



Sacred Heart
UNIVERSITY

Sacred Heart University
DigitalCommons@SHU

Presidential Seminar on the Catholic Intellectual
Tradition

Office of Mission and Catholic Identity

2015

Leadership Development of Faculty in Academia - The Impacts of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition

Michael S. Carriger

Sacred Heart University, carrigerm@sacredheart.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/mission_seminar



Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Carriger, Michael S., "Leadership Development of Faculty in Academia - The Impacts of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition" (2015).
Presidential Seminar on the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. Paper 4.
http://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/mission_seminar/4

This Essay is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Mission and Catholic Identity at DigitalCommons@SHU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Presidential Seminar on the Catholic Intellectual Tradition by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@SHU. For more information, please contact ferribyp@sacredheart.edu.

Leadership Development of Faculty in Academia – The Impacts of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition

Michael S. Carriger, M.S., D.Mgt.
Sacred Heart University
Welch College of Business

Keywords: faculty leadership development, Catholic Intellectual Tradition, leadership development, leadership challenges in academia

Abstract

A fairly recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 12, 2013), by Barden and Curry asked the question, "Faculty members Can Lead, but Will They?" Barden and Curry suggest that, "every professor has the intellectual capacity to understand and embrace the elements of modern leadership necessary to guide institutions in today's higher-education marketplace." But ... is there a dearth of leadership and leadership development opportunities among faculty in the academy? The current research used a survey approach to look at the landscape of leadership development in academia among Catholic, Lutheran, and Secular institutions. The general hypothesis was that Catholic Institutions, incorporating the Catholic Intellectual Tradition and the philosophy of the institutions founding order would show more investment in leadership development than other types of institutions of higher education. Results however indicate that there is a dearth of leadership development across all types of institutions of higher education. Most notably, there is very little in the way of formal leadership development for faculty across all institutions, virtually no institution provides professional development plans for its faculty, funding for leadership development tends to be ad hoc (on a case by case basis) or minimal (less than \$1,000 per faculty annually) at best, and the primary challenges facing all institutions is a lack of interest of faculty taking on leadership roles and difficulty identifying leadership potential. The primary resources used to support leadership development among faculty are national organizations or conferences (such as CIC and ACE). However, secular and Lutheran institutions leverage these more than do Catholic institutions. Perhaps of most concern although virtually no institution incorporates leadership development in their prevailing institutional philosophy, Catholic institutions are much less likely to integrate leadership development in their missions than are secular and Lutheran institutions. The research suggests that the development of a leadership institute, founded on and based in the Catholic Intellectual Tradition, and housed at a Catholic College or University, may be a way to address the state of leadership development among faculty. This may especially be the case if the leadership institute could focus on cost effective and affordable programs, work toward integrating leadership development into institutional mission and philosophy, and work toward generating interest in leadership among faculty.

A fairly recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 12, 2013), by Barden and Curry asked the question, “faculty members can lead, but will they?” Barden and Curry suggest that, “every professor has the intellectual capacity to understand and embrace the elements of modern leadership necessary to guide institutions in today’s higher-education marketplace.” But, are there leadership development opportunities for faculty in academia to support this embrace of the mantle of leadership? The survey research reported here suggests that answer is “no”.

Brown (2001) has suggested, “leadership development is an underutilized strategy at most universities.” The author (Brown, 2001) goes on to describe that lack of leadership development opportunities for chairpersons at a major Canadian University. He notes that most faculty do not believe they need management and leadership development. Most faculty do not aspire to leadership roles and do not see leadership roles in their career paths. This led to a negative view of the chairperson role and reluctance to accept the role. But the chairperson role is unique as a leadership role in that the role is not permanent, rotating among faculty every few years, and the chairperson is viewed by faculty as more of a colleague than a leader. As the primary leadership position a faculty member might take on is the chairperson role, and given the unique nature of the chairperson as leader in academia, leadership development support may be more crucial in academia than it is in industry.

The same issue of lack of leadership development opportunities may pervade the more traditionally viewed leadership roles in academia, deanships. Carriger (2013) reported on an interview with a sitting dean of a smaller liberal arts, Catholic university in the Northeast US who reported that he felt wholly unprepared for his promotion from

the faculty to deanship. The author (Carriger, 2013) goes on to describe what might be learned from industry about leadership development support for both chairpersons and deans. In some respects, the lack of leadership development in the promotion of faculty members to chairs or deanships parallels a common problem in industry when individual contributors are promoted to managerial positions without any management or leadership development support. Newly promoted managers in industry must learn what it means to be a manager: develop interpersonal judgment, gain self-knowledge, and cope with the stress and emotion of leading (Carriger, 2013). The same may be true for faculty in academia. Carriger (2013) concludes, "Many larger universities provide internal resources to support the transition from faculty to administration, and national resources exist to provide professional development to academic leaders ... but more needs to be done to provide academic leaders with the tools they need to be successful in their roles." And this may be particularly the case in smaller colleges and universities that don't have the capacity to develop internal resources or the funds to support attendance at national resources.

Braden and Curry (2013) see this as an ongoing problem in academia. "Colleges and universities looking to recruit leaders from within the faulty ranks will face more and more difficult." The authors (Braden, Curry, 2013) argue that institutional and faculty culture work against leadership development. Taking a leadership position is seen as a demotion, temporary, and sacrificing for the institution (Braden, Curry, 2013; Hancock, 2007). Faculty are suspicious of colleagues seeking leadership positions (Braden, Curry, 2013) and those with an affinity for leadership may not be drawn to academia (Hancock, 2007). Typical academic institutions invest little money in leadership development, with

faculty development generally focused on teaching not leadership (Watson, Grossman, 1994). Faculty with leadership potential and acumen are rarely exposed to strategic issues by academic institutions (Braden, Curry, 2013). This has lead many institutions to fill academic leadership positions with leaders from outside the academy (Braden, Curry, 2013). The irony here being that faculty culture is such that faculty want leadership to emerge from within the faculty ranks, but faculty don't encourage, and often discourage, their peers to develop the skills and knowledge needed to lead (Braden, Curry, 2013; Hancock, 2007).

Hancock (2007) notes that leadership positions are typical administrative roles in academia and more managerial than academic. However, faculty taking these administrative, managerial positions receive no training as managers or leaders. Hancock (2007) raises the interesting question, "if the chair's role requires special training, does it make sense to invest that in someone already highly and successfully trained to do something else?" And, if a faculty member knew specifically about the administrative, managerial, and leadership responsibilities of a chairpersonship, would that faculty member be more or less likely to accept that chairpersonship? (Hancock, 2007).

Finally, Kezar and Lester (2009) note that there is minimal literature or research on faculty leadership and support for faculty leadership. The literature that does exist focuses on formal leadership roles, such as deans and chairs, but not informal grassroots leadership (Kezar, Lester, 2009). Rayner, Fuller, McEwan, and Roberts (2010) echo this conclusion suggesting that "there is limited literature available dealing with leadership and management in the university, and less still with the role of the professor." However, the authors (Rayner, et. al., 2010) note that the professor, at least in the UK university

system, is at the center of the academic hierarchy and is expected to lead. As has been noted by Canadian and US authors above, these authors in the UK find that “a case might be made that the current expectations and career options for all aspiring academics and working professors militate against involvement in active leadership across the institution.” The authors (Rayner, et. al., 2010) conclude that there is little empirical research and little theoretical literature on leadership and management development among faculty in higher education.

But what is required of academic leaders today? Academic leaders must be adept at strategy: assess conditions, anticipate trends, persuade people, make difficult decisions (Barden, Curry, 2013). “Today’s leaders must be idealistic in terms of values and aspirations but pragmatic in terms of decision-making and execution” (Barden, Curry, 2013). But without specific leadership development, faculty members tend to be deductive, working from first principles, rather than inductive, working from the ground up, as academic leadership requires (Barden, Curry, 2013). Not only is leadership development necessary for academic leaders as individuals, but a cultural change at the institutional level may also be necessary to achieve this. Structures are needed to provide development in strategic thinking and leadership and faculty must be encouraged and nurtured for leadership roles (Barden, Curry, 2013).

There are a number of factors working against the development of faculty leaders. “Various factors are making faculty leadership challenging including the rise of part-time and non-tenure-track faculty, the increasing pressure to publish and teach more courses and adopt new technologies and pedagogies, increasing standards for tenure and promotion, ascension of academic capitalism, and heavy service roles for woman and

people of color” (Kezar, Lester, 2009). Academic capitalism refers to the trend for faculty to be required to support or subsidize part or all of their position through grants or outside consulting contracts (Kezar, Lester, 2009). Many of these issues, academic capitalism, rising tenure requirements, increasing publication standards (Rayner, et. al., 2010), increasing teaching loads, expectations about use of technology and innovative pedagogical techniques, take away from leadership activities within the academy (Kezar, Lester, 2009).

An additional cultural pressure against faculty leadership is the culture of becoming a faculty member itself. Becoming a faculty member means working primarily independently and in isolation as a graduate student. This, however, ill-equips the graduate student, now a faculty member, for leadership roles and challenges (Kezar, Lester, 2009).

Kezar and Lester (2009) offer that shared governance, leadership development programs, faculty development programs, and mentoring programs would be necessary to begin to address the faculty leadership issue. However, faculty receive no formal training or participate in shared governance to any appreciable extent, with internal leadership development programs focused almost exclusively on the guild of teaching and informal mentoring (Kezar, Lester, 2009). There are a number of national programs that provide formal leadership development experiences: the American Council on Education (ACE), Higher Education Resource Services (HERS), the Institute for Educational Leadership at Harvard, the Individual Development and Education Assessment Center (IDEA) within ACE (Kezar, Lester, 2009), and the Leadership Enhancement and Development (LEAD)

program (Abdur-Rahman, 2007). However, it is unclear how many financial resources can be applied to attendance at these national programs.

One area where one might expect to find a bit more leadership development among faculty is the Catholic college or university with its emphasis on the Catholic Intellectual tradition. There are 283 Catholic colleges and universities in the US (Steinfels, 2003). Many of these institutions focus on their city, region, history, and founding order. For example, the Jesuit institutions focus on humanism and rigorous learning, the Franciscan and Vincentian institutions focus on charitable service (Steinfels, 2003). However, there is a burgeoning problem of Catholic identity at Catholic colleges and universities (Steinfels, 2003). Is Catholic identity the responsibility of the theology department, campus ministry, the founding religious order? And if the founding religious order also influences the institution's view of leadership, would this impact leadership development of faculty?

The distinctive nature of the Catholic college or university is the integration of Catholic belief into the curriculum and entire operation of the institution itself (Roche, 2003). "A defining aspect of Catholicism is the stress on universalist principles and, with this, an emphasis on community and love" (Roche, 2003). The Catholic college or university is founded on the Catholic principles of the recognition of the divine presence in reality, the sacred moral law, the elevation of tradition and reason, the unity of knowledge, the holistic nature of learning and the learner, and the focus on the liberal arts. One might hypothesize from this that with the dearth of leadership development support in academia, in general, one area one might find leadership development would be within the Catholic Intellectual Tradition housed in the Catholic college or university.

Whereas the majority of the limited research on leadership in academia has focused on the perception of various types of faculty members (full-time, adjunct) as leaders (Ballantyne, Berret, Harst, 2010), leadership styles among faculty at various types of institutions (Bodla, Nawaz, 2010), standards governing educational leadership development at the doctoral level (Twale, Ridenour, 2003), the effectiveness of leadership development and ways to overcome the obstacles to leadership development (Kezar, Lester, 2009), academic chairperson's perception of their role (Hancock, 2007), and leadership development as an organizational development initiative (Turnbull, Edwards, 2005), no research has looked at the prevalence of leadership development particularly among smaller to medium-sized institutions that do not have the resources larger universities do. Additionally, no research has looked at whether the prevalence of leadership development differs across types of institutions, Catholic, secular, and other religiously affiliated schools. The present paper describes survey research aimed at beginning to address this lack of research. The present study was design to assess the prevalence and quality of leadership development, as well as the perceived obstacles to leadership development in small to medium-sized Catholic, secure, and Lutheran colleges and universities. It is hypothesized that although there may be little to no leadership development within these institutions, the prevalence of high quality leadership development would be greater in Catholic institutions, this leadership development would be integrated into the Catholic institutions mission and philosophy, and fewer obstacles would exist in these Catholic institutions to leadership development as compared to secure and other religiously affiliated institutions.

Methods

A survey consisting of 18 questions focused on prevalence, characteristics, and obstacles to leadership development in academia was e-mailed to Provost or Chief Academic Officers at 238 small to medium-sized colleges or universities in the US. Catholic institutions accounted for 125 (52%) of the e-mailed surveys, Lutheran institutions accounted for 42 (18%) of the e-mailed surveys, and secular colleges or universities in the Eastern part of the US accounted for 71 (30%) of the e-mailed surveys. Further, the Catholic colleges or universities were divided by founding order with 13 Benedictine, 7 Lasallian, 18 Dominican, 23 Franciscan, 28 Jesuit, 8 Sisters of Charity, 16 Sisters of Mercy, and 12 Diocesan institutions receiving the invitation to complete the survey.

Survey questions were constructed by the present author and focused on assessing whether the respective institutions offered formal or informal leadership development programs, how much funding was available for leadership development and where the funding resided, which local or national resources, if any, the institution leveraged for leadership development, whether formal development plans existed, what methods of leadership development (mentoring, training, coaching) were employed, if any, how satisfied the institution was with its leadership development, and what challenges, if any, interfered with leadership development. See appendix 1 for the complete survey form.

The survey was implemented through a third-party survey firm, Qualtrics, insuring the anonymity of all respondents. A link to the anonymous survey was e-mailed directly to the Provost or Chief Academic Officer of each institution at his or her institutional e-mail address. Three follow-up reminders to complete the survey were

subsequently e-mailed to each potential respondent, the final reminder coming from the Office of Mission at the present authors current institution.

Both quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted on the survey data. Quantitative analysis consisted of applying a Chi Square statistic to the distribution of responses for Catholic, Lutheran and secular institutions on the categorical questions on the survey and a simple one-way Analysis of Variance comparing the average rating for Catholic, Lutheran, and secular institutions collected from the rating question on the survey. Qualitative analysis consisted of the use of a word count procedure to assess the frequency of various responses for Catholic, Lutheran, and secular institutions on the more open-ended questions on the survey.

Results

Of the 238 invitations to complete the survey that were e-mail, 50 of the Provosts or Chief Academic Officers responded to the survey, a 21% response rate. Responses were received from 27 Catholic colleges or universities, 7 Lutheran colleges or universities, and 16 secular colleges or universities. This distribution of responses significantly differed from random at the 0.01 level of significance. A significantly higher percentage of Catholic colleges or universities responded to the survey.

Of the Catholic colleges or universities, 31% of the Franciscan, 31% of the Sisters of Mercy, 29% of the Lasallian, 29% of the Jesuit, 25% of the Diocesan, 17% of the Dominican, 13% of the Sisters of Charity, and 8% of the Benedictine schools responded to the survey. This distribution of response did not significant differ form random at the 0.05 level of significant. However, as the number of individual institutions for each founding order was quite low (range – 1 to 8) the Catholic institutions were combined and all analyses were focused at the Catholic institution level rather than the founding order level.

Very few colleges or universities had any kind of formalized professional development plans for their faculty interested in pursuing leadership positions, just 1 of 27 Catholic institutions (4%) and 1 of 7 Lutheran institutions (14%). Very few colleges or universities provided formal leadership development, just 2 of the 27 Catholic institutions (7%) and 3 of the 16 secular institutions (19%). Many more of the colleges or universities provided informal leadership development, 10 of the 27 Catholic institutions (37%), 5 of the 16 secular institutions (31%) and 6 of the 7 Lutheran institutions (86%). This distribution of provision of informal leadership development

across types of institutions approached a significant difference ($X^2 = 5.610$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.061$) from random.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

A majority of the colleges or universities leveraged national resources to provide leadership development, 18 of 27 Catholic institutions (67%), 8 of 16 secular institutions (50%), and 4 of 7 Lutheran institutions (57%). A smaller set of colleges and universities leveraged local resources to provide leadership development, 8 of 27 Catholic institutions (30%), 6 of 16 secular institutions (38%), and only 1 of 7 Lutheran institutions (14%).

[Insert Table 2 about here]

The primary way in which leadership development was handled at these colleges and universities was through mentoring, 13 of 27 Catholic institutions (48%), 8 of 16 secular institutions (50%), and 4 of 7 Lutheran institutions (57%). Coaching followed close behind as a method for leadership development, 12 of 27 Catholic institutions (44%), 5 of 16 secular institutions (31%), and 4 of 7 Lutheran institutions (57%). Formal leadership training lagged behind, 10 of 27 Catholic institutions (37%), 3 of 16 secular institutions (19%), and 3 of 7 Lutheran institutions (43%).

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Very few of the colleges and universities integrated development of faculty for leadership roles into their mission or grounded their leadership development approach in their educational philosophy. With regards to mission, only 1 of 27 Catholic institutions (4%), 3 of 16 secular institutions (19%), and 3 of 7 Lutheran institutions (43%) integrated leadership development into it mission. This distribution of mission integration across types of institutions significantly differed ($X^2 = 6.579$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.037$) from random.

With regards to philosophy, only 3 of the 27 Catholic institutions (11%) and 4 of the 16 secular institutions (50%) grounded their leadership development in their educational philosophy.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

On the whole, however, these colleges and universities were satisfied with their present preparation of faculty for leadership roles, with Catholic institutions rating their satisfaction 3.76 on a 5 point scale, secular institutions 4.00, and Lutheran institutions 4.00. The average rating did not significant differ by type of institution ($F = 0.223$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.801$).

Qualitatively, of those institutions that did offer formal leadership development opportunities those opportunities were evenly split between internally and externally created leadership development programs. With regards to informal leadership development opportunities more of these were developed internally than purchased from an external source. Funding for these leadership development opportunities was ad hoc or not budgeted at all for Catholic institutions, ad hoc to under \$1,000 annually for secular institutions, and under \$1,000 annually for Lutheran institutions. What limited funding there is exists in the Provost's budget rather than the academic departments' budgets.

The primary national resource used by all types of colleges or universities were leadership development opportunities offered by the Council of Independent Colleges, with all other national resources relegated to nominal use.

The primary challenges facing these colleges and universities in terms of leadership development of its faculty were primarily interest in the faculty at pursuing

leadership opportunities, identify leadership potential in faculty, and lack of strategic thinking and planning on the part of the institution. This was particularly the case for Catholic and secular institutions.

In summary, although there appears to be a dearth of leadership development of faculty across all types of institutions surveyed here, Lutheran colleges and universities tend to provide more informal leadership development and Lutheran and secular universities significantly integrated their leadership development into their mission. Additionally, there appears to be a considerable lack of formal budget for leadership development across all institutions. And the primary challenge to leadership development of faculty was a lack of interest in faculty at pursuing leadership opportunities, difficult identifying leadership potential in faculty, and lack of strategic thinking and planning on the part of the institutions. This was particular the case for Catholic and secular institutions.

Discussion

The answer to Barden and Curry (April 12, 2013) question, “faculty members can lead, but will they?” appears to be “no”. Survey research reported here indicates that very few medium-sized college and universities in the Eastern part of the US offer any kind of formal leadership development or leadership development planning for faculty. And although these institutions may leverage national resources to provide faculty with leadership development opportunities, budgets are not in place to support access to these resources. Further, the primary obstacle to colleges and universities providing leadership development are difficulty identifying leadership potential in faculty and a lack of interest in leadership roles among faculty.

Additionally, within Catholic college and universities, where one might expected to find more emphasis on leadership development among faculty, because of the foundation of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition, the results here indicate this is not the case. And, perhaps more concerning, the Catholic institutions were least likely to integrate leadership development for faculty into their institutional mission. This, even though, each Catholic institutions was found by a particular Catholic order and incorporates that order’s focus in their institutional mission.

But this lack of leadership development for faculty appears to be more of a cultural issue in these institutions than one of a lack of faculty leadership ability. Given the identified obstacles to leadership development found here, a difficulty identifying leadership potential and lack of interest among faculty in leadership roles, and previous research looking at the obstacles to express interest in leadership roles by faculty (for example, Kezar, Lester, 2009), it would seem that this is a systemic, organizational issue

rather than a personal issue. Therefore, perhaps the answer to Barden and Curry's question is a qualified "no".

A systemic, organizational issue would require a systemic organizational solution. And in this respect, perhaps more leadership development opportunities, though important, would not be the solution to the lack of leadership development among faculty. Perhaps in this case, an Organizational Development (OD) intervention aimed at the institutional level would be more appropriate. Turnbull and Edwards (2005) provide an example. The authors (Turnbull, Edwards, 2005) describe an OD program aimed at the top 120 academics and senior managers at a UK university. The intervention involved three modules, an experiential intervention, review of theory, and follow-up and review. Similarly, Abdur-Rahman (2007) describes an OD-like intervention provided by the Leadership Enhancement and Development (LEAD) program incorporating active research back at the participants' institutions as a component of the leadership development. And, Watson and Grossman (1994) describe a comprehensive faculty development program at Arizona State University focused on defragmenting leadership development opportunities across the University.

One particularly interesting approach to addressing this lack of leadership development in faculty might be the creation of a leadership institute focused on promoting not only leadership development opportunities (training, mentoring, coaching) but also cultural change among faculty and institutions. In fact, such an institution housed in a Catholic college or university providing not only generic interventions to any and all institutions but also specifically tailoring interventions to Catholic colleges and universities, tailored to the mission of the particular Catholic college or university's

founding order, might provide the broadest range of intervention and might have the broadest impact of leadership development of faculty.

Limitation and Future Research

Two limitations exist with the current research and should be addressed with future research. First, the sample of college and universities is relatively small (50) in this research. The survey response rate of 21% is rather low (a 30% response rate as a rule of thumb is generally considered a good response rate for survey research). Follow-up research attempting to attract a higher response rate and larger sample of respondents may lead to new and additional insights. Second, responses were collected using a survey which only allowed for fairly brief written responses. Kezar and Lester (2009) in their research looking at perceived obstacles to leadership development in faculty used a variety of individual and groups interviews to collect their data. The use of focus groups or interviews, though more labor intensive, would provide opportunity for longer, perhaps more thought out responses. A richer data set, may lead to new and additional insights.

Conclusion

There is a decided lack of leadership development among faculty. However, this lack may be do more to systemic and organizational issues of identifying leadership potential and supporting the aspiration to leadership roles in institutions of higher education. In order to address this lack, interventions focusing on the systemic organizational level should be considered. More leadership development training, mentoring, and coaching, though important, may not solve the problem. Changing the culture of faculty and institutions of higher education to support identification of leadership potential among faculty and support the aspirations of faculty to leadership roles just may.

References

- Abdur-Rahman, V. (2007). My journey through project LEAD. *ABNF Journal*, 18(3), 83-87.
- Ballantyne, S., Berret, B., & Harst, W. (2010). Fulltime faculty perceptions of leadership in adjunct faculty to maintain Franciscan identity. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 9, 1-9
- Barden, D. M., & Curry, J. (2013). Faculty Members Can Lead, but Will They? *Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Bodla, M. S. & Nawaz, M. M. (2010). Comparative study of full range leadership model among faculty members in public and private sector higher education institutions and universities. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 208-214.
- Brown, L. M. (2001). Leading leadership development in universities: A personal story. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 10(4), 312-323.
- Carriger, M. (2013). Leadership development in academics: What can be learned from industry? *The Department Chair*, 23(3), 18-19.
- Hancock, T. M. (2007). The business of universities and the role of department chair. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(4), 306-314.
- Kezar, A. & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, 715-740.
- Rayner, S.; Fuller, M.; McEwan, L. & Roberts, H. (2010). Managing leadership in the UK university: A case for researching the missing professoriate? *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(6), 617-631.
- Roche, M. W. (2003). *The Intellectually Appeal of Catholicism and the Idea of a Catholic University*. University of Notre Dame Press: South Bend, IN.
- Steinfels, P. (2003). *A People Adrift*. Simon & Shuster: NY.
- Turnbull, S. & Edwards, G. (2005). Leadership development for organizational change in a new UK university. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(3), 396-413.

- Twale, D. J. & Ridenour, C. S. (2003). The sacred and the secular: Aligning a Marianist mission with professional standards of practice in an educational leadership doctoral program. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 7(2), 181-196.
- Watson, G. & Grossman, L. H. (1994). Pursuing a comprehensive faculty development program: Making fragmentation work. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72(5), 465-473.

Tables

Table 1 – Faculty Development Planning, Informal and Formal Development

	Development Plans	Formal Development	Informal Development *
Catholic	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	10 (37%)
Lutheran	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	6 (86%)
Secular	0 (0%)	3 (19%)	5 (31%)

- $X^2 = 5.610$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.061$

Table 2 – Resources Leveraged

	Local	National
Catholic	18 (67%)	8 (30%)
Lutheran	4 (57%)	1 (14%)
Secular	8 (50%)	6 (38%)

Table 3 – Types of Leadership Development

	Mentoring	Coaching	Training
Catholic	13 (48%)	12 (44%)	10 (37%)
Lutheran	4 (57%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)
Secular	8 (50%)	5 (31%)	3 (19%)

Table 4 – Integration into Mission, Grounding in Educational Philosophy

	Mission *	Philosophy
Catholic	1 (4%)	3 (11%)
Lutheran	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
Secular	3 (19%)	4 (50%)

- $X^2 = 6.579$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.037$

Appendix

Survey Description/Instructions:

You are being asked to participate in a survey research project entitled "Management and Leadership Development Among Academics," which is being conducted by Michael Carriger, a faculty member at the Welch College of Business, Sacred Heart University. This survey is anonymous. No one, including the researcher, will be able to associate your responses with your identity. Your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to take the survey, to stop responding at any time, or to skip any questions that you do not want to answer. Your completion of the survey serves as your voluntary agreement to participate in this research project

Questions regarding the purpose or procedures of the research should be directed to Michael Carriger at carrigerm@sacredheart.edu. The IRB, a university committee established by Federal law, is responsible for protecting the rights and welfare of research participants. If you have concerns or questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the IRB Administrator:
<http://www.sacredheart.edu/officeservices/institutionalreviewboard/>.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this survey research. Your effort is greatly appreciated.

Survey Questions:

1. Do you have a formal, structured leadership development program for faculty members considered for prospective leadership positions (department chairs, assistant deans, associate deans, deans, etc...)?
 - a. If yes, briefly describe the formal development program.
2. Do you have an informal, structured leadership development program for faculty members considered for prospective leadership positions (department chairs, assistant deans, associate deans, deans, etc...)?
 - a. If yes, briefly describe the informal development program.
3. Where does leadership development funding for faculty reside?
 - a. Provost Office/Academic Affairs
 - b. Academic Departments
 - c. Human Resources
 - d. Office of Mission
 - e. Other
4. What is the level of funding available for leadership development among faculty in preparation for leadership roles?
5. Do you leverage National external sources of leadership development for faculty members considered for prospective leadership positions?
 - a. If yes, which ones?

6. Do you leverage local external sources of leadership development for faculty members considered for prospective leadership positions?
 - a. If yes, which ones?
7. What are the primary challenges you face with regards to preparation of faculty for leadership roles?
8. Do you have formalized professional development plans for faculty interested in pursuing a leadership position within the academy?
9. Do you provide informal or formal leadership mentoring to your faculty members being considered for leadership roles?
10. Do you provide informal or formal leadership coaching to your faculty members being considered for leadership roles?
11. Do you provide informal or formal leadership training to your faculty members being considered for leadership roles?
12. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not satisfied at all and 5 being completely satisfied, how satisfied are you with the preparation of your faculty for leadership roles at your institution?
13. What is the average tenure of your Department Chairs?
14. What is the average tenure of your Assistant, Association, and Full Deans?
15. What is the general size of your faculty?
 - a. Fewer than 50
 - b. 51 to 150
 - c. 151 to 250
 - d. 251 to 350
 - e. 351 to 450
 - f. More than 450
16. Is the development of faculty for prospective leadership roles integrated into your institution's mission as an institution of higher education?
 - a. If yes, in what way?
17. Is the development of faculty for prospective leadership roles grounded in a particular philosophy or approach?
 - a. If yes, in what way?
18. Any additional comments about the preparation of faculty for leadership roles?