of the information and the human resources for helping to guide these transitions. Thus, another critical part of the faculty's work is to serve the larger community through their consultative expertise and the new knowledge they create.

In summary, college and university faculty are called upon in their work to provide leadership as teachers, scholars, and servants to the larger society, and it is these many challenging roles and responsibilities that not only make the academic profession so appealing, but also create so many opportunities for faculty to play a key role in institutional and societal transformation.

Faculty as Leaders

Faculty can serve as agents of societal transformation.

Faculty are called to lead in ways that readily bring to mind the “core” individual and group values and principles set forth in detail in Chapter 2, “Principles of Transformative Leadership.” In short, we believe that academic work can be enriched if faculty can model the individual personal qualities – *self-awareness, authenticity, empathy, commitment, and competence* – in their daily interactions with both students and colleagues. At the same time, the exercise of transformative leadership on the part of faculty can also be enhanced through the application of group qualities such as *collaboration, common purpose, division of labor, and respectful disagreement*. In particular, these qualities can facilitate the varied forms of collective work that faculty engage in: committees and other administrative responsibilities, team teaching, departmental meetings, and so forth.

Faculty also participate with each other and with the administration in shaping the culture of the institution through the many decisions they make: defining admissions standards; deciding what to teach and how to teach it; setting requirements and performance standards for students; evaluating, advising, and mentoring students; choosing topics and methods for their research and scholarship; relating to colleagues; participating in shared governance; setting criteria for hiring new colleagues; and

reviewing the performance of colleagues. In short, faculty decision making spans the gamut of roles and responsibilities: teacher, mentor, role model, scholar, colleague, fund raiser and entrepreneur, administrator, servant to the community, and consultant. Let us now examine how faculty can apply and model the principles of transformative leadership in fulfilling their various roles.

Teacher

Faculty are drawn to become professors first and foremost because they want to teach. For many faculty members, teaching is a way of sharing the information and knowledge that they find exciting and challenging. They welcome the chance to share what they have learned and to see it reflected in their students as they encounter the joy of discovery and understanding. It is the love of learning and of the discipline that compels faculty to share knowledge with others, in this case students. Faculty also love to teach because it allows them to mentor students; help them develop as scholars and professionals; and through them, to shape the future of our society. For many faculty, it is these exchanges with students that draws them out of their laboratories and offices and into the classroom.

How faculty view their power will largely determine the kind of leadership they exercise in the classroom.

However, this relationship between teacher and student is not always a simple one; on the contrary, it is often complex and can be fraught with tension and frustration for both the professor and the student. A professor comes to the classroom with positional power and much more expertise than most students have. How faculty view this power and how they use their expertise will largely determine the kind of leadership they exercise in the classroom.

Applying the leadership principle of *self-knowledge*, for example, would lead faculty to raise questions such as the following: Am I teaching to impart my knowledge to passive, receptive students? Or am I there instead to share my expertise, recognizing that students whose life experiences have differed from mine will determine how they hear, understand, and receive whatever knowledge I have to offer? How in my work with students can I build upon their previous life experiences, connecting my teaching to those experiences in ways that create new knowledge for them as well as for me? Do I buy into the unspoken assumption – so common to undergraduate students – that the professor has all the

answers? How important is this image of omniscience to me; to what extent do I find it a burden? How willing am I to say, “I don’t know. Let’s find out, together.”

Another source of tension for professors is their dual role in the classroom: they are expected not only to help students learn but also to judge them. When students are constantly aware that their professors are evaluating and grading them, they may be less open and less willing to take risks, to explore unknown territories, and to become self-directed learners. And then there is the special dilemma presented by the underprepared student: most faculty are ambivalent about teaching such students, not only because they have not been trained to teach them, but also because the faculty culture may regard teaching underprepared students as a low-level activity or perhaps even degrading. And even when faculty see less-well-prepared students respond to their instruction and make substantial progress but still fail to meet “standards” or “make the curve” in a competitive grading system, they may find themselves facing the dilemma of “educating” vs. “selecting.”

We believe that the faculty’s ability to deal creatively and effectively with these dilemmas and contradictions can be substantially strengthened by incorporating the principles of transformative leadership in their work with students. Let us now move to consider each of these principles in terms of a series of questions.

Shared purpose. Do our students share with us a common understanding of expected learning outcomes and of class norms and expectations for interaction and how responsibility will be shared and accountability be determined? If not, how should we go about developing a common purpose for the class? Do students share these norms simply because they have been imposed, or because they have had a part in formulating them?

To create *shared purpose*, professors and students alike must bring their *self-knowledge* and their *empathy* to the discussion. Do I understand my students’ goals and motivations, learning styles, and limitations (i.e., *their* level of *competence*), not to mention *my* own beliefs, values, goals, skills, and limitations (i.e., *self-knowledge*)? Am I clear with myself, and

have I been clear and truthful with my students about how and why I intend to present the class material, choose assignments, and provide evaluative feedback to the student?

Self-knowledge on the part of the faculty member – which facilitates the group process by developing trust and helping to shape the common purpose – requires that one first explore questions such as: What are my values? What kinds of institutional or societal change do I care about? What are my skills, strengths, talents, and limitations? Do I have a clear sense about class purposes, objectives, and expectations for students?

Authenticity calls for faculty to align their actions with their most deeply felt values and beliefs: Would I be inclined to compromise my standards, lower my expectations, or inflate student grades because I worry about student evaluations that could be damaging to my chances for promotion or merit increases? If I expect assignments to be submitted in a timely fashion, do I reciprocate by returning graded assignments promptly, regardless of the pressure of grant deadlines and committee meetings? Do I limit my teaching effectiveness by spending less time with students and with class-related activities in order to be rewarded for research and writing? Am I willing to tell students that I've made a mistake or that I don't know something?

Disagreement with respect. When students disagree or raise questions, do I always show *respect* for them, or do I sometimes get defensive or try to diminish their ideas and act in superior/more knowledgeable ways? Do I likewise encourage students to treat disagreements among themselves with respect?

Collaboration. A key to the practice of transformative leadership, is directed toward some *common purpose* that transcends individual goals. *Collaboration* is not merely coming together around a predetermined vision or approach. It is also about how people value and relate to each other across differences in beliefs, ideas, visions, and identities (e.g., race, gender, culture, religion, sexual orientation, class, etc.). When faculty can practice and model leadership that is framed in individual qualities such as *self-knowledge* and *authenticity*, their work with students is more likely to be *collaborative* and characterized by mutual accountability and respect.

When faculty model transformative leadership, their work with students is characterized by mutual accountability and respect.

Collaboration in the classroom can extend beyond faculty-student interactions. Faculty can model *collaboration* for students by engaging in team teaching or by developing interdisciplinary courses. How do I go about doing collaborative work? Do I demonstrate through my words and actions that I understand and value my colleagues' special qualities and expertise (i.e., *empathy*)? Do I model shared responsibility, shared authority, and accountability in designing an interdisciplinary course or in team teaching a course? When I encounter disagreements or differences in opinion with a colleague, do I recognize and respect the different viewpoint (i.e., *disagree with respect*), or do I diminish or belittle the other's ideas?

Scholar

The way faculty personally or collectively view scholarship has implications for how they deal with each other and their students.

A major core activity of most faculty members is that of a scholar. However, the meaning of scholarship varies by where one works, and especially by the type of institution with which one is affiliated. Scholarship has for many become synonymous with research and the discovery of new knowledge. Universities have led the way in defining what we can expect and value from the scholarly work of faculty, and publications have become the principal measure of academic scholarship. Even though the "scholarship of discovery" (research and published work) has never been the only accepted mode of scholarship across all institutions, it was not until the recent appearance of *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1996) that we have begun to consider other forms of scholarly work – the scholarship of *integration, teaching, and application* – as legitimate.

The way faculty personally or collectively view scholarship has implications for how they deal with each other, how collaborative or competitive they are, and how *authentic* they are able to be in their interactions with others, especially colleagues and students. While research can often be viewed as an individual endeavor, there are many ways in which it can be seen as an interpersonal process. A great deal of research work in the sciences, for example, is necessarily done by the faculty member's research group: other faculty, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, and sometimes even undergraduate students. Participating in such a research group once again provides an opportunity for the faculty member to practice transformative leadership: Do I listen to and appreciate the ideas offered by all members of the team, including graduate and

undergraduate students (i.e., *empathy*)? Are decisions made *collaboratively*, or do I unilaterally decide what needs to be done, by whom, and by when? Do I believe that each member of the team has plenty to contribute to these decisions, or do I feel that I am the sole expert and that others are pretty much supposed to do as I say? Do I delegate responsibility and trust others to do the work competently (*division of labor*)?

Disagreements are a part of any group effort, including the research team. Conflicts do arise. Differences of opinion are inevitable. What matters most is how faculty deal with these differences and disagreements. *Disagreement with respect* means being willing, ready, and committed to understanding the sources of disagreement (*empathy, competence*) and to work toward common solutions. It means engaging in open dialogue (*authenticity*) that can be satisfying and beneficial to all members of the group. But to be able to engage in this teamwork collaboratively and with respect for each other's talents and contributions, faculty need to remain open to themselves, to reflect on their own beliefs and values (*self-knowledge*), and to be *authentic*, which means not saying one thing and doing something else, but "walking the talk." In short, collaborative research work, like almost any other group activity, prospers when there is trust, and trust can be built and maintained when the participants are *self-aware* and *authentic*, and when the team leader is *empathic* and understands others – their fears, aspirations, and hopes.

Service to the Institution

The prototypic service work of the faculty is to serve as members of institutional committees. A great deal of conceptual work of colleges and universities is done through committees: decisions about student admissions, the setting of curriculum requirements, reviews of faculty performance, and planning and budgeting are just a few of the many ways in which faculty participate in shared governance through committee membership. This group work, in turn, provides many opportunities to model and practice the principles of effective leadership. For example as faculty engage in debates over sensitive issues such as funding priorities or collegial review, do they always *disagree with respect*? Or do they welcome the opportunity to be critical or contrary, launch barbs, rankle colleagues, act out old grudges, or develop factions? Are there faculty who distance themselves from the committee discussions and debates and

remain generally aloof and uninvolved (lack of *commitment*)? When faculty are involved in campus decisions, do their first thoughts turn to the interests of the student, to the long-term benefit of the institution, or to their narrow departmental or personal interests? Do faculty respect and value the opinions of their non-faculty committee colleagues in student affairs, career services, and administrative services who also interact closely with students and teach them valuable life lessons (*empathy/understanding of others*)?

Unfortunately, some faculty members have developed a mistrust of leadership – the concept as well as the individuals who hold positional leadership in the university. Adversarial camps have developed where an “us-them” mentality separates the faculty from the administration, and sometimes also from student affairs, other staff, or even students. Such feelings and beliefs are dysfunctional to transformative leadership and to establishing a truly shared approach to governance, as illustrated in the following excerpt from a recent national report:

The faculty don't trust the administration. Students find faculty distracted and not well attuned to their learning needs, administrators are wary of both trustees and faculty. Staff see themselves as disenfranchised victims of the administration's need to save money and the faculty's penchant for protecting their own. Frequently, schools, departments, and even individual faculty act as if they are each other's targets.

Pew Policy Perspectives, May 1997, Volume 7 Number 2

Transformative change requires that we find ways to restore trust. We believe that by cultivating the leadership values and principles presented in Chapter 2, we can begin to build trust through *collaboration*. Trust, in turn, enables colleagues to effect a *shared purpose* and a meaningful *division of labor*.

The peer review process deserves some special attention, given that participation in faculty review committees provides an excellent opportunity for almost all faculty members to apply the principles of transformative leadership. However, in reviewing colleagues for promotion, faculty often see themselves exclusively in the role of critics and judges, rather than also as colleagues who are also offering constructive feedback. How

then, can faculty practice the principles of transformative leadership under such conditions? Let's start with *self-knowledge*. Are the critical standards that are applied to the candidate's work equivalent to the standards one would apply to one's own work? In reading a colleague's work, does the faculty reviewer ever feel competitive? Does he ever feel threatened that someone else's success may diminish his? Such competitive and defensive feelings can often surface because of the way we have structured the review process, i.e., less as a process to learn about and understand someone else's work and to give appropriate feedback than as a way of critiquing the work and deciding whether the colleague demonstrates a *quantity* and *quality* of work that is commensurate with the perceived status and prestige of the department and the institution.

Participation in promotion and review committees provides faculty with an opportunity to enhance *self-knowledge* by examining their own beliefs and values with respect to issues such as "standards" and "peer review," to practice *authenticity* in reviewing another's work, and to *collaborate* with colleagues in quest of the *common purpose* of producing a fair, honest, and constructive review of the candidate's performance. Trust and *authenticity* would also be enhanced if the review process were made more open. For example, rather than keeping the process secret, members of review committees could be made known to the person under review. Once the committee is known to the candidate, the members could discuss the work and identify strengths and weaknesses openly but with *empathy*. In this way, it becomes much easier to understand the colleague under review – her aspirations, doubts, goals, and hopes.

In reviewing colleagues for promotion, faculty often see themselves exclusively in the role of critics and judges.

Any committee – be it a peer review committee, a hiring committee, or a budget committee – will first need to spend some time defining its *shared purpose*. What is our goal as a committee? Are we going to try to create a *learning environment*, where we collectively come to understand the work under review in terms of the candidate's special qualities and perspectives (i.e., *empathy*)? And if it is a personnel committee, is its purpose, at least in part, to benefit the person being reviewed – to help him learn, understand, and grow – or is it only for purposes of "quality control," i.e., to insure that we will terminate people whose level of scholarship might diminish our institutional, and ultimately our own, status?

Obstacles and Possibilities

Even though faculty have numerous opportunities to exercise transformative leadership, they frequently find themselves feeling disempowered by a set of dysfunctional beliefs and by a life of contradictions. These beliefs, held individually or by the faculty as a whole, are often manifested in behaviors that prevent faculty from exercising leadership on campus and fully contributing to the institution's development. Table 1 lists some of the limiting beliefs that can prevent faculty from taking advantage of opportunities to initiate or participate in change efforts or to

Individual Internal Beliefs	Individual External Behaviors	Implications for Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't have time to get involved in change efforts • My colleagues will never change their way of doing things • I'm not a leader because, I don't have a leadership position • My role is to transfer disciplinary knowledge • Students are not motivated, interested in, or capable of mature action • My role is to criticize, not to initiate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual faculty focus only on their disciplinary specialty • Individual faculty are reluctant to serve on institutional committees • Individual faculty do not attempt to understand Institutional constraints and opportunities • Individual faculty are passive reactors to change proposals • Individual faculty do not engage students in meaningful decision making 	
Group Internal Beliefs	Group External Behaviors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to the institution is weakened • Faculty lack awareness of how others in the institution perceive them • Faculty lose the opportunity to use their competence in institutional problem solving • Faculty lack empathy for other constituencies • Faculty are not included in determining the common purpose of the institution • Disagreements do not surface or are lacking in respect • Faculty do not practice collaborative skills • A meaningful division of labor is lacking
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty expertise is not valued in running the institution • Nothing can be changed because of administrative attitudes • Faculty and administrators could never work together • All learning occurs in the classroom • Student Affairs can't be trusted in academic matters • Faculty and staff have nothing in common 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty do not interact with non-faculty colleagues • Faculty do not take the initiative in problem solving • Fragmentation occurs between faculty and non-faculty and between academic departments • Faculty committees duplicate administrative roles 	

otherwise model transformative leadership. Consistent with the previous chapter, we have arranged these beliefs according to Ken Wilber's (1998) fourfold scheme, which interfaces interior/exterior with individual/group. Since beliefs are *interior* events, they are located in the two left-hand quadrants, with the individual faculty member's beliefs appearing in the upper-left (psychological) quadrant and faculty's shared beliefs appearing in the lower-left (cultural) quadrant. The two right-hand quadrants show the *exterior* correlates of these beliefs, with the individual faculty member's *actions* appearing in the upper-right (behavioral) quadrant and the collective faculty behavior and associated institutional *programs* and *policies* appearing in the lower-right (social) quadrant.

While many faculty believe that they are the "center" of the institution and that the institution could not survive without them, they often believe that there are fundamental contradictions in their institutional lives. Thus, in small institutions they may feel under-valued and exploited as they compete for limited resources with other areas of the campus. Or, in the larger institutions, they may feel conflict between their own values and those of their institutions. As one participant in a recent interview study of faculty (Astin, Astin, & Associates, 1999) said, "One thing that's clear is that the university prioritizes research, and if the university were to properly appreciate the value of teaching and service, I would perhaps ... be able to prioritize [it] more highly." A similar contradiction is implied in the belief expressed by another respondent in the same study: "I see my primary professional role as that of teacher, but it is research that is truly valued around here."

Faculty often feel inherent contradictions in their institutional lives.

Although faculty work long hours performing difficult and complex tasks, they also often feel that "our work is never done," a dilemma which causes enormous stress in the lives of many faculty. Their inability to trust other groups on the campus sometimes results in a proliferation of faculty committees which duplicate work that would – in a more trusting environment – be done by others.

The faculty's strengths are also often seen as giving rise to weaknesses. For example, while enjoying a good deal of status and autonomy and being perceived as the "core" of the institution can strengthen one's *commitment* to the institution, it can also undermine *collaboration* through

the misuse of power. Similarly, having a lot of technical or scholarly expertise can be of substantial value to the individual faculty member's career, but an expert mindset – and the critical thinking skills that often come with it – can also undermine *collaboration*.

Excessive autonomy can be antithetical to a sense of community.

In addition to these constraining (disempowering) beliefs, there are two cultural traditions that can also prevent faculty from practicing transformative leadership: their excessive need for *autonomy* and their strong allegiance to the *discipline*. As we have already said, the appeal of autonomy is one of the strongest motivators/reasons for pursuing an academic career. Except for scheduled class time, office hours, and scheduled committee work – which usually consume less than half of a normal work day – the rest of the faculty member's time can be scheduled according to each faculty member's idiosyncratic needs and preferences. Such autonomy, however, has one paradoxical drawback: by not having one's work clearly scheduled during normal working hours, most faculty tend to create a great deal of stress for themselves by taking on too many open-ended responsibilities that have no clearly defined limits: "our work is never done... time is a big thing, you are always... trying to maximize, get as much accomplished as you can" (Astin, Astin, & Associates, 1999). Excessive autonomy can also be antithetical to a sense of community, since it militates against feeling connected and interdependent. Autonomy can thus serve as a barrier to *collaborative* work, since it makes it difficult for faculty to get to know and trust each other and prevents them from developing a *shared purpose*.

The second value – disciplinary allegiance – is reflected in the strong departmental structures and the resulting institutional fragmentation and division that we find on many campus. It also tends to create intense competition for resources, together with status hierarchies among the disciplines. Obviously, these structural divisions and subcultures can act as strong barriers to creating community, interdependence, and collective learning and action.

While personal autonomy and disciplinary specialization can serve as barriers to implementing the principles of transformative leadership, the process can also work in reverse: that is, the principles themselves can also be powerful tools for counteracting the negative effects of autonomy and

specialization. In fact, one of the key principles to follow here is *self-knowledge*, which means being aware of one's own prejudices and vulnerabilities and being alert to situations where efforts to practice transformative leadership are being undermined either by blind defense of personal autonomy or by excessive disciplinary loyalty.

Practicing Transformative Leadership

Notwithstanding the limiting beliefs just discussed, any faculty member who seeks to become a change agent can begin by practicing transformative leadership *right now*. Of course, if faculty persist in believing that it is only the people at the top of the administrative hierarchy who are in a position to initiate change, then they are effectively disempowering themselves. This is precisely the attitude that transformative leadership tries to combat, on the premise that everyone has the ability to live by the leadership principles and therefore to work for change in his or her sphere of influence. When faculty decide to model and practice the principles of transformative leadership, their constraining beliefs are replaced by a set of empowering beliefs that can lead to actions that not only strengthen the institution and model leadership for students, but that also improve and enrich the individual faculty member's working life. Table 2 uses Wilber's model to enumerate some of these empowering beliefs and actions together with their implications for the leadership principles.

Faculty are in a position to begin the change agenda in their classrooms and in their governance activities.

Most faculty members are already in a position to begin the change agenda in their classrooms and in their governance activities. Within the classroom, faculty autonomy is actually a potential *facilitator* of change, since each professor has the power to model the principles and to make whatever other changes he/she believes will benefit the students and the learning environment. Since professors are generally free to experiment with and incorporate new ways of teaching and leading, one very simple and direct approach would be to choose just one of the principles of transformative leadership each semester or quarter and experiment with ways to integrate and model it in classes. One could focus, for example, on *shared purpose*, spending some time during the first day of class discussing students' expectations. The professor's expectations could be presented at the next class session, after which both sets of expectations could be discussed jointly to create a *shared purpose* of what can happen

Table 2: Empowering Faculty Beliefs		
Individual Internal Beliefs	Individual External Behaviors	Implications for Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I help create the institutional culture through my daily individual decisions • Leadership is not a separate activity; it is an integral part of what I do • Learning is an activity that I can model daily • I can model leadership in every class • I have the freedom and autonomy to initiate inquiry or action • Students have the capacity, and therefore should be given the opportunity, to engage in decision making that affects them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professors model leadership principles in classes • Individuals work effectively in committees • Individual faculty take an institutional perspective in solving problems • Individual faculty mentor the development of student leadership capacities • Faculty contribute their expertise to the campus community 	
Group Internal Beliefs	Group External Behaviors	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty are the stewards of the institution • Everyone in the institution directly contributes to student development • Change initiatives can start with anyone • We can make change through collective action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty invite non-faculty community members to collaborate • Faculty take the initiative in identifying and solving problems 	<p>Individual faculty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop competence, authenticity, and self-knowledge through collaborative efforts involving each other and non-faculty • Strengthen commitment to positive change • Develop collaborative skills with all institutional constituencies • Help to develop greater common purpose with others in their institution • Strengthen capacity for respectful disagreement through enhanced empathy

in that particular class. This development of such a *shared purpose* could, of course, be carried out within whatever constraints – e.g., certain required course content – the professor would choose to present during the first class session. The point is that, no matter how many such constraints there might be, there are always many areas – teaching techniques, assignments, conduct of classes, etc. – where joint planning is possible.

Committees offer almost limitless possibilities for modeling the principles. Thus, despite the fact that an individual's power to effect change through committee work is often constrained by other people's behavior or by long-standing traditions and possibly even handbook rules, one can still

experiment with new ways of working within almost any kind of committee. For example, at the beginning of most committee work each member is usually free to raise procedural questions: Are there student participants who also have the privilege to vote? If not, why not? Does the search committee reflect the total community of the institution? What is the purpose of the committee, and what is to happen to its reports or other products? How are the deliberations to be conducted, and why? Does the group need a facilitator in addition to the chair to practice more democratic, learning behaviors? What is expected of each individual member?

Are the decision-making modes clearly understood by everyone? (For a more comprehensive discussion of leadership issues connected with the formation and conduct of committees, see pages 75-80.) By raising such questions in the early meetings, we greatly increase the likelihood that the committee will develop a *shared purpose*, effect a meaningful *division of labor*, and operate *collaboratively*. And just as it happens in classes, personal behavior can become a model for others: by practicing *disagree - ment with respect* and demonstrating *empathy and understanding of others*, an individual faculty member's behavior can become the norm for others.

Another approach is to be alert for creative, collaborative ways to solve problems. For example, if the institution is considering an academic reorganization, any faculty member can proactively organize a group that represents the interests of all affected. Such a group can collaboratively develop new approaches that can be suggested to the administration.

Another very direct approach is simply to ask: What can I as a faculty member do to exercise transformative leadership? The initial answer is that you have already taken the first step by reading this chapter and by reflecting on the culture of your institution. A possible next step would be to make a list of your own personal beliefs about yourself, about your institutional colleagues, and about the institution in general, and to reflect on the extent to which each belief either facilitates or constrains your capacity to model the leadership principles. You could also make a list of the many questions posed in this chapter and think of how you would answer them: Are you satisfied with your own behavior and that of your colleagues? Does your institution provide a model for other institutions?

Then, as you reflect on these beliefs and their implications for the next week, month, or year, you can practice the enhancement of *self-knowledge* by paying special attention to the interactions between yourself and members of your academic community: Are you teaching and modeling the qualities of transformative leadership traits for your students? Do you promote *collaboration* or competition? Are you *authentic* and *empathic* in your interactions with students? When you interact with other faculty, how important is it to impress them, to appear “smart”? When interacting with other staff members, do you treat them on an equal basis? Do you respect and honor your support staff? Do you seek the opinions of student affairs staff? What is your attitude toward administrators? Can you practice *empathy*: are you open and willing to see the complexities administrators face in their roles?

Faculty members are in a powerful position to initiate transformative change on the campus.

Making a conscious effort to be more mindful and *self-aware* – to observe and reflect on your own beliefs and behaviors – puts you in an excellent position to initiate a dialogue with your colleagues. The important thing is to devise a simple way to get together with your colleagues so you can collectively examine the systems and structures that delimit your actions. Genuine discussions over lunch, in committee or department meetings, or in learning circles that you arrange, are the first step to change. These dialogues can help to define common values and a common mission – standards against which current policies, practices, and individual behaviors can be assessed. Recognizing discrepancies between values or mission, on the one hand, and practice or behavior, on the other, is another essential stage in the process of transformative change.

Faculty members are in a powerful position to initiate this kind of transformative change on the campus. In particular, the autonomy that they enjoy in the classroom puts them in a position to begin a change process immediately. Further, the respect and influence that faculty enjoy among other staff members and students makes it easy for them to convene meetings or to form task forces to begin the sorts of grassroots changes that are essential to transformation.

If, in reading this chapter, you have discovered ideas that intrigue or excite you, and if you are not happy with your answers to some of the questions that have been asked, then you have the opportunity to become

a change agent by observing your community, thinking carefully about the systems and structures in place, engaging in dialogue with colleagues, and taking the actions that are available to you. The fact is that *you have the power to bring about change*. You can become a student – a student of your department and of your institution. By modeling some of the leadership principles in your teaching and committee work, you can open yourself to learning and to seeing from a different perspective. You can begin the process of relationship building by initiating dialogues that span boundaries and rebuild relationships. You can make the decision to take the initiative without having to wait for “the administration.” Instead of waiting to be empowered by others, you can empower yourself. Transformative leadership is empowering leadership because it is predicated on being *self-aware*, *authentic*, and *empathic*, and because it develops trust through listening, *collaborating*, and shaping a *common purpose*.

Our college and universities have the unique opportunity to shape our future society by giving our students an opportunity to live and practice the future on our campuses. As long as we simply mirror the behaviors that have created our current problems, we will not move beyond those problems. But by practicing the principles of transformative leadership, we can begin the process of creating an institution that models the just, civil society in which we all want to live.

Chapter 5

The Leadership Role of Student Affairs Professionals

Student affairs professionals have historically demonstrated an active commitment to leadership development in college students. By providing programs where students can practice and integrate classroom knowledge with real-life experiences (such as internships and service learning) and by facilitating opportunities for students to participate in collaborative group learning and student governance (such as theme residence halls and elected student offices), student affairs staff can enhance students' leadership competence and abilities in a variety of ways.

And while student affairs professionals have thus had a good deal of success in preparing students for civic and community life, their own full potential as institutional leaders has yet to be realized. One problem is that student affairs professionals, like many others in academe, have tended to accept the notion that institutional “leaders” are primarily those who hold formal leadership positions, especially those in the academic hierarchy. Similarly, they have tended to limit their conception of “leadership development” efforts to intentional programming for students and for staff, administrators, and faculty. Given our view that “leadership” can occur in any area of institutional functioning and that all members of the academic community are potential leaders, these limiting beliefs severely constrain the role that student affairs professionals are likely to play, not only in positively shaping the learning environment of students, but – more importantly – in transforming the educational and organizational culture of their institutions.

As noted earlier in Chapter 2, we view leadership as a group process that is fundamentally concerned with fostering value-based change. In contrast to traditional hierarchical notions of leadership, our leadership principles emphasize the potential that resides within every individual to be an initiator and agent of institutional transformation. As such, this

definition of leadership focuses on the capacity building of the entire organization. If student affairs professionals are to become more active participants in helping to create learning environments that are characterized by *commitment, empathy, authenticity, and shared purpose*, they must first understand the individual and group dynamics that come into play as they interface with the rest of the campus community. Gaining a fuller appreciation of their own leadership capacities as members of the academic community should enable student affairs professionals to have a more direct impact on organizational learning, renewal, and transformation.

To that end, this chapter will briefly highlight the core functions and responsibilities of student affairs professionals, examine their practices and beliefs regarding leadership development, and offer strategic suggestions for what they can do individually and collectively to facilitate integrated communities of learning that enhance their own leadership potential, as well as that of their students and institutional colleagues.

Student affairs professionals can have a direct impact on organizational learning, renewal, and transformation.

Core Functions

In their efforts to create seamless learning environments that support the integration of curricular and extra-curricular experiences for students, student affairs professionals juggle four primary roles and responsibilities. For brevity's sake we shall organize these under the general rubrics of Service Delivery, Student-Directed Activities, Integrated Learning, and Institutional Governance. The first three areas reflect student affairs professionals' direct work with students; the fourth area concerns their many and varied interactions with faculty and staff outside of student affairs and especially their service on institutional committees and task forces. While each area is different in emphasis, the interpersonal and relational nature of almost all of this work creates opportunities for exercising and modeling principled leadership on both the individual and group levels. And despite the fact that the work of most student affairs divisions and their organizational structure make it easy to respond to student needs and interests by bridging gaps between the various constituent groups on campus (students, student affairs, faculty, administrators, and staff), relatively few student affairs professionals view their work with persons outside of their domain or their service on institutional committees as opportunities to model transformative leadership.

Therefore, by more carefully examining their professional practices, and the values and beliefs that support those practices, student affairs professionals can better position themselves to more effectively utilize their resources and assets in designing purposeful learning communities that encourage leadership development, fuel organizational transformation, and ultimately contribute to social change.

Service Delivery

Service delivery encompasses essential functions such as admissions processing, orientation, residence hall programming, and distributing financial aid awards to students, as well as auxiliary functions such as the bookstore and food services. Inherent in effective service delivery are two complementary sets of principles: (1) understanding the needs of others, and (2) having competence in delivering services. Take two rather mundane examples: (a) A student store that stocks African-American hair care products is collaborating with institutional efforts for meeting the needs of all of its community members; and (b) A financial aid office that distributes funding-assistance checks in time for students to meet tuition and fee payment deadlines is participating in a thoughtfully coordinated division of institutional labor.

While such examples may seem trivial to the overall operation of the institution, they nevertheless provide opportunities to model many of our individual and group principles of leadership. Contrast these with practices that ignore individual differences – such as having no kosher options in the cafeteria for Jewish students – which demonstrate a lack of *empathy* and a lack of *competence* in serving the diverse needs of students and colleagues. In other words, how students are served by their student affairs staff communicates values such as empathy and competence and models a set of beliefs about individual and organizational leadership. Thus, the more *self-aware* and *empathic* student affairs professionals can be in serving their students, the more the students are encouraged to emulate these same qualities and to become principle-centered leaders who can effectively exercise individual and group leadership qualities.

Student-Directed Activities

Student-directed activities provide many avenues for students to engage with the institution and with each other. These include intramural sports, student organizations, student government, and campus clubs, to name just a few. Clearly, as students become involved with such activities and programs, they are presented with increased opportunities for integrating their academic learning with their lives outside of the classroom. In doing so, their leadership potential is expanded through enhanced self-awareness and competence. By directing their own social, cultural, educational, recreational, health, and spiritual-related activities, students can also practice *commitment* to developing *shared purposes*, develop *competence* in effecting a *division of labor*, and be challenged to interact *authentically* and with integrity as they learn to reconcile *disagreements with respect*. The insight and meaning that students derive from these self-directed activities set the stage for life-long learning and motivates them to develop leadership capacities in themselves and others.

By advising and supervising students in such activities, student affairs professionals openly invest in students' abilities to learn through self-reflection, a process that facilitates not only individual leadership development, but also group learning and renewal. If student affairs staff are too quick to intervene in student activities, even when programmatic failure is likely, they arrest student development by not allowing the individual and group principles of leadership to play out in a relatively safe learning environment. If student affairs staff can demonstrate patience and empathy for the leadership process as it unfolds, students will be more likely to reflect and incorporate these values themselves.

Since student affairs professionals strive to integrate the curricular and co-curricular realms of learning, they are educators who focus on students' holistic development.

Integrated Learning

While faculty are generally considered to be the primary educators of students, the roles and responsibilities of student affairs professionals include the active facilitation of students' social, emotional, physical, spiritual, and cognitive growth. In other words, they strive to integrate the curricular and co-curricular realms of learning. Student affairs professionals, then, are quite accurately defined as educators who focus on students' holistic development in terms of academic skills and knowledge, interpersonal communication abilities, and sense of connectedness – both to the campus community as well as to the societal community at large.

Being a student affairs educator involves a philosophical perspective and a way of interacting with students, and with faculty, staff, administrators, and the community that occurs through a variety of services, programs, and activities. It is a frame of reference that strives to build the capacities of individuals and organizations, and that can communicate both subtly and intentionally the core values of leadership.

Having the mindset of an educator provides a *shared purpose* for the role of student affairs professionals which integrates the cognitive and affective aspects of the college experience. This role combines specific academic or curricular support programs such as academic advising or tutorial services with community building through residential living or service-learning programs. A few examples of diverse ways of being a student affairs educator: a tutor who provides academic support for athletes; a career services professional who helps students locate an internship; an orientation program director who designs social activities for students to meet new friends; and the ropes challenge course facilitator who builds trust that bonds together the elected representatives of student government. Each such moment in institutional life offers opportunities for educational modeling and for facilitating the development of conflict-resolution skills, team-building skills, tolerance for difference, communication skills, reflective questioning, problem-solving skills, analysis of information and context, critical thinking skills, and so forth. In essence, these are the kinds of knowledge and abilities student affairs staff should attempt to exemplify as educational leaders not only in their work with students, but also with other constituent groups, in the expectation that graduates will subsequently model the same qualities in the community in their roles as professionals, family members, and citizens.

However, even when student affairs staff see themselves as educators, their beliefs about students' capabilities may inhibit student development. In this sense, the development of students' leadership skills is shaped not just by the opportunities student affairs staff provide through services and programming, but also by their views about the appropriate roles and responsibilities of students. For instance, how do student affairs staff feel personally and collectively about students serving as trustees of the institution? How do they feel about students monitoring their own judicial processes such as in cases of cheating or plagiarism? Are students allowed to independently operate their own on-campus living

environments? How much are students trusted to take responsibility for their own learning, governance, recreation, and spiritual lives? How are these beliefs played out in the interactions that student affairs staff have with students, and in their policies and programs?

Institutional Governance

Except for those who happen to hold high ranking administrative positions, most student affairs practitioners probably do not see themselves as participants in institutional “governance,” much less as institutional “leaders.” The fact of the matter, however, is that student affairs staff at all levels are increasingly involved in institutional governance through their participation in all sorts of committees and task forces. In most colleges and universities, it is now standard practice to involve student affairs staff in virtually any group that has planning or policy-making responsibility, especially if the group is dealing with an issue that bears directly on students. Beyond this, the work of student affairs staff frequently puts them in a position to affect policy and to initiate transformative change. Take just one example: student assessment. In most institutions, student affairs professionals have assumed responsibility for most major student assessment programs, including assessment of entering students and various follow-up surveys that assess student learning, satisfaction, and perceptions of the college experience. The data produced by these surveys has enormous potential as a tool for demonstrating the need for institutional change.

Whether or not student affairs professionals demonstrate transformative leadership depends, in large part, on their beliefs about what leadership role they might be able to play.

Whether or not student affairs professionals utilize such opportunities to demonstrate transformative leadership depends in large part on their *beliefs* about who they are and what leadership role they might be able to play in the larger institution: Are we limited in our abilities as non-faculty members to affect the culture of the institution? Is it appropriate for us to initiate new ideas for curricular reform and revision, or do we believe this is solely the purview of faculty and the administration? How might the choices and decisions we make individually and programmatically differ from our current experiences if we believed that anyone (student, faculty, staff, administrator, student affairs professional) could rightfully and effectively initiate change and transformation?

Another way of looking at these issues would be for student affairs staff to pose for themselves the following questions: How can we fully empower our students, unless we fully empower ourselves? Is it enough merely to encourage and support leadership development in students, or do we need to model it within the institution in new and creative ways, whether in our role as educators or as participants in governance? Since modeling leadership in these new ways may well require some significant shifts in the traditional beliefs and practices of student affairs practitioners, in the next two sections we will offer specific suggestions for developing and modeling transforming leadership.

The Role of Beliefs

Student affairs professionals have both assets and constraints that affect their ability to initiate change within our institutions and to facilitate leadership development of students. Many constraints exist in the *minds* of student affairs practitioners, and operate on both individual and professional levels. Given that the typical college or university provides so many opportunities for student affairs practitioners to get involved in group activities that can facilitate the development of their leadership skills, the greatest obstacle to participation may be their *beliefs*. These beliefs, in turn, shape their behaviors within the institution and help to co-create the cultures of the institutions in which they work.

Just as there is a direct relationship between our individual beliefs and the individual actions we choose, so do our *shared* beliefs shape institutional structures, policies, and practices. For example, if student affairs professionals believe that they can make a difference in the lives of students, then their interactions with students and faculty and their other daily work activities will reflect that belief. On the other hand, if the institutional culture is characterized by a belief that the work of the student affairs division is not related to the learning enterprise, then the institution will develop academic governance structures and policies that reflect a peripheral role for student affairs professionals.

Many current structures and policies within our institutions relegate student affairs professionals to the margins in discussions about learning, in part because there is a shared belief that teaching is the sole province of faculty and that learning occurs only within the classroom. This type of

institutional culture constrains student affairs professionals and ultimately limits their ability to be institutional leaders. The first step in contending with such limiting beliefs, of course, is simply to become *conscious* of them and of their constraining effects on individual and group behavior.

While beliefs can sometimes be liberating, most beliefs tend to be limiting, e.g., “it is not my job to lead change efforts unless I happen to hold a formal leadership position.” Perhaps the most limiting beliefs, however, are those based on feelings of disempowerment – where student affairs staff assume either that they lack the requisite expertise and experience to effect meaningful change or that their institutions do not value or even want their input or involvement in shared governance. Table 1 lists some of the limiting beliefs that can prevent student affairs staff from

Table 1: Constraining Beliefs in Student Affairs

Individual Internal Beliefs	Individual External Actions	Implications for Individual Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My perspectives and ideas would not be taken seriously by others at this institution • The work I do is not appreciated within the institution • I'm a second-class citizen within the institution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual staff members do not speak their mind or share their perspectives at meetings • Staff members do not ask to participate in institutional decisions or institutional forums • Individual staff members do not attempt to influence the institution's values, future plans, or goals 	<p>Individual members lose opportunities to model and develop individual qualities of leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-knowledge is distorted by constraining beliefs • Commitment becomes difficult because one is suppressing one's passion and not sharing perspectives • Opportunities to develop competence and empathy are diminished
Group Internal Beliefs	Group External Actions	Implications for Group Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work of student affairs is peripheral to the main work of the academy • Student affairs professionals are “service providers” rather than educators • Learning happens mainly in the classroom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student affairs staff are generally not included in discussions of “academic” issues • Resource allocation does not reflect the contribution of the student affairs division • The administrative structure leaves student affairs out of the academic “loop” 	<p>Implications for group qualities of leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration is diminished • Opportunities to develop shared purpose and to disagree with respect are reduced • The learning environment is hindered because individual knowledge is not shared with group

taking advantage of opportunities to initiate or participate in change efforts or to otherwise develop their own leadership skills. As was done in the preceding two chapters, we have arranged these beliefs according to Ken Wilber's (1998) fourfold scheme, which interfaces interior/exterior with individual/group. Since beliefs are *interior* events, they are located in the two left-hand quadrants, with the individual student affairs practitioner's beliefs appearing in the upper-left (psychological) quadrant and their shared beliefs appearing in the lower-left (cultural) quadrant. The two right-hand quadrants show the *exterior* correlates of these beliefs, with the individual practitioner's *actions* appearing in the upper-right (behavioral) quadrant and the collective *group behavior* and associated institutional *programs* appearing in the lower-right (social) quadrant. We now turn to a discussion of beliefs that either constrain or facilitate the development and modeling of leadership qualities among student affairs professionals.

Constraining Beliefs

We shall start with constraining beliefs, first from the individual perspective and then from the perspective of the institutional culture.

Individual Constraining Beliefs

Individual beliefs lead to individual external actions. For example, when student affairs professionals believe that they are "less important" than faculty, they will tend to defer to faculty in meetings and generally remain passive. Similarly, if they believe that their perspectives are not valued by the institution, they will tend not to speak their minds or to share their views in meetings. Such beliefs may also lead student affairs practitioners to assume that they have "no right" to participate in institutional decisions or forums, thereby reducing the chances that they will become involved in efforts to influence the institution's values, future plans, or goals. Such a situation creates a loss for both the students and the institution, because it discourages student affairs staff from modeling leadership and from participating in institutional leadership activities. In other words, constraining beliefs can cause student affairs professionals to avoid initiating or participating in change efforts within the institution, a reaction which severely limits their capacity to model and practice

institutional leadership. Consider the consequences of such beliefs for our leadership principles:

- *Knowledge of self* becomes distorted, because student affairs professionals come to underestimate their capacity to lead and to model leadership for others.
- *Commitment* is withheld, because student affairs practitioners feel disempowered (“why bother?”).
- *Competence* is diminished, because student affairs practitioners bypass precious opportunities to practice institutional leadership.

Such self-limiting professional behavior also teaches students to limit their own potential for leadership in the institution. Thus, if a resident director models a sense of powerlessness and diminished *commitment* to the institution, students in the residence hall will be more likely to display similar behavior. If the students thus think that their actions do not make a difference, they may hesitate to commit themselves to the *shared purpose* of their residential community and will be less likely to see themselves as leaders within that community. In other words, to engage in leadership activities requires a sense of personal efficacy: if one does not engage, one cannot lead.

Self-limiting professional behavior teaches students to limit their own potential for leadership.

For student affairs professionals, the key to confronting such a dilemma can be found in two of our leadership principles: *authenticity* – which means speaking out when there is a perceived need for change – and *commitment* – which means being willing to invest the time and energy required to initiate and sustain a change effort. Further, since *self-knowledge* is another critical quality in the practice of leadership, if individuals are unable (or believe they are unable) to share their talents, then they inhibit the development of self-understanding. In other words, we come to know ourselves through relationships with others in our communities. As we interact with our communities, self-knowledge increases through the sharing of our talents and gifts. If these capacities are withheld, self-knowledge is diminished.

Group Constraining Beliefs

Individual beliefs often become group beliefs that characterize the community of student affairs professionals. For example, in 1987, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) released *A Perspective on Student Affairs*, a publication which demonstrates how individual beliefs may be reflected in a professional statement. The 1987 statement models both constraining beliefs and strengthening beliefs. In the former instance, the group belief of marginality took the following form:

The academic mission of the institution is preeminent. Colleges and universities organize their primary activities around the academic experience: the curriculum, the library, the classroom, and the laboratory. The work of student affairs should not compete with and cannot substitute for that academic experience. As a partner in the educational enterprise, student affairs enhances and supports the academic missions.

NASPA, 1989; p. 9

This perspective on the field of student affairs is much different from earlier philosophical statements written in 1937 and 1949 that reflected a strong belief that student affairs educators are actively engaged in the holistic learning and development of students. Therefore, if a sufficient number of individuals within a division or a profession believe that their work is not valued or is secondary to the primary learning function of higher education, then the institution will reinforce this belief, and the professionals' actions, as they relate to learning, will be constrained. This mutually shaping reality creates structures that discourage student affairs professionals from engaging in conversations about institutional leadership, and keeps their perspectives and knowledge from being used to improve the learning environment.

There are two major negative implications that this shared group belief and the resulting structures and policies have for leadership development. First, when an institution creates structures and practices that reinforce isolation and territoriality, opportunities for *collaboration* are decreased. This not only diminishes the leadership role that student affairs staff can play, but also impairs their ability to develop their students'

leadership capacities. Since students learn from what faculty and staff do individually and institutionally, opportunities are lost to model collaboration across boundaries, which is an essential skill for leadership. Instead of learning how to collaborate with others, students watch student affairs staff defend their boundaries and experience a fragmentation in both thinking and action. In effect, this absence of collaboration also limits the number of opportunities student affairs practitioners have to practice and model *disagreement with respect*.

Second, the critical group leadership quality *disagreement with respect* is difficult to model if people do not talk to each other. Some colleges and universities have an informal rank ordering of “who counts” in the institution. For example, if we believe that faculty are central to the educational mission and that student affairs professionals are not, then faculty may not think to include student affairs staff when planning general education reforms. Further, faculty may not respect the information that a student affairs member contributes to a strategic planning committee. The result is that such institutions fail to capitalize on the diverse talents and perspectives of any constituency that is not recognized as part of the leadership that is fundamental to creating sound learning environments.

Student affairs educators can enhance their own effectiveness through empowering beliefs.

Empowering Beliefs

Just as some beliefs can constrain and restrict individual action and institutional policies and structures, there are others that actually empower and enhance academic work. As with the constraining beliefs, they operate on both individual and group levels. This section will describe some of the empowering beliefs held by student affairs professionals.

Individual Empowering Beliefs

One empowering individual belief is that student affairs educators can make a difference in the lives of students. In fact, this belief is often cited as the reason why people pursue careers in student affairs. This faith in their own capacity to enhance student development comes from years of feedback concerning the effect that student affairs professionals have had on students' lives.

Another empowering belief is that student affairs professionals are here to facilitate the holistic development of students. This work with the “whole” student is intended to integrate students’ course-based learning with opportunities to practice leadership and other skills, thus combining the emotional, cognitive, physical, and spiritual domains of students’ lives.

Attention paid to the “whole student” integrates course-based learning with opportunities to practice leadership.

When these beliefs are actualized into day-to-day interactions, student affairs professionals can demonstrate a powerful personal *commitment* to students and reinforce students’ belief that they can make a difference. Additional opportunities are created for students to practice the development of leadership through tutoring, leading student government, and representing the students’ voice and interests on academic committees. In other words, the way student affairs professionals do their work will facilitate student leadership development when it models *commitment, empathy, and understanding of others*.

Another empowering belief for many student affairs professionals is the notion that they can be creative and innovative with their work. Indeed, one potential *advantage* of being marginalized by their institutions is that student affairs professionals can enjoy a good deal of discretionary freedom over their own departments and programs because their activities are not closely scrutinized. This clears the way to develop pockets of innovation that support and facilitate the development of students. For example, career center staff may take it upon themselves to work with like-minded faculty to develop service learning courses or internships for students without feeling that they first have to seek “approval” from the central administration.

Group Empowering Beliefs

Any individual empowering belief has the potential to become a cultural (i.e., shared) belief which can, in turn, serve as a basis for developing a *shared purpose* and a *collaborative* vision of the work of student affairs professionals within the institution. Such a common purpose could be grounded, for example, in beliefs such as those originally expressed in the early Student Personnel *Points of View* from 1937 and 1949 (NASPA, 1989). Learning, in these statements, is defined in its broadest sense by encompassing a holistic view of the individual, together with a

philosophy of education and learning instead of a narrow vision of the field of “student affairs.” Thus, the statements reinforce the value of integrating scholarship with the domains of intellectual, emotional, social, and physical development.

Specifically, the 1949 Student Personnel *Points of View* statement centers on a vision for facilitating the development of leadership, citizenship, and values in students. For many contemporary practitioners, this vision has evolved to include a variety of other shared beliefs such as the valuing of diversity and educational equity and teaching students how to live in and value community. These values derive from the belief that appreciation of diversity and community and a commitment to equity are critical to the development of citizen leaders who can contribute effectively to our society. By embracing these shared group beliefs, student affairs professionals are encouraged to make every effort to consciously model *collaboration, disagreement with respect, empathy, shared purpose*, and other community building skills not only to their students, but also in their work with faculty, academic administrators, and other staff.

Most professionals within the field of student affairs believe that learning should be student-centered and that they should be actively engaged in facilitating and integrating learning on college campuses (American College Personnel Association, 1994; Allen & Garb, 1993; Baxter Magolda, 1996). A formal expression of such a student-centered approach is set forth in the recent publication, *Student Learning as Student Affairs Work: Responding to Our Imperative* (NASPA, 1989).

Similar shared beliefs are expressed through mission statements developed within divisions of student affairs across the country. They can be further reinforced through regional and national meetings as well as local divisional meetings, discussions, assessments, and retreats which emphasize the multi-faceted nature of the work of student affairs practitioners and the multiple roles they fulfill, whether as integrators of learning, facilitators of student activities, or service providers.

Table 2 provides a visual representation of how empowering individual and group beliefs and actions of student affairs’ professionals can help develop their leadership capabilities. The contrast between the con-

straints articulated in Table 1 and the empowering beliefs articulated in Table 2 highlights how important the *culture* (i.e., shared belief systems) can be for student affairs professionals, not only for their morale, but also for their professional effectiveness in developing individual and group leadership qualities in themselves and their students.

Table 2: Empowering Beliefs in Student Affairs		
Individual Internal Beliefs	Individual External Actions	Implications for Individual Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can make a difference in individual students' lives • Student learning and development should be viewed holistically and individually • I can be creative and innovative in my work with students and colleagues • I am a full partner with faculty in facilitating student development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual staff members are proactive in their work with students and colleagues • Student affairs staff regularly promote an integrated/holistic perspective in their dealings with faculty • Student affairs staff take the initiative to promote student learning by proposing and trying out new approaches 	<p>Promotes the following individual leadership qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-knowledge (i.e., of one's capabilities) • Commitment (i.e., to making a difference in students' lives and to serving as institutional leaders) • Authenticity (i.e., by modeling core values to students and faculty) • Collaboration (i.e., reaching out to faculty and staff colleagues)
Group Internal Beliefs	Group External Actions	Implications for Group Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student affairs are partners with faculty in promoting the holistic development of students • Student learning occurs outside the classroom, as well as within. Education should be student-centered • Equity and diversity are high priorities • Community is a critical part of effective education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional mission statements articulate the importance of holistic development • Teaching and mentoring receive significant weight in the faculty reward system • Student affairs sponsors workshops, seminars, and classes on diversity and equity for students and staff • Student affairs builds collaboration into its work with students and other employees in the institution • Student affairs creates learning opportunities and experiences that facilitate holistic development of students 	<p>The following group leadership qualities are modeled and reinforced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration and division of labor (i.e., in working actively with faculty and staff to implement a holistic approach to student learning) • Shared purpose and commitment (i.e., in the consistent support shown for a holistic approach and for the values of diversity, equity, and community) • Group learning is enhanced when faculty, staff and students work together

Prospects for the Future

We believe that there are several very promising trends both in student affairs and in higher education in general that offer tremendous opportunities for student affairs practitioners to practice leadership and to develop their leadership potential for the overall benefit of the institution. Here are just a few of the trends which are enabling the student affairs profession to take a more active role in institutional transformation:

- Service learning
- Institution-wide leadership-development programs
- Community service activities
- Living/learning communities
- Campus retention initiatives
- “Accountability” and the use of student “outcomes assessment”
- Efforts by universities to become more “student centered”
- The growing emphasis on civic responsibility
- “Freshman 101” courses

The fact that the use of such programs and activities is on the increase suggests that there are changes occurring within higher education that present student affairs professionals with excellent opportunities to collaborate more frequently and more effectively with faculty and other institutional personnel in campus change efforts. By capitalizing fully on these opportunities, student affairs professionals can create new forms of collaborative relationships with faculty and other groups that will enhance the holistic development of students. Among other things, such collaborations can contribute to the current effort to shift the pedagogical focus in higher education away from teaching and instruction and more in the direction of student learning and development (Allen & Garb, 1993).

Implementing the Leadership Principles

How, then, can student affairs practitioners begin the challenging work of implementing the leadership principles in their daily work? One approach that holds a good deal of promise is known as “functional coordination” (Jones, 1998), a concept which uses clearly defined insti-

*Student affairs
practioners can
take the initiative
to create collabora -
tive change efforts.*

tutional needs – e.g., to reduce student attrition – as a basis for creating *collaborative* agendas of *shared purpose* which connect people across different parts of the institution. The coordination might take the form of an ad hoc committee or task force involving faculty, administration, students, student affairs, and possibly other staff. Such a collectivity can then provide a vehicle for modeling the individual and group principles of transformational leadership. In contrast to traditional hierarchical administrative structures, which are concerned primarily with management and maintenance of day-to-day institutional operations, functional coordination is a horizontal approach to transformation which uses clearly recognized problems and needs as a basis for forming collaborative alliances among interested parties. The collaborative framework can be designed to be either temporary or permanent, depending upon the particular problem or issue. While such collaborations can be created in top-down fashion, there is no reason why they cannot also evolve as grassroots efforts. In other words, student affairs practitioners can take the initiative to create such collaborative efforts. (For a detailed discussion of issues related to the formation and operation of collaborative leadership groups, see the next chapter, pp. 75-80.)

Functional coordination works most effectively when it brings together people from student and academic affairs. For example, an effort to address the institution's high attrition rate might bring together diverse individuals and organizational units such as the admissions and orientation directors, faculty and teaching assistants from introductory general education courses, remedial instructors, the counseling and health centers, housing staff, academic advisors, and student peer mentors and advisors. The recognized need to reduce attrition and to increase retention provides the conceptual nucleus for the assembled group's *shared purpose*, but the tricky and often contentious details on *how* to achieve the desired ends – including an appropriate *division of labor* – need to be worked out collaboratively and in an atmosphere characterized by *authenticity, empathy, and disagreement with respect*. Given the difficulty and complexity of the attrition problem (and, indeed, of most other institutional problems), it is important to view the assembled group as a *learning environment*, where each member learns from the others and where creative approaches to the problem are developed through collaborative interchanges among the diverse members.

The individual and group principles of transformational leadership can be applied to an almost limitless number of other change efforts that could be initiated by student affairs professionals. Such initiatives might include increasing participation in community service and service learning, improving the campus climate for diversity, integrating multicultural issues in the classroom, developing residence theme halls connected to academic programs, better supporting the needs of adult learners and commuter students, providing intentional leadership-development programs that are housed in academic departments, and so forth.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have attempted to point out that the capacity of student affairs practitioners for the exercise of transformative leadership on the campus is far greater than is usually recognized, even within the student affairs community. Our analysis suggests that there are several major points that student affairs professionals might want to keep in mind as they consider becoming involved in transformational leadership efforts:

- In their work with students, student affairs personnel are presented with many opportunities to *model* the principles of transformative leadership.
- Although there are also many ways that student affairs staff can initiate and participate in transformational leadership efforts within the larger institution, these opportunities tend to be underutilized.
- Whether student affairs professionals are able to realize their full potential as initiators and participants in institutional change efforts depends heavily on their *beliefs* about themselves, the institutional culture, and their “proper” role in the institution.
- Constraining beliefs that tend to inhibit participation include the notion that student affairs professionals “lack power” because their work and their views are not respected by others, the idea that “student” affairs is necessarily separate and distinct from “academic” affairs, and negative stereotypes about the faculty’s relative “lack of interest” in students. Such beliefs severely limit the capacity of student affairs staff to manifest *commitment* to change efforts, to demonstrate *empathy* for persons outside of student affairs, and to develop *self-knowledge* and leadership *competence*.

- Empowering beliefs that can enhance participation in transformational leadership efforts include the realization that student affairs professionals *can* make a substantial contribution to the student's learning and development, that they have an important perspective to bring to deliberations on institutional policy and practice, that they have the freedom and the expertise to initiate institutional change, and that they can become full partners with faculty and academic administrators in transformational leadership efforts. Such beliefs greatly enhance the odds that student affairs professionals will become involved in *collaborative* leadership initiatives, identify *shared purposes* with other institutional colleagues, practice the leadership qualities of *empathy*, *division of labor*, and *disagreement with respect*, enhance their *self-knowledge* and leadership *competence*, and sustain their *commitment* to the change effort.

One final observation: when it comes to the exercise of transformative leadership, one of the real strengths of the student affairs culture is that most of its members are already committed to most of the leadership principles as outlined in Chapter 2. In other words, most student affairs administrators and staff will not take much “persuading” when it comes to the importance of such things as *collaboration*, *empathy*, *self-knowledge*, *authenticity*, *commitment*, and *disagreement with respect*, much less leadership development and social change. Under these conditions, the possibilities for achieving *commitment* to *collective action* on behalf of a *shared purpose* would seem to be especially powerful within the student affairs community.

Chapter 6

College Presidents as Leaders of Institutional Change

In this chapter we discuss the implications of the conceptual principles for the chief executive officers of colleges and universities. While the focus throughout is on the institutional president or chancellor, much of the discussion can apply as well to any other high-ranking administrator who has line responsibility for the work of others. In other words, if the reader were to substitute “vice-president,” “provost,” “dean,” or similar titles whenever “president” or “CEO” appears, most of the discussion will still apply.

College presidents¹ present an interesting challenge in attempting to apply our conceptual framework, for at least two reasons: (1) there is no generally agreed-upon job description for CEOs in higher education, and (2) the expectations and responsibilities of the CEO can vary widely from one institutional context to another. Institutional context, in turn, has at least two aspects that need to be taken into account: the *type* of institution and its particular mission, and the immediate *circumstances* under which the CEO has to operate. Is the institution financially secure and running smoothly, or is it experiencing some sort of crisis? Is the CEO an incumbent with significant tenure in office, or has she recently been installed in office? In articulating the implications of our conceptual principles, we will make every effort to focus on implications that have broad generalizability across different institutional types and contexts, but we will also attempt to highlight those institutional situations where the relevance of certain principles may be problematic.

¹ Since the chief executive officers of colleges and universities are usually called “presidents” and, less frequently, “chancellors,” we will use the terms “president” and “CEO” interchangeably.

The Job of the President

It is useful to view the work of the college president as comprising at least two different but complementary roles: a *symbolic* role and a *functional* role. Given our emphasis on collaboration and change, we shall focus our attention in this chapter on the various functional roles that presidents can play. However, it should be noted in passing that those who have written on the subject of the presidency have characterized the symbolic role of the CEO in a variety of ways: “celebrity” or “merchandizer of good will” (Kauffman, 1982); “representative” (Monson, 1967); and “symbolic leader” (Green, 1997). We shall have more to say about the CEO’s symbolic role in the section on Modeling the Principles (see pages 83-86).

Practically all of the relevant “leadership tasks” that college presidents perform are interpersonal in nature.

When it comes to the president’s functional role, even a cursory reading of the literature on the college presidency will show that the list of functions that college presidents can be called upon to perform is a very long and diverse one: fundraising, public relations, consultation, budgeting, planning, articulating a “vision,” crisis management, mediation, staff development, consensus-building, and so on. Cohen and March’s (1974) assertion that there is “no well-defined model of the presidential job” is further reflected in the variety of functional “roles” that the college president can play: team leader, coalition builder, futurist, or “knowledge executive” (Green, 1997); caretaker, empire builder, hero builder, or scholar-leader (Kauffman, 1982); visionary, interpreter, communicator, money manager, “zoo keeper,” or “diplomat-healer” (Monson, 1967); “super-entrepreneur” (Baldrige, 1971); the person who “defines reality” (O’Toole, 1995); and “balancer” (Shapiro, 1998).

So where does this leave us? If college and university presidents are expected to perform all these functions and can be called upon to play so many different roles, how is it possible to develop a generic description of the “work” that they do? Since our focus here is on leadership, one way to approach this problem is to limit our analysis to those presidential functions that clearly require the exercise of leadership skills, and to classify these functions in terms of the particular leadership skills or qualities that they require. However, since our leadership model relies on *collaboration*, practically all of the relevant “leadership tasks” that college presidents are called upon to perform are *interpersonal* in nature. Under

these conditions, it becomes possible to organize the “leadership work” that college presidents perform in terms of the *people* – individuals and groups – with whom the college president interacts. In addition, since we are primarily interested in *transformative* leadership – i.e., change-oriented leadership – we can limit our analysis to those constituencies with whom the president ordinarily interacts in order to effect *change*. Following is a list of such constituencies, together with examples of some typical change issues that would involve each one:

Constituency	Change Issue
Faculty	Reform the general education curriculum
Students	Reduce alcohol abuse
Trustees	Reduce chronic operating deficit
Local community leaders	Improve relations with the community
Student affairs staff	Strengthen ties to the academic program
Other staff	Improve morale

How do CEOs typically approach such issues of institutional change or transformation? Perhaps the *least* common strategy would be a “top-down,” “command and control” approach where the CEO simply *orders* others to change their ways of doing things. Aside from the practical reality that such an approach is likely to fail because it would tend to generate a great deal of resentment and resistance, it would also run against the grain of academe’s longstanding tradition of “shared governance.” Further, it goes without saying that such an approach would directly violate our basic leadership principles of *collaboration* and *common purpose* and make it very difficult for others to model the principles of *authenticity*, *commitment*, and *disagreement with respect*.

Given that transformative change necessarily involves other people, the obvious alternative to simply giving orders would be some sort of *collaboration* where the CEO selects and appoints one or more groups that carry out the planning and implementation collectively. Before addressing the specifics of how CEOs might go about selecting a leadership group, let us first consider the various circumstances under which the CEO might perceive a *need* for such a group.

The Genesis of the Change Initiative

How the CEO structures and orients the leadership group and the role that she decides to play in that group will depend in part on how and why the change initiative evolved. There are at least three distinctively different institutional scenarios for the development of change initiatives, and each of these has potential implications for how the CEO structures the leadership group and what roles he chooses to play in the process.

Presidential Initiatives

All transformational changes efforts will require some form of active involvement on the part of the CEO.

In a sense, all transformational change efforts will ultimately require some form of active involvement on the part of the CEO. What we have in mind here are change efforts that *originate* in the mind of the CEO and that are not viewed as reactions to specific events that appear to require some institutional response. Since such initiatives would not be “missed” if the CEO did not take them, presidential initiatives are to a certain extent gratuitous.

Ideally, CEO-initiated efforts at institutional change are an expression of the president’s personal aspirations for the institution. Virtually all heads of higher education institutions have hopes and dreams for their institutions, visions of how the college or university can grow, develop, and improve. One of the usual responsibilities of the college president is to articulate this vision, not only to the academic community, but also to the trustees, the alumni, the local community, and the public in general. Since such a “vision” is, in essence, a statement of personal *values*, there are at least two of the principles from our leadership model that come into play when the CEO endeavors to articulate a vision for the institution: *authenticity* and *self-awareness*.

Let’s start with *authenticity*. If the president is unwilling or unable to be authentic in expressing her most deeply felt concerns, hopes, and dreams for the institution, the vision she articulates may well sound pro forma, banal, hollow, or otherwise unconvincing. While such a vision may be all right for an address at the local Rotary Club luncheon, it provides a flimsy conceptual basis for developing a significant transformation effort and is not likely to inspire others in the institution to get behind such an effort. And even greater difficulties may lie ahead if the CEO is able

to sell others in the institution on an inauthentic vision. People who get behind the change effort may soon discover that their time and energies are being wasted because there is really no “support from the top.” Sooner or later, the CEO who has succeeded in persuading others to rally around an inauthentic vision will be “found out,” and the resulting lack of trust and cynicism will make it very difficult to govern effectively, much less to mount any other change efforts.

Similar problems await CEOs who have limited *self-understanding*. At the most basic level, poor self-awareness makes it very difficult for CEOs to be authentic, simply because they will not be able to articulate a vision that reflects their most deeply felt values if they are not clear about what these values really are. One “safe” strategy for dealing with such a lack of self-awareness is simply to *avoid* undertaking any effort at significant institutional change. When a CEO who has adopted such a strategy is forced by circumstances to respond to others’ demand for change, the resulting change effort may well end up being misdirected because the CEO has been pressured into embracing *someone else’s* vision and values.

Change in Response to Internal Pressures

There are few days in the work life of the typical college president when someone in the institution is not asking for something. While these requests typically involve specific favors for individuals, departments, or other campus units, not infrequently they also suggest or imply the need for significant institutional change. Regardless of whether such requests come from faculty, student groups, or administrative colleagues, from the point of view of the CEO they can often constitute a kind of double-edged sword, especially if they are either made publicly or presented in the form of “demands.” On the one hand, a CEO who has a clear sense of institutional mission and purpose (i.e., who is *self-aware*) and who is interested in facilitating significant institutional reform may be able to use such a request as a launching pad to initiate needed reforms. On the other hand, a CEO who simply wants to pacify or “cool out” those who are making the request may be tempted either to: (1) undertake precipitous actions which are not in the best interests of the institution; or (2) exacerbate the tension either through inaction or by embracing some form of token response which fails to deal with the underlying issues.

The latter form of response, of course, is much more likely to occur among those CEOs who have difficulty being *authentic* or who are unclear about their personal values and institutional vision (i.e., those whose *self-understanding* is limited). CEOs with limited self-understanding can also fall prey to a kind of self-delusion, where they temporarily pacify those who are seeking change by promising genuine reforms which seem “appropriate” and “reasonable” at the moment, but which are never really acted upon. This lack of follow-through can occur when the real (but unrecognized) intent of the CEO is to relieve the pressure to take action or simply to be seen as a “good guy” by promising to give the requestors what they are asking. The promised reforms never materialize, either because the CEO lacks the conviction and the *commitment* to follow through or because the reforms are not based on a realistic understanding of institutional resources, politics, and capabilities (i.e., the CEO lacks *competence*). Perhaps the most serious long-run consequences of such a response are the growth of institutional cynicism and the erosion of trust in the CEO.

Change in Response to External Pressure

External pressures frequently present an opportunity to initiate significant institutional reforms.

External pressures to undertake significant institutional reforms typically come from governmental bodies or from the local community where the college or university is located. Governing boards of public institutions also operate much like “governmental bodies,” and, from the viewpoint of most people in private institutions, the trustees are also considered to be an “external” group.

For CEOs whose *authenticity*, *self-understanding*, or *competence* (i.e., institutional knowledge) is limited, the risks involved in responding to pressures from such external groups are very much like the risks already described with respect to internal pressures. However, when it comes to pressures from external agencies, these risks can be compounded when the pressures involve cost cutting or being more “fiscally responsible” or “accountable.” In other words, poorly-conceived attempts either to reduce spending or to impose some new form of “assessment” or “evaluation” can have serious negative consequences for faculty and staff morale and, ultimately, for the quality of education. One strategy that will tend to minimize such consequences is for the CEO to take a *collaborative* approach in devising a plan that responds to such pressures,

where the task of deciding how to respond is shared by all members of the academic community, and especially by those who are most likely to be affected by the plan.

But perhaps the most interesting aspect of external pressures is that they frequently present an *opportunity* to initiate significant institutional reforms. One of the major obstacles to change initiatives that are primarily CEO-initiated (above) is that it may prove difficult to mobilize much institutional energy and support behind the change effort because it will be seen by some as gratuitous: “if it ain’t broke, why do we need to fix it?” However, in the case of demands from external authorities for change, there is usually an awareness within the academic community that *something* needs to be done. Here is where the CEO who is trusted by her colleagues, and who has articulated a clearly defined sense of institutional mission and purpose, can mobilize a collaborative leadership effort to respond to the external pressures in ways that will further that mission and purpose.

Forming a Leadership Group

Once the “change issue” has been identified (at least in a general sense), the first task for the CEO is to create a “leadership group” that can begin to develop plans and strategies for addressing the issue. We use the phrase “leadership group” to underscore the fact that any group that is involved with institutional change or transformation is, in effect, performing a leadership function. In this connection, college administrators who appoint such groups might want to consider calling them “leadership groups” rather than “committees” or “task forces.”

Any group that is involved with institutional change or transformation is performing a leadership function.

Most CEOs, of course, have a standing leadership group – the president’s cabinet – and for certain kinds of change efforts this body might well be the group of choice. However, since the cabinet is most often preoccupied with issues of “governance” – i.e., maintenance and management of day-to-day operations – in cases of transformative change it is often more appropriate to form an ad hoc group that can be charged with the task of planning and guiding the specific change effort (such ad hoc groups, of course, might well include members of the president’s cabinet).

However the group is formed, it is important to realize that, in selecting the members and charging them with responsibility for designing the change effort, the CEO is speaking both “to” and “through” the group to the larger academic community. Since the “messages” that are implied in the selection of group members and in the charge given to the group will be seen as expressions of the CEO’s personal values and aspirations for the institution, the effectiveness of presidential decisions about the group’s composition and purpose will be enhanced by reliance on at least four principles from our leadership model: *self-awareness* (Does the CEO have a clear understanding of her personal values and intentions for the institution?), *authenticity* (Are the CEO’s choices consistent with these values and intents?), *empathy* and *understanding of others* (To what extent do the CEO’s choices reflect an awareness and understanding of the larger academic community’s needs, concerns, and hopes for the institution?).

The decision to form a leadership group raises a number of issues:

- How large should the group be?
- How should it be composed?
- What role should the CEO play?
- How should the group be oriented to the task?
- How much time should the group be given to do its job?
- What resources should be made available?

While the CEO can simply decide on the answers to such questions on his own, our principle of *collaboration* suggests that it might be helpful to involve other trusted colleagues in the decision-making process. Further, while our suggested approach to some of these questions (see below) might seem self-evident, the potential importance of how and why the leadership group is formed and of how it is oriented to its task prompts us to include at least some discussion of each question.

Size

While a collaborative leadership group could, in theory, be as small as two members, very large groups pose a real challenge to implementing certain principles in the model. Developing a *shared purpose*, in particular, might

become very difficult if the group becomes too large. Perhaps the ideal working group is one that is large enough to incorporate a diversity of talents and points of view, but small enough to hold conversations where every member has an opportunity to contribute and to be a full participant. If addressing the leadership issue adequately requires a great many participants, then it might be worthwhile to consider forming several subgroups.

Composition

We have already suggested that the selection of group members conveys an important “value message” to the larger academic community. Many academic leaders are inclined to structure committees and task forces primarily from a *political* perspective, where the main emphasis is on how the group *appears* to various constituencies within the academic community. Members are thus picked primarily on the basis of the constituencies they are expected to “represent” (departments, schools, ranks, genders, races, students, staff, trustees, alumni, administration, union, etc.). A potential problem with such an approach is that group members who see themselves as “representing” a particular constituency may act in a competitive or adversarial fashion – looking out for the interests of “my” people, ensuring that some other constituency doesn’t get favored treatment – thus making it very difficult for the group to develop a *shared purpose* and to function *collaboratively*.

The selection of group members sends an important “value message” to the academic community.

While the CEO obviously cannot ignore completely such political considerations in forming the leadership group, we believe that it is critical to take into account at least two other factors in selecting group members:

- (1) *Competence* – does the candidate for membership in the group possess needed knowledge or expertise which would contribute significantly to the group’s task and complement the knowledge and expertise of other group members? and
- (2) *Values* – are the candidate’s values consistent with the intended change effort? Achieving an appropriate mix of expertise within the leadership group is clearly important in attempting to achieving a meaningful *division of labor* and, ultimately, in developing a workable plan for the change effort. At the same time, having a group whose members share certain basic values that are consonant with the goals of the change effort will greatly facilitate the attainment of a *shared purpose* within the group.

Role of the President

While this discussion has proceeded on the assumption that it is the president or CEO who is taking the initiative to form the leadership group, what role the CEO ends up playing once the group has been appointed will depend to a certain extent on factors such as the size and mission of the institution and the nature of the change effort being undertaken. For example, if the task is to reform the general education curriculum, the CEO of a small liberal arts college would probably be much more inclined to play an active role within the group than would the CEO of a large research university. On the other hand, if the change issue is to work with trustees to reduce or eliminate a chronic annual operating deficit, the CEO might well play an active role in the leadership group regardless of the type of institution.

One advantage of being a regular participant in the group deliberations is that the CEO can thereby obviate the need to play the sometimes difficult and politically sensitive role of “reviewer” or “receiver” of the group’s final product. Another, perhaps more important advantage is that it can help to break down the artificial division that so frequently exists between those who develop recommendations for change (the leadership group) and those who are in a position to authorize the implementation of the recommendations (the top administration). Those of us who have worked in academe for any period of time are all too familiar with the following scenario: a committee or task force works diligently and creatively to produce a report which subsequently generates no action or, at best, elicits a recommendation from the top administration for “further study” of the problem. Having the CEO as a regular member of the group also helps to avoid recommendations that are fiscally unfeasible or otherwise unworkable from an administrative point of view. Another advantage of being a regular group member is that the CEO would have an opportunity to introduce the group to the leadership model over a period of time and to work directly with the other group members to facilitate its implementation. Our discussion of group functioning (below) assumes that the CEO is, in fact, a member of the group.

Active participation by the CEO in the leadership group, however, is not without its potential problems. First and foremost is the reality that other group members will be well aware of the status and a power differential that exists between the CEO and other members. While our model is

indeed collaborative and nonhierarchical, there is no avoiding the fact that at least some group members will be inclined to relate to the CEO as an authority or as someone who has disproportionate power. (Even if the CEO does not become a regular participant, there may well be other status and power differentials within the group that need to be acknowledged and dealt with.) Probably the most effective way to prevent these differentials from becoming obstacles is, first, to treat them in an *authentic* fashion, which for the CEO, means to acknowledge them openly, and for the other members, to share their concerns about them. Then, in a collaborative fashion, the group should be in a better position to decide collectively on the best means for preventing these status and power differentials from impeding effective group functioning. In addition to modeling a “follower” role whenever possible, there are at least two specific things the CEO can do to facilitate this process: (1) to be alert to situations when group members appear to be treating the CEO as “the president” rather than just another group member, and to share these perceptions with each other – i.e., to model *authenticity* – and (2) to encourage others to be likewise authentic by pointing out when the CEO is *acting* like “the president.”

Orienting the Group

This is obviously a critical part of the leadership process, since it can have a major impact on how the group goes about its task and, ultimately, on its effectiveness. Among other things, this orientation process could be used to familiarize the group with the principles of the leadership model and to encourage it to operate according to these principles. If we could single out one weakness in the way we typically use ad hoc committees and task forces in academe, it would be the neglect of *process*: new groups seldom devote enough time and reflective thought to the issue of *how the group is to function*. We believe that the basic principles in our conceptual framework (Chapter 2) provide a useful set of guidelines for the leadership group’s *modus operandi*.

Another potential use of this orientation process could be to clarify the relationship between the group’s work and the institutional decision-making process. What will happen to the group’s final report? What has to happen before the recommendations can be implemented? Will further review be required? By whom? How will the report be disseminated?

Should the report include a detailed implementation plan? What role, if any, will the group play in disseminating the report and implementing the recommendations? Should the resource implications of the proposed changes be spelled out in the report? What resources, if any, will be made available for implementation? In the spirit of *collaboration*, it may well be desirable to involve the group directly in deliberating such questions. The most important thing, of course, is that some effort be made to clarify or discuss these issues very early on in the group process.

Developing a shared purpose can often consume a good deal of group time and energy.

In orienting the group to the leadership model, it is helpful to stress the importance of developing a *shared purpose*, and to point out that this particular principle can often take a good deal of group time and energy to realize. It may also be useful to remind the group about the importance of “processing” during the group’s deliberations, which means remaining mindful of the model’s principles – *authenticity, empathy, and disagreement with respect*, in particular – and of the need to discuss openly the extent to which group members are actually modeling these principles during their deliberations.

Time and Resources

Since most groups comprised of busy people function more effectively and efficiently when their work is carried out in conjunction with specific timetables and deadlines, the CEO can probably facilitate the work of the group by being specific about such things as the number and timing of meetings, expected completion dates, and anticipated workload for group members. Given that the CEO’s expectations and assumptions might be viewed as unrealistic by other group members, it is helpful if discussions about these matters are conducted with a good deal of authenticity and *disagreement with respect* on the part of all parties. If the workload is substantial, consideration might be given to releasing group members from some of their other responsibilities. It may also be appropriate to provide the group with its own budget to cover such things as meals, travel, communications, office supplies, consultants, graduate assistants, and secretarial assistance. Again, the CEO might well want to consider involving the group members collaboratively in the decision making with respect to such matters as timing and budget.

The Role of Beliefs

In each of the preceding three chapters we have used Ken Wilber's (1998) fourfold classification scheme – interior/exterior versus individual/group – to illustrate the powerful influence that individual and group beliefs can have on the practice of transformational leadership. We have chosen not to treat beliefs in exactly the same way in this chapter, primarily because for the CEO there is no “peer group” at the institution that is comparable to what exists in the case of students, faculty, and student affairs professionals. The president may well have a peer group comprising presidents at other similar institutions, but at any given institution there really is no “presidential culture” because the president really has no peer. (This fact no doubt accounts for the “loneliness” experienced by many college presidents; see Kauffman, 1982).

This is not to say that the president's peer group of other CEOs does not have its own “culture,” or that this culture does not embrace a particular set of shared beliefs. Indeed, from the perspective of this monograph, this presidential culture is relevant in at least two respects: (1) What implications do the shared beliefs of the culture have for the practice of transformational leadership? and (2) How conscious is the president of these cultural beliefs and of their impact on his own conduct? (i.e., How *self-aware* is the CEO?)

While each president probably has a unique subculture of peers, the types of cultural beliefs that are most likely to have implications for any individual president's capacity to practice transformative leadership would include the following:

- Presidential careers: What is a “normal” term of office? What is the “expected career trajectory” for a president? Is it expected that presidents should always seek to be “upwardly mobile?” Such beliefs have potential implications, for example, for the degree of *commitment* to the institution's future that the president is able to manifest.
- Risk-taking: Are presidents who are willing to take risks on behalf of institutional transformation viewed by their peers with admiration and respect, or is significant risk-taking seen as foolhardy and “unpresidential?”

- Presidential success: Are the most “successful” presidents those who manage to govern without experiencing significant problems or conflicts on the campus or without “making waves?” What role, if any, does the ability to facilitate transformative change play in defining success?

The president must ask, “What role does the ability to facilitate change play in defining my success?”

But the CEO’s most significant beliefs usually have to do with the *institution* – its mission, faculty, students, trustees, alumni, and local community, not to mention its problems, prospects, and potentials. Perhaps the greatest *self-awareness* challenge for any CEO is to be fully conscious of these beliefs and of their effects on his policies and actions. Following is just a brief sampling of beliefs that can inhibit the CEO’s ability to model the principles of transformative leadership:

- I have no real power or influence on this campus; most of the power is vested in the faculty (or trustees).
- We really can’t undertake any significant change efforts because we lack the needed resources.
- Real change is impossible around here because the faculty is too stuck in its ways.

By contrast, consider the implications for transformative leadership of the following kinds of beliefs:

- This institution has enormous untapped resources in the intellectual and creative talents of its faculty, the dedication and experience of its staff, and the energy and abilities of its students.
- There are plenty of people on this faculty and staff who care deeply about this institution and who could be engaged in collaborative efforts directed toward institutional transformation.
- Even my severest critics on the faculty might have something useful to contribute to a transformational change effort.
- Many faculty, students, and staff will find that they actually *enjoy* collaborative leadership once they have had an opportunity to experience it.

To summarize briefly: The primary “belief challenge” for the CEO is: (1) to identify beliefs that may be dysfunctional to the transformative leadership process, examine them critically, and consider changing them or replacing them with more functional beliefs; and (2) to identify beliefs that are congruent with the change initiatives and build on them.

Modeling the Principles

Perhaps the best way for the CEO to facilitate implementation of the leadership principles across the campus is to *model* these principles, not just in his own functioning as a leadership group member, but also in his other daily activities. In many respects this “symbolic” modeling can be just as important as any specific policies or practices that the president implements. Assuming that it is the CEO who is initiating the change effort, and given the power/status differential that he represents to other group members, the CEO is in a unique position to serve as a “living exemplar” of the leadership model.

*“Symbolic”
modeling can be
just as important
as specific policies
and practices.*

Collaboration. This is an especially challenging principle for the CEO to promote within the leadership group, given that the other group members, at least in the early stages of group functioning, will almost certainly be attuned to the CEO’s greater power and status. On the one hand, if the CEO is too assertive or too forceful in expressing her viewpoint, some group members may hesitate to express differing views (i.e., to be *authentic*), while others may find it difficult to sustain any kind of *commitment* because they feel that their ideas will not be valued. On the other hand, if the CEO is too passive, the sense of trust that is so critical to *collaboration* may be impaired because group members may assume that the CEO is either being *inauthentic* (i.e., not sharing his views or plans openly with the group), or sitting back quietly and “evaluating” or “judging” the performance of others. While the line between these two extremes can be a fine one for *any* group member to walk, the CEO’s differential power and status suggests that there is more to be gained if she makes a special effort to find that line, to be an active and engaged group participant without seeming to dominate the group deliberations, and to be a good listener who is *empathic* and able to accept *respectful disagreement* from others.

Authenticity. While personal *authenticity* on the part of the CEO facilitates the development of trust, both inside and outside the academic community, it is in many respects the most difficult and challenging of all the leadership principles to model. The basic problem is that the CEO must deal with a great many internal and external constituencies, and that these constituencies typically have widely varying and sometimes even conflicting priorities and values. Being authentic in dealings with the students, for example, may require the president to say or do things that could offend certain legislators, trustees, or even faculty.

Loss of trust is a heavy price to pay.

How, then, is the president to balance and adjudicate these potential conflicts without alienating one or more of these constituencies? Perhaps the most *inauthentic* approach is simply to “tell them what they want to hear.” While this approach may satisfy most constituent groups in the short run, over the long-term the inauthentic president will almost certainly be “found out,” first by those with whom he works closely, and ultimately by other groups as well. The resulting loss of trust – “He seldom delivers on his promises,” “Does she really stand for *anything?*” – is a heavy price to pay.

While it is clearly unrealistic for the CEO to expect to be able to model *authenticity* in a way that will keep all constituent groups equally well satisfied, our leadership model embraces several other principles that bear directly on this dilemma. First is *self-knowledge*. If the CEO has a clear sense of his own values and of how they connect to his institution’s mission and purpose, and if he has taken advantage of each opportunity to articulate these values and purposes consistently to each of the various constituencies with whom he has to deal – i.e., if he has modeled *authenticity* in what he *says* – then he will be in a much stronger position to model *authenticity* in what he *does*. This is not to suggest that his policies and actions will please each constituency equally, or even that they will not substantially displease some. But even those who might be displeased by the president’s actions will probably not be very surprised – the president is, after all, merely being consistent. Further, the fact that the president is being true to his most deeply felt values and sense of institutional mission is likely to generate a certain amount of respect, even among those who might disagree with his policies and actions.

A second principle that applies directly to the problem of dealing with multiple constituencies is presidential *competence*. The sine qua non of *competence* for the CEO of any college or university is to be *knowledgeable* about the institution: its history, traditions, programs, problems, finances, physical plant, faculty, staff, students, trustees, local community, and political constituencies. One way to develop such knowledge of cause, is to exercise a good deal of *empathy* in an effort to develop an *understanding of others'* concerns, needs, and hopes for the institution. Students, faculty, and staff possess a great deal of valuable knowledge about the institution – its problems, its strengths, and weaknesses – and empathic listening is often the best way to acquire some of that knowledge. Ironically, a key part of the process of becoming knowledgeable about the institution is for the CEO to be open (*authentic*) with others about what he *doesn't* know (*self-knowledge*), and to be willing to listen and learn from others who know more about the institution. It can be particularly useful to learn how others view the institution – its problems and prospects, their hopes and dreams for the institution – which suggests the exercise of still another principle from our leadership model: *understanding of others*. In short, the kind of *competence* described here will enable the CEO not only to establish policies and initiate changes that are feasible and consistent with her values and sense of institutional mission and purpose, but also to explain and defend these policies and practices to constituents who may disagree with them.

Disagreement with respect. This is another leadership principle that CEOs may find difficult to model, for at least two reasons. In the case of disagreements with students, faculty, or staff, the president's greater power and status can be threatening and intimidating, a consequence which, in turn, tends to inhibit *authenticity* in others and makes true *collaboration* very difficult. In the case of trustees, legislators, and other "authorities," presidents who air their disagreements authentically run the risk of being viewed as insubordinate. One way to minimize such negative consequences and to articulate disagreements authentically and respectfully is to rely on still another principle from the leadership model: *empathy*. If the CEO takes the trouble to *understand* the other person's viewpoint – the values and assumptions that underlie that person's position – then it becomes much easier to express and *explain* an opposing point of view respectfully and in terms that the other person can understand.

A president who is being true to her most deeply felt values and sense of institutional mission is likely to generate respect, even among those who might disagree with her policies or actions.

Empathy/understanding of others is an especially important quality for CEOs to cultivate, given the many different and sometimes competing or conflicting constituencies with which she has to deal. *The cultivation of empathy is facilitated, first, by having at least some regular contact with each constituency and, second, by being a good listener.* At the same time, what the CEO can learn by listening empathically to each constituency can be extremely useful in the cultivation of presidential *competence*.

The cultivation of empathy is facilitated by contact with others... and by listening.

But perhaps the most important “modeling” that the president does is in relation to her closest administrative colleagues – those who usually constitute what is variously known as the president’s executive staff or “cabinet.” These colleagues, who usually include the vice-presidents for academic, student, and fiscal affairs and – in the larger institutions – the deans of the various schools, are directly involved with key personnel in *every part of the institution*. Moreover, each of these individuals typically has his or her *own* “cabinet” whose members, in turn, work directly with most of the key personnel across the entire institution. Thus, in most colleges and universities there are only two, or at most three, “degrees of separation” between the president and all of the other key people in the institution, including students. Note the direct consequences here for presidential *authenticity*: are the president’s public pronouncements and policies consistent with what the cabinet member tells his or her own cabinet about the CEO’s personal conduct?

In short, if the president is able to model the principles of transformative leadership in her dealings with her cabinet and if she openly advocates that cabinet members do the same with *their* immediate colleagues, she could well create a ripple effect that can transform the culture of an entire institution.

Chapter 7

We Have the Power and the Opportunity to Transform Our Institutions

“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.”

—MARGARET MEAD

In this monograph we have described how faculty, students, student affairs professionals, presidents, and other administrators can apply the principles of transformative leadership to bring about positive change in their institutions and, ultimately, in the larger society. The principles can also enrich the professional life of any individual who chooses to apply them in his or her daily work. Our ultimate goal, of course, is to serve society by creating more effective institutions and to create better places for each one of us to work in. In short, applying the principles of transformative leadership will help to create a genuine community of learners; an environment where students, faculty, and administrators can benefit personally and also contribute to the common good.

Transformative work involves many personal and organizational challenges.

Since it was written in part to generate discussion among those who care about the future of our academic communities and the well-being of our society, this book is intended to serve both as an invitation and as a stimulus. Our hope is that it will help us to think and converse more deeply about the challenges of leadership and about how our academic behavior is forcefully shaped by our beliefs and expectations.

We recognize that, in doing *transformative work*, we face *numerous personal and organizational challenges*. Indeed, when we make a commitment to practicing the type of leadership discussed in the earlier chapters, we

Inherent in many of our “limitations” and “constraints” are some of our greatest opportunities for transformative change.

also necessarily open ourselves to questioning some of our most cherished individual habits and long-standing institutional traditions. We have stressed the importance of *beliefs*—our individual and collective notions about what is true, what is good, what is important, and what is possible—because confronting our most deeply held beliefs is an essential first step in exercising transformative leadership. We understand that this step is a difficult one to initiate because our academic culture is, in large part, defined by such beliefs. Perhaps our most limiting beliefs are concerned with what is *possible*. “It’s impossible to get anything done around here,” “The faculty will never change its way of doing things,” “Academics could never apply the principles in Chapter 2 in their work,” and so on. However, confronting such beliefs honestly opens the way for us to clarify *why* we act and react the way we do. It also enables us to become more conscious of *how* our habitual ways of thinking, feeling, and responding ultimately shape our institutions, our community, and our society. Most importantly, once we recognize the constraints imposed by our current beliefs and habits and by the organizational structures that emanate from them, we can begin to open our minds and hearts to one of higher education’s greatest paradoxes: inherent in many of our “limitations” and “constraints” are some of our greatest opportunities and potentials for transformative change.

While many higher education leaders believe that most of our problems could be solved if we could simply avail ourselves of greater financial resources, we believe that the resources that are most vital for transformative change are readily available both within and all around us. These include our individual personal “resources” of academic freedom, autonomy, critical thinking, and a willingness to challenge, and our institutional “resources” of new starts, celebrations, and mission.

Personal “Resources”

We turn now to a discussion of personal “resources” that can facilitate implementation of the principles of transformative leadership: autonomy, critical thinking, academic freedom, and a willingness to challenge.

Autonomy

The autonomy that most academics enjoy and the individual traditions of academic freedom and critical thinking are often seen as sources of resistance to transformative change. However, in the context of our Principles of Transformative Leadership (Chapter 2), these same qualities can be viewed as potential facilitators of change. Autonomy is the sine qua non of academic culture. Many professionals, in fact, are attracted to a c ademic life primarily because it embraces a great deal of autonomy – the freedom to think, reflect, engage oneself with ideas, and speak openly, coupled with a good deal of discretionary freedom in how we allocate our time. Many of the same freedoms are enjoyed by students, especially those whose basic sustenance needs are covered by parents and financial aid.

While autonomy can be misused to isolate us from our community, it is also one of our greatest potential assets in that it can allow us, and even encourage us, to initiate change. The great potential of autonomy for facilitating the practice of transformative leadership is that it affords all members of the academic community the freedom to undertake *initia - tives*. Both faculty and student affairs professionals, for example, have the freedom to organize colleagues on behalf of institutional change. Similarly, students have the freedom to organize for change: in recent years we have seen how students' collective demands for curricular and other institutional change have prompted faculty and administrators to reexamine curricular content, pedagogy, and student life in general (Astin, Astin, Bayer, & Bisconti, 1975). Student activism has led to changes in course offerings and alterations in teaching behavior that are intended to make students' educational experiences more integrated; more relevant; and, thus, more effective in promoting their personal and academic development. The autonomy that students enjoy and their freedom and willingness to question and challenge institutional practices have also played an important part in the development of entirely new areas of course offerings such as women's studies and ethnic studies.

While autonomy can be misused, it is also one of our greatest potential assets for initiating change.

Critical Thinking, and a Willingness to Challenge

A traditional value in the academic community is the right, indeed the obligation, to challenge ideas and to raise questions. These traditions can, of course, be seen as obstacles to change, given our tendency to

look at change proposals in terms of their defects and given our willingness to share our critical appraisals with each other. However, rather than simply serving to maintain the status quo, our penchant for critical thinking can also become a tremendously valuable asset for those who desire to practice transformative leadership. We believe that the key to using our critical thinking skills in this way is to practice the Principles of Transformative Leadership outlined in Chapter 2.

One principle that can play a pivotal role in using our critical skills to enhance the change process is *shared purpose*. On the one hand, our willingness to challenge, discuss, and debate can be critical in arriving at some agreement about *what needs changing* and *why*. On the other hand, once the leadership group has agreed on a common purpose, critical thinking skills can be invaluable in devising the most effective *strategies* for change. Clearly, our ability to use our critical thinking skills in this way will depend on our willingness to practice the other leadership principles, in particular, *disagreement with respect*, *authenticity*, *empathy*, and *commitment*. Critical thinking, moreover, can be extremely helpful in ensuring that the leadership group is, in fact, practicing the principles:

- Is each of us really being *authentic*?
- Are we being *empathic* and *respectful* when we disagree with each other?
- How much *commitment* is each of us really showing?
- Are we functioning *collaboratively*?
- Have we effected a meaningful and equitable *division of labor*?

Institutional “Resources”

While institutional rituals and traditions are often regarded as obstacles to change, they can also be seen as *opportunities* to *initiate* change. In particular, there are three types of traditions that can actually facilitate the practice of transformative leadership: new starts, celebrations, and statements of institutional mission.

New Starts

Higher education is characterized by a “new start” with the advent of each new academic year as well as at the beginning of each academic term. Our administrative structures also reflect the inherent value we place on renewal. One of our common practices, for example, is to rotate formal leadership responsibilities at the departmental and/or divisional/school level. Presidents or chancellors also commonly appoint deans to finite, rather than indefinite, terms of office.

We see these practices as evidence of the value that colleges and universities place on change and renewal in academic life. Each of these new starts, in turn, provides us with opportunities to reexamine our overall practices and to introduce the principles of transformative leadership, whether we are faculty with a new department chair, newly elected members of the student government, or a CEO who is reorganizing her cabinet at the beginning of the new academic year. Such renewals always present opportunities to consider our *common purpose*, to evaluate the extent of our *self-knowledge*, *competence*, and *division of labor*, to examine our willingness to be *authentic*, *collaborative*, *empathic*, to *disagree with respect*, and to reassess our level of *commitment*.

A new academic year and administrative transitions signal opportunities for renewal and change.

Whether we are students, faculty, student affairs professionals, or administrators, we can take advantage of such opportunities to work collectively to change those policies and practices that are not effectively serving our institution and its people, our surrounding community, and our society at large. In other words, new academic years and administrative leadership transitions signal natural times for renewal and change. Such occasions also present individual members of the academic community with an opportunity to enhance *self-knowledge*. “What would I like to see changed?” “How would I like to see it changed?” “Why is this type of change important to me?” “Who else might feel the same way?” “What can I do to start the process?” “What can *we* do to make our vision a reality?”

Perhaps the most direct way to take advantage of the opportunities provided by “new starts” is to bring together like-minded peers and colleagues to discuss the principles of transformative leadership. By collectively agreeing on a *shared purpose*, the leadership group can begin to

focus its efforts on initiating change and to determine a plan of action and a division of labor for achieving the desired changes. The desired changes could cover any of a wide range of issues, from how faculty review each other for promotion or how resources are allocated to departments and units to how students are admitted or how governance responsibilities are assigned in residence halls.

Celebrations

Public events and celebrations can be used to build a sense of community and shared purpose.

Most institutions of higher education build into their annual calendars a number of occasions for the entire community to come together for celebration and renewal: convocations, annual faculty or staff retreats, registration and orientation, recognition and award ceremonies, and commencement, to name but a few. Few other organizations have so many opportunities in the span of a year to engage all their members in productive work and renewal activities while they celebrate. Each such occasion presents opportunities to introduce or reaffirm the qualities of transformative leadership. Presidents, deans, and other positional leaders can use these public celebratory events to evoke feelings of belonging, pride, and responsibility among members of the campus community, to refocus attention on the community's *shared purposes*, and to encourage individuals to reconnect with each other and to become *collaboratively* engaged in the process of transformative leadership. Faculty, student affairs professionals, and students can follow their administrators' leads in evoking *commitment* to these same principles among individuals within their classes, academic units, or residence halls.

Faculty retreats, staff development seminars, and community stakeholder meetings can also be used to promote the leadership values and principles described in this book. Whereas these occasions have often been used simply as forums for the delivery of formal reports and speeches, by applying the principles of transformative leadership, these same events can be used instead to facilitate interactive dialogues that encourage discussion and the development of plans for collaborative action to address issues that concern the entire campus community. When all community members can become engaged contributors to the process of change, they naturally develop greater *commitment* and investment in that process and its potential outcomes. And as engagement and investment grow within individual members of the community, the likelihood of transformative change increases exponentially.

Institutional Mission

While many students, faculty, and staff may not be very knowledgeable about their institution's formal statement of mission or purpose, the substance of many such statements can provide a powerful "license" to initiate transformative change and to practice our leadership principles. While there are clearly no "quick fixes" to transforming our institutions, it is also important to remember that our college or university mission statement can provide a kind of conceptual launching pad to initiate change. Well-articulated mission statements frequently provide us with a set of values and ideals that complement and sometimes even restate our principles of transformative leadership, especially the qualities of *self-knowledge*, *authenticity*, *competence*, *commitment*, *empathy*, and *collaboration*.

While statements of institutional mission vary to some extent depending on the institution's history and type, they typically espouse values such as honesty, character, civic responsibility, citizenship, service, and leadership. In theory, such qualities define the ideal academic community, one that provides a model environment that supports the discovery, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge and promotes the preparation of well-educated, responsible citizens of high character. If such statements are to be taken seriously, they challenge each of us as members of the academic community to model these qualities and to find creative ways to bring these ideals to life in our daily activities and interactions with others. As Plater (1999) suggests, mission statements "link the work of the individual and the work of the institution" (p.163). Viewed this way, the campus mission statement provides a flexible, yet ever-present, reminder of the importance of collective reflection in directing and refining our chosen paths of action within the institution.

Using Transformative Leadership at the Personal and Collective Level

As a reader of this book and as a member of the academic community who may be interested in becoming a transformative leader, here are some things you might want to keep in mind as you consider embarking on the path of transformative leadership:

- Like-minded fellow travelers make the journey easier. Attempts to change one's behavior are most successful when reinforced by others who share some of your personal values. In some respects, this book advocates relinquishing an addiction to power and power politics because such addictions are, in the long run, *disempowering* for most members of the academic community. Moreover, having regular conversations with people who share your goals and frustrations can increase *self-awareness* and strengthen *commitment*.
- Small interventions can pay big dividends. Simply changing the way that committee meetings are structured and conducted on a campus can result in a new awareness that promotes *collaboration, empathy, disagreement with respect*, and the development of a *learning environment*. Such grassroots changes can permeate an organization and eventually affect the entire culture. Another powerful advantage of "small successes" is that they can be very important in sustaining each individual's *commitment* to the change process.
- Change efforts should be tied to recognized needs and priorities. It is important to find leverage points in an academic organization where the impact of a new way of working will most likely be noticed and, therefore, most effective. High profile efforts or critical situations that have not been successfully handled with traditional methods offer great opportunities to demonstrate the effectiveness of new leadership qualities. Being alert for such opportunities helps greatly to cultivate a *shared sense of purpose*.
- Resistance is a necessary part of the change process. Just when a critical mass of people begins to practice the transformative leadership principles is when those who do not yet understand the change effort are most likely to react strongly. They may become very vocal, insisting strenuously on maintaining traditional power arrangements and personal prerogatives that they feel are being threatened. By seeing only the resistance, it is easy for a social change agent to lose heart and think about giving up. But these are

the critical times to maintain *commitment*, to hold firm and practice *disagreement with respect* and *empathy* that can, ultimately, move the larger organization toward *collaboration* and *common purpose* and help to create a true *learning environment*.

- Practicing transformative leadership is a never-ending process. The time frame for changing an organizational culture is always measured in years, not weeks or months. Maintaining one's *commitment* to the practice of transformative leadership is thus very challenging because measurable outcomes may take a long time to materialize. Another way to look at this issue is to focus also on the *means* (the process). In one sense, then, "success" can be attained simply by continuing to practice the principles.

Some Final Practical Suggestions

We conclude by sharing a few ideas about how to begin an institutional conversation about transformative leadership, how to apply the principles within an academic or administrative unit of the institution, and how to apply the principles within our various professional associations.

Beginning the Conversation

- Sections of this book could be made available to students as they begin their orientation to college.
- The topic of leadership could be introduced as a common theme for freshman seminars on the campus.
- Faculty could discuss their reactions to the leadership principles described in this book as a part of a fall retreat.
- The president or other top administrators could devote the first cabinet meeting to a discussion of the principles, or make periodic "leadership audits" a regular part of the cabinet agenda.
- Student affairs staff could organize "Introduction to Campus Leadership Opportunities" sessions during fall orientation week.
- Students could agree to practice the ideas in this book in their next study group or group class assignment.

- Individual students could look for examples of transformative leadership (or *lack* thereof) in their residence halls, on the job, or in the actions of their professors or administrators.
- Individual students could reflect on how the principles of leadership described in this book are validated or challenged by what they read or learn in history, sociology, psychology, or business classes.
- The principles could be the central topic for discussion at a meeting of the campus general education committee.
- Scholarships could be provided for students who serve the campus by exemplifying the leadership principles.
- Admissions materials could underscore the expectation of leadership as an everyday activity on the campus.
- Grassroots leaders from the community who exemplify some of the principles could be recognized and honored for their contributions, just as financial benefactors are honored.
- The student newspaper could run a feature on “leadership in action” that provides real life examples of people or groups that exemplify the individual and group leadership practices described in this book.
- Commencement speakers could be encouraged to use their graduation address to speak to the importance of collaborative leadership in our society.

Applying the Principles in an Academic Department or Administrative Office

- The principles of leadership described in this book could be discussed in depth for possible adoption as “professional practice” for departmental meetings and daily interactions between colleagues.
- A full meeting of an academic department could be devoted to considering how these principles can be applied to interaction with students in the classroom or in advising students.
- A similar meeting could be convened in any *non*academic department that deals with students.
- Alumni of various academic departments could be asked to describe how their experiences in practicing these principles as students have influenced their personal and professional lives after college.

Applying the Principles in Professional Associations

- Since virtually all professional associations in higher education are concerned with “leadership,” the second chapter of this book could be used as a “discussion starter” for a conversation at a national meeting.
- Pre-meeting workshops could be devoted to a consideration of how the principles could be applied in professional practice.
- Positional leaders in the association could evaluate the possibility of establishing standards of “best practice” for the profession based on the principles of transformative leadership.

In sum, each one of us has the power and the opportunity to begin the conversation and to set the process in motion, and each of us can identify peers and colleagues who can *participate in collective work around the practice of transformative leadership*. While the model of transformative leadership that we have proposed is in many respects an idealized one, none of its principles is beyond the capabilities of any member of the academic community. Indeed, the major obstacle to embracing and practicing these principles is not a lack of resources but rather our own limiting *beliefs* about ourselves, our colleagues, and our institutions. What the model challenges us to do is to muster the courage to be more authentic – to more openly acknowledge the limiting beliefs that prevent us from realizing our full creative potential as individuals and as institutions and to take advantage of the many opportunities that our institutions provide us to exercise transformative leadership.

*Each one of us
has the power and
the opportunity to
participate in
collective work
around the practice
of transformative
leadership.*

References

- Allen, K.E., and Garb, E.L., (1993). Reinventing student affairs: Something old and something new. *NASPA Journal*, 30(2), 93-100.
- American College Personnel Association (1994). *The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Astin, A.W. & Astin, H.S. with the assistance of Antonio, A.L., Astin, J., & Cress, C.M. (1999). *Meaning and Spirituality in the Lives of College Faculty*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Astin, A.W., Astin, H.S., Bayer, A.E., & Bisconti, A.S. (1975). *The Power of Protest*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A.W. and Sax, L.J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(3), 251-263.
- Astin, A.W., Sax, L.J., and Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22(2), 187-202.
- Astin, H.S. and Cress, C. (1998). *The Impact of Leadership Programs on Student Development*. UCLA-HERI Technical Report to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Baldrige, V.J. (1971). *Power and Conflict in the University*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Baxter Magolda, M.B. (1996). Cognitive learning and personal development: A false dichotomy. *About Campus*, 1(3), 16-21.

-
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On Becoming a Leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Boyer, E.L. (1996). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Burkhardt, J.C. and Zimmerman-Oster, K. (1999). How does the richest, most widely-educated nation prepare leaders for its future? *Proteus*, 16(2), 9-12.
- Cohen, M. & March, J.G. (1974). *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Eyler, J. and Giles, D.E. (1999). *Where's the Learning in Service Learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goleman, D. (1997). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Green, M.F. (1997). *Transforming Higher Education: Views from Around the World*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *Guidebook for a Social Change Model for Leadership Development*. Los Angeles, CA: Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California.
- Jones, Phillip E. (1988). Student services perspectives from a different point of view: Theory and application of functional coordination. *NASPA Journal*, 25(3), 213-217.
- Kauffman, J.F. (1982). The college presidency – yesterday and today. *Change*, 14, 12-19.
- Levine, A. & Cureton, J.S. (1998). *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Monson, C.H. (1967). Metaphors for the university. *Educational Record*, 48, 22-29.
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (1989). *Points of View*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading Change: Overcoming the Ideology of Comfort and the Tyranny of Custom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pew Policy Perspectives May 1997, 7(2): Knight Higher Education Collaborative, Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.

Plater, W.C. (1999). Habits of living: Engaging the campus as citizen one scholar at a time. In R.G. Bringle, R. Games, and E.A. Malloy, (Eds.), *Colleges and Universities as Citizens* (pp. 141-172). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Rice, R. Eugene (1996). *Making a Place for the New American Scholar*: Working paper series, American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Sax, L.J., Astin, A.W., Korn, W.S., & Gilmartin, S.K. (1999). *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1998-99 HERI Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Sax, L. J., Astin, A.W., Korn, W. S. & Mahoney, K. M. (2000). *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1999*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Shapiro, H.T. (1998). University presidents – then and now. In W.G. Bowen and H.T. Shapiro, (Eds.), *Universities and their Leadership* (pp. 65-114). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Thoms, M. and Blasko, D. (1998). Leadership evaluation report on the leadership institute and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Wilber, K. (1998). *The Eye of the Spirit: An Integral Vision for a World Gone Slightly Mad*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation (1999). *Building Leadership Capacity for the 21st Century: A Report from Global Leadership Scans* Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Zimmerman-Oster, K. and Burkhardt, J.C. (1999). *Leadership in the Making: Impact and Insights from Leadership Development Programs in U.S. Colleges and Universities* Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

About the Authors

Kathleen Allen is currently senior fellow at the University of Maryland's Burns Academy of Leadership. Her work focuses on leadership, human, and organizational development. She is co-author of *Systemic Leadership: Enriching the Meaning of Our Work* and, as president of her own consulting firm, Kathleen Allen Associates, does leadership coaching and organizational transformation.

Alexander Astin is Allan M. Cartter professor of higher education at the University of California, Los Angeles and director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. His current research focuses on student outcomes; educational policy and reform; the civic role of higher education; and the role of values, consciousness, and spirituality in higher education. His latest book is *What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited*.

Helen Astin, a psychologist, is professor of higher education and associate director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. Her research and writings have focused on issues of gender and education and on leadership. She is the author, with Carole Leland, of *Women of Influence, Women of Vision: A Cross-Generational Study of Leaders and Social Change*.

John Burkhardt is program director for Leadership and Higher Education at the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. He is a former Kellogg National Leadership Fellow and served as vice-president for administration at the University of Detroit Mercy. He also serves on the editorial board of the *Journal of Leadership Studies*. His most recent book, written with Kathleen Zimmerman-Oster, is *Leadership in the Making: Impact and Insights from Leadership Development Programs in U.S. Colleges and Universities*.

Christine Cress is assistant professor of Post-secondary, Adult, and Continuing Education at Portland State University and affiliated scholar, Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA. She teaches courses on educational leadership and social change and recently collaborated on a project which assessed educational outcomes of college students' participation in leadership programs.

Robert Flores is professor of Agricultural Education and Communication at California Polytechnic State University. He also serves as the coordinator of curriculum for the California Agricultural Leadership Program and is the former director of the Multi-cultural Agriculture Program at Cal Poly. He has been recognized as a Kellogg National Leadership Fellow and is one of the founders of Visión Unida, a local nonprofit organization devoted to leadership development.

Phillip Jones is vice president for Student Services and dean of students at the University of Iowa. He has created and directed a training institute for Educational Opportunity Program directors across the United States. He serves as consultant on organizational development to create social change in higher education, and regularly teaches a course on social change in education at the University of Iowa.

Nance Lucas is director of the James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership at the University of Maryland and is a faculty member at the National LeaderShape Institute in Illinois. She has served as convenor of the 1997 Global Leadership Week Program and is co-author of *Exploring Leadership: For College Students Who Want to Make a Difference*. Her research and scholarship interests focus on moral and ethical leadership.

Bonnie Pribush is professor of mathematics and director of the Leadership Program at Franklin College of Indiana. She also serves as education director of “Leadership Johnson County” (Indiana). She has conducted numerous workshops for colleges and community organizations on leadership and pedagogy, collaborative leadership, and organizational change. Her current research interest is in multicultural leadership.

William Reckmeyer is professor of Leadership and Systems at San Jose State University. He consults on strategic-change projects with clients in complex organizational, community, and national settings. As a visiting scholar at Harvard University, he helped develop the Harvard Institute for School Leadership. He has served as president of the American Society for Cybernetics and has been a Kellogg National Leadership Fellow.

Bettye Parker Smith is an educator, lecturer, and writer on issues related to African American women writers. She currently serves as provost/vice president for Academic Affairs at Dillard University in New Orleans, Louisiana. Prior to assuming this position, she was vice president and senior program officer for the Florida Educational Fund located in Tampa, Florida. She is co-editor of *Sturdy Black Bridges: Visions of Black Women in Literature*, an anthology on Black women writers.

Kathleen Zimmerman-Oster is assistant professor of Psychology at the University of Detroit Mercy in Detroit, Michigan. She is also the president of TEST, Incorporated (Training, Evaluation, & Survey Technicians). Her research involves the evaluation of leadership-development programs. She is the author, with John Burkhardt, of *Leadership in the Making: Impact and Insights from Leadership Development Programs in U.S. Colleges and Universities*



W.K.KELLOGG
FOUNDATION

One Michigan
Avenue East
Battle Creek, MI
49017-4058
USA
616-968-1611
TDD on site
Telex: 4953028
Facsimile: 616-968-0413
Internet: <http://www.wkkf.org>