

9

Fostering Faculty Leadership for Sustainable Change in the Academy

Adrianna J. Kezar and Alice (Jill) N. Reich

Promise: Jan has been at Midwestern Liberal Arts College for five years and is excited to integrate service learning into her biology course. In graduate school she and some fellow students created a field-based experience that she wants to replicate as part of her teaching. Because of Jan's interest in new methods of teaching, her dean sent her to a conference about service learning. She worries about the time commitment as her colleagues have emphasized the importance of research for tenure and promotion, but she has met several other faculty members on campus through the center for teaching and learning who have already included it in their courses and have offered to share best practices and advice with her. She wants more people in her department to think about the role of service learning and has recently brought it up in curriculum discussions. Because of her vocalness, she has been put on a committee that is working on changes. Jan has been chatting with other like-minded colleagues across campus for tips about how to navigate the curriculum committee and achieve her goals. She is really thankful that she became connected to the center for teaching and learning network.

Perils: Don is a sociology faculty member at a large, urban public institution and has been there for fifteen years. He has been interested in getting students more involved in voting and political participation. He has spoken to colleagues over the years, mostly senior, but they do not see the importance of his ideas. In fact, they are often fairly hostile. When Don mentions the issue to his chair, she says, "You know it is always like that with faculty. They just resist new ideas." Younger colleagues have come in with an interest, but he does not want to burden them until they get tenure. He feels really isolated and talks to the dean about his passion for citizenship education. His dean says he is really busy dealing with the declining state budget and cutting costs, but perhaps they can talk next fall. Don

is beginning to feel the pinch of extra administrative work now that the campus has increased the number of non-tenure-track faculty. He decides to shelve his ideas, hoping for a better time.

Faculty as the Necessary Agents of Sustainable Change in the Academy

These two narratives foreshadow the theme of this chapter: that faculty leadership, a necessary component of successful academic change, is at a time of both promise and peril. Careful attention and creative intervention are needed to capitalize on the promise and overcome the perils currently in play. But before we dig deeper into this theme, it is important to understand why faculty leadership has become a prominent ingredient in contemporary calls for change in the academy.

Several recent national studies exploring institutional change and transformation have documented faculty leadership as a key ingredient for success.¹ The largest study of institutional transformation and change in higher education demonstrated that shared leadership among the various stakeholders (administration, faculty, and staff) on campus is necessary for creating buy-in and ownership, enthusiasm, and energy for momentum.² It is essential for creating a vision connected to implementation practicalities and for the shift in values that must permeate the organization. Deep and sustained change requires persistent and substantive faculty involvement.

Moreover, while showing the importance of multilevel leadership or shared responsibility for change, these studies point in particular to the importance of faculty leaders who play a variety of key roles.³ For example, faculty leaders can be cultural influencers, shifting faculty values and perspectives, particularly in disciplines that have become ossified and with colleagues resistant to change. These faculty leaders serve as political influencers, winning over colleagues to the change even when concrete institutional rewards are unavailable. And often they are the academic entrepreneurs who garner the revenues or grants to support change and forge partnerships. Too often today we think of these change activities as part of administrative work rather than activities led by the faculty. Yet studies of change describe complex and very large institutions of higher education with dual authority structures where faculty have delegated authority because of their expertise and knowledge about teaching and learning. This dual authority structure requires shared leadership.

While faculty are needed agents in change, within many institutions they have felt pressured because of increased workloads and changing

incentives around research and teaching to abdicate authority to administrators. Furthermore, studies of faculty leadership demonstrate there has been little infrastructure in place to support skill development for faculty to be leaders. Typically, faculty do not learn leadership skills in graduate school; in fact, much of their training and social structures work against the type of skills necessary to be a good leader, skills such as vision development, networking, politics, and relationship building. Once they become faculty, they can continue to work quite autonomously, so it is easy to forget the value and necessity of working with others, essential ingredients for creating change. Thus, both organizational pressures and individual skill and motivation have created challenges for fostering faculty leadership. But the literature on faculty leadership indicates there is more focus on the need for individual development than on recognition of organizational constraints. In spite of our earlier history and traditions of shared governance, higher education today is trailing behind other sectors, such as business, that have for several decades recognized that meaningful change requires ownership and involvement from stakeholders throughout the organization.⁴

In this chapter, we explore some of the complexities involved in building the faculty leadership necessary for the kind of deep, sustainable change discussed in this book. We divide these complexities into two parts: (1) the perils of engaging faculty and (2) the promise of engaging faculty. This approach is unique in moving beyond the focus of most recent research that has identified and documented the key role of faculty leaders, examined how faculty and the administration need to work together in a shared or multilevel leadership process, and described some ways to build the skills needed among faculty. These contributions, while important, have ignored and hence not capitalized on the context in which faculty leadership already takes place. In order to effectively capitalize on existing forms of faculty leadership, we need to understand the current state of the academy and how this affects the possibilities for leadership. We will delineate new strategies for fostering the skills that are necessary components of leadership and propose new ways to overcome the organizational obstacles now facing faculty seeking to lead change on their campuses. The past focus on faculty skill development is less relevant because faculty are increasingly learning leadership skills as part of inter- and multidisciplinary research and teaching projects, and their interest in and commitment to becoming change agents is fostered by their involvement in engaged learning. More important now is to delineate how leadership skills are being learned, to expand these skills and foster their use across a range of situations, and to overcome the obstacles that prevent effective leadership among the current generation of faculty.

Our audience is academic administrators and policy makers who make decisions that impact campuses; faculty (both tenure-track and non-tenure-track) who may be interested in leading campus change; and staff who are often looking for partners in creating change. In short, our thesis is that the type of engaged and transformative learning environment proposed in this book not only requires but also builds faculty leaders. It is a timely topic because the new generation of faculty has many individuals passionate about this kind of learning for their students and themselves. But the current academic context and structures work such that faculty have few opportunities to take advantage of their commitment. Only with awareness of these conditions can we hope to reverse these trends, thereby fostering the leadership necessary for developing and sustaining the transformative learning environment we seek.

The Perils of Faculty Leadership: Glass Half Empty

Historically, faculty leave graduate school with no leadership training and enter a socialization system on campus that, at best, informally provides some of them with knowledge about how to lead. Few empirical studies exist, but conventional wisdom suggests that faculty have typically developed skills as leaders through the socialization that takes place during the tenure process and through involvement in shared governance on campus. Traditionally, tenure-track junior faculty are mentored by more senior-tenured faculty who explain the institutional structure, politics, key issues on campus, and committees central to making a difference. Through this socialization process, junior faculty are introduced to shared governance processes such as a Faculty Senate, committee structures, ad hoc groups, and other aspects of governance with which faculty are expected to be involved as they become associate and full professors. Through the concept of shared governance, faculty are expected to play a leadership role by providing their voices on key issues that are important to the institution. In these ways, faculty begin to identify as leaders as they learn about the informal processes (relationships that should be developed or networks to join) and skills (politics) needed to make a change.

While it is debatable whether or not consistent mentoring occurs on many campuses, whether socialization processes are strong across different institutional types, or whether shared governance is more an ideal than a reality, there is a sense that in the past these structures played some role in fostering leadership among at least some faculty at some institutions. And although there have long been few visible incentives or concrete rewards for leadership, it was considered an expectation of the profession

once one had achieved a certain status. While not perfect, this system of socialization and shared governance could be relied on to produce faculty leaders. To be sure, some campuses did a better job than others.

Unfortunately, even this tenuous system (tenure, socialization and shared governance, professional norms for expecting and naming leaders) of fostering faculty leadership has been in decline over the last twenty years. In some sectors, such as community colleges, the change started much earlier as large student enrollments, reduced funding, and external pressures forced institutions to hire increasing numbers of part-time faculty, to move away from a predominantly tenure-track faculty, to proceed toward unionization, and to lose shared governance structures. These same factors are now occurring across the entire academy. The number of non-tenure-track faculty has risen at all institutional types, presently representing two-thirds of our nation's faculty. Not just two-year institutions but the majority of four-year institutions are now staffed predominantly by non-tenure-track faculty who are not socialized to campus culture, receive little if any orientation, and are not thought of by themselves or others as potential leaders.⁵ Thus, most often they are not included in shared governance activities and typically have few expectations about campus leadership.⁶ If the current trends in hiring non-tenure-track faculty (three out of four appointments) continue, then tenured faculty will become a marginal part of our higher education institutions, perhaps existing only within elite research universities or liberal arts colleges or within a few select departments. We also know that non-tenure-track faculty, particularly part time, use less engaging pedagogies, focus less on diversity, and spend less time with students.⁷

Increasingly, the tenure-track faculty who remain find themselves involved less with overall institutional affairs and more with local or departmental decision making. In general, they have less of a voice in the overall institution, its planning, and its development.⁸ Faculty find themselves increasingly as "managed professionals," with the administration making the major decisions for the institution and the faculty having less and less input into the overall work environment.⁹ Academic values are increasingly being short shrifted for more corporate or bureaucratic values of the administration.¹⁰ In a national study, Schuster and Finkelstein reported that faculty feel as if they have less influence now than they did in previous decades.¹¹ At the same time as they are reporting a decline in the broader mechanisms of shared governance, they report more work in service and local administration (paperwork, accountability and assessment, admissions, scheduling). These dual-authority paths may be exacerbated by the uneven distribution of tenure- to non-tenure-track faculty further limiting their time and ability to be involved in leadership and

broader change efforts. You may be lucky enough to be on a campus with fewer non-tenure-track faculties, a more robust tenure system, and healthy shared governance processes. Unfortunately, if past trends continue, it may be slowly eroding without your knowledge, as many campuses have shifted their workforces in the last ten years with little awareness by faculty.¹²

As if this were not a difficult enough system to navigate, faculty have long argued that institutional and professional rewards are mostly for publishing. More recently, public attention on teaching and student learning has begun to build emphasis in this area as well. But few, if any, rewards for being involved in campus leadership exist. Moreover, the pressure to publish has intensified over the last three decades. Schuster and Finkelstein found that publication standards for tenure are more than triple what they were in the 1970s.¹³ Campuses (except for community colleges and some undergraduate institutions) increasingly place significant weight on publications for tenure and promotion and place virtually no weight on other criteria. Not only are service and leadership short shrifted, but the overwhelming publication requirements can focus faculty efforts at the assistant and associate level exclusively on publication. Moreover, with increasing public attention on student learning, the implications for service are further compromised.¹⁴

In addition, faculty report increasing stress due to heavier workloads compared with earlier decades. In recent years, faculty have been asked to try new pedagogies and retool their teaching on an ongoing basis, to integrate new technologies into their classrooms, and to assess their teaching and student learning.¹⁵ The dramatic increase in knowledge production in some fields makes further demands on faculty time—just keeping up with regular advances in one's field can become all consuming.¹⁶ Because of all these increasing demands, the work week for faculty is increasing, requiring ever more hours to complete a regular workload. As women have entered the professoriate, and they do in ever-increasing numbers, they have to manage the double burden of household responsibilities and work. Even the most recent data show that these burdens are generally not shared by their spouses, including care for elderly parents.¹⁷

Why focus on all these barriers and challenges? Without an awareness of them, we cannot foster change by creating the kinds of support needed for faculty to be successful leaders. If the challenges are not recognized, it is even more likely that faculty will burn out and relinquish leadership roles in the future. Alas, we cannot offer a quick "silver bullet" solution, but we believe that faculty stakeholders can together build solutions. We must change our mind-set about faculty life, recognizing that being in the academy is much different than it was just a generation ago. We must

build faculty leaders who understand the constraints yet find within them new, efficient, effective, and sustainable solutions for our campuses.

The Promises of Faculty Leadership: Glass Half Full

While many of the changes in the academy create a difficult environment for developing leadership, other shifts can be used to foster faculty leadership. There are at present several factors that can support the change we seek. These include changing demographics, faculty retirements, interdisciplinary teaching and research, and new paradigms for teaching and learning. In short, there is a cadre of faculty with a vision and commitment for change who are already in clusters and networks, positioned to work collectively, and who often already have leadership skills.

Numerous studies document that the diversification of faculty results in more women and underrepresented minorities in higher education institutions.¹⁸ These are just the people who tend to experiment with new and innovative pedagogy such as service learning, collaborative learning, and the like.¹⁹ Research reveals varying reasons for the relationship between gender/race and use of innovative pedagogies, including an interest in changing power relationships in the classroom, the importance of helping one's community, and/or recognition of needing to work with a variety of individual learning styles among an increasingly diverse student body. No matter the reason, the trend results are the same: These new faculty are more likely to engage in practices that create the type of learning environment proposed in this book. Gappa, Austin, and Trice found that new faculty have such a deep passion for these issues (service, citizenship, community-university partnerships) that they are drawn into just the kind of work that ultimately builds the leadership skills that can then be used to create the desired change.²⁰

At the same time, graduate students are being introduced to new paradigms related to research and knowledge production. In more recent years, action research, critical theory, community-based research, and even interpretive research approaches have required greater connections with communities outside of the academy for the creation of knowledge. All these approaches encourage faculty to become engaged with their research topics in ways that are connected and holistic, breaking away from the narrow, more objective stance toward their area of study, their students, and the communities they research. Both of these trends—new demographics and socialization to new paradigms—create a group of faculty who are mastering leadership skills as a part of carrying out their research agenda and becoming successful teachers. Among the new professoriate

are many who are well poised to be leaders with the vision for and commitment to the kind of change espoused in this book.

Change such as we seek requires a critical mass to make a sustained difference. Another trend that bodes well for this shift is the mass retirement of faculty we are experiencing. Approximately 50 percent of the faculty retired between 2001 and 2010; this was the most massive turnover of faculty in the history of higher education.²¹ While numbers were smaller than predicted because of the economic recession and lack of a mandatory retirement age, a huge shift has nonetheless taken place and is still in progress in some institutions. The faculty who were part of the significant expansion of the higher education system in the 1960s and 1970s are now retiring. And because these retirements are occurring in a wave, rather than slowly over time, many campuses are experiencing clusters of hires within departments and schools. This trend represents an opportunity for the new hires clustered in groups to create a new value system and to support the new vision they have for teaching and research. While this may not be occurring in every case, it represents an untapped source of leadership that, when recognized, can be fostered and utilized.

Not only are a new commitment and vision in place for leading this change, but the very skills necessary to implement this change are being learned through the processes many of these faculty bring to their teaching and research. Increasingly, graduate students are being introduced to community-based and inter- and multidisciplinary research. The kinds of community-based, inter- and multidisciplinary work described in this book require that faculty work in groups and teams. The skills needed to work effectively in these groups require faculty to grow in ways that help them be leaders. They learn how to work effectively in a collective endeavor toward a desired outcome, a key ingredient for any change agent. They are learning communication skills; relationship building; and the politics of working in teams and groups within larger units, organizations, and communities. A typical barrier preventing faculty from learning to be effective change agents is that they have difficulty moving a change beyond their department or local unit because they do not understand how to communicate with a broad range of people. However, civic engagement and community-based work bring faculty into contact with individuals in other departments and units in and outside of the academy. All these skills are helping to train and socialize faculty in important capacities on which campuses can build and change. Thus, at the same time that faculties are increasingly structured in ways that can work against their leading institutional change, we have a great opportunity to enhance faculty leadership for sustained change. A critical mass of new faculty with a passion, vision, and commitment for engaged learning, who think about research and

teaching in more connected ways, are gaining leadership skills through their work and creating a sustaining system for desired change. As they advance their teaching and research agenda, they are simultaneously learning to be leaders.

The promise outlined in this section is generally ignored as a source of leadership in the academy, and so it remains an untapped potential for institutions and individuals interested in creating a more engaged learning environment. We are not suggesting that all new faculty are committed to engaged learning or have the kinds of teaching and interdisciplinary research agenda that help them develop leadership skills, but we are proposing that these are increasing trends that, when recognized and fostered, can be leveraged to foster the very change agents the new system requires.

What Can Be Done to Enable Leadership in this Context of Perils and Promise?

Faculty involved in engaged pedagogies and/or community-based, interdisciplinary research are at the same time developing leadership skills, although neither they nor their colleagues usually recognize or label this as such. This recognition is a great place to begin. Faculty development can be offered that demonstrates the skills learned through interdisciplinary research, and pedagogies fostering civic engagement are transferable to leadership and creating change. This approach to faculty development is likely to provide a more effective way to attract faculty into leadership programs. For example, there may be more interest among faculty to learn new pedagogies known for enhancing student learning and/or to become involved in community-based interdisciplinary research groups because these are directions of increasing federal funding.²² Faculty often do not perceive of themselves as leaders so will not pursue faculty development with that label. Campuses would do better to offer faculty development programs related to immediate interests of faculty—teaching and/or research—and then to make the connection to how these skills can also be used to become a leader or change agent on campus.

With this foundation, administrators and faculty change agents can next identify and connect faculty with common interests in these innovative pedagogies, faculty who are often spread out and unaware of each other. Through these connections, faculty with a commitment to engaged learning consolidate their knowledge and network their connections to make these pedagogies more effective and more efficient to implement. Faculty can share strategies for overcoming pressures they may experience from colleagues who do not share their enthusiasm for new pedagogies or

research paradigms. In this way, their passion and interests are expanded rather than stamped out, and opportunities to build a critical mass of engaged faculty on campus are fostered. Strategic hiring and connecting interested faculty will also create the collective will and enthusiasm needed to face the obstacles mentioned earlier.

But the issues are multidimensional and so too must be the solutions. The promise for change cannot be fully realized only by growing faculty leadership through faculty development, cluster hiring, and networks. Formal structures within the academy must also be addressed directly. We review the key practices and policies campuses can use to combat these obstacles and highlight how these approaches address challenges such as the rising standards for tenure and promotion or the increase in contingent

Table 9.1 Policies, Practices, and Values Supporting Faculty Leadership and Barriers They Address

<i>Policy, Practice, or Value</i>	<i>Barriers Addressed</i>
Department/School Level	
Supportive individuals	Rising publications standards Socialization as a faculty member—lacking leadership skills Expansion of faculty role Fear of speaking up before tenure and promotion
Autonomy and flexibility in role	Rising publications standards Rise of contingent faculty Expansion of faculty role
Supporting faculty to go to conferences	Socialization as a faculty member—lacking leadership skills Rising publications standards
Campuswide	
Collegiality and campus networks	Socialization as a faculty member—lacking leadership skills Rising publications standards Academic capitalism Fear of speaking up before tenure and promotion
Policies for contingent faculty	Rise of contingent faculty
Campuses that see questioning as healthy	Fear of speaking up before tenure and promotion Lack of shared governance

and part-time faculty.²³ Table 9.1 summarizes how each approach to fostering faculty leadership addresses barriers or hindrances.

Help Faculty Build Off-Campus Networks

Faculty can be assisted in becoming change agents by attending professional conferences focused on topics such as citizenship, diversity, innovations in teaching and learning, civic engagement, or community partnerships. These conferences and the stories and demonstrations they provide help faculty foster a vision, create a network of like-minded people, strengthen leadership skills, and garner insight into the ways they might approach change on their own campus. Conferences assist them to build the leadership skills they lack, refine the skills they are developing, and save time by learning about key strategies and models to follow. In this way, faculty can still play a leadership role even as workload increases and demands for publications rise. Departments and schools that make such opportunities available for faculty through additional funding or by letting faculty know about these opportunities foster greater leadership. These conferences socialize faculty to leadership, introduce leadership skills, and connect faculty to people who can help them learn shortcuts for facilitating their leadership efforts, leaving time for research and additional teaching responsibilities.

Foster Collegiality and Campus Networks

Campus collegiality and mentoring networks are another way to address rising workloads because they link faculty to networks that provide information about how to increase productivity and efficiency. Administrators can foster faculty leadership at home by creating connections among people and by valuing collegiality. Through these networks, early-career faculty not only learn valuable leadership skills but also make important connections to faculty who can advocate on their behalf during the tenure and promotion process. On some campuses, centers for teaching and learning offer symposia and workshops, while on other campuses, centers for community partnerships offer ongoing structures for community-based teaching and research. There is also a variety of smaller ways to do this, many involving small amounts of funding or even none at all. Faculty are often eager to organize events, bring in speakers, foster important discussions, and exchange ideas, especially when these tasks are shared with colleagues and the outcomes benefit all. These events can serve many direct goals for enhancing teaching and research and at the

same time create networks that foster faculty leadership aimed at desired change.

For example, a college might sponsor faculty learning communities to cultivate faculty networks and promote collaboration on different themes each year (e.g., civic engagement pedagogies, community-based research programs, or learning-centered communities). Faculty selected for the program meet several times throughout the academic year to discuss the topic, identify individual and collaborative projects related to the theme, receive funding to travel to related conferences, and present their projects to the campus community at the end of the year, thereby building a sustainable system for growth and change. Another often missed opportunity for building faculty connections is to consider campus spaces. Placing like-minded faculty offices near one another and creating common spaces on campus for people to meet and socialize over lunch can be an unnoticed but strategic step.

These kinds of campus support structures link faculty to networks that optimize their productivity and efficiency. In a sense, today's faculty need instant relationships built for them rather than their taking the time to organically develop these relationships themselves. At the same time, when faculty have a base of support across campus, they feel more confident playing a leadership role.

Role Flexibility: Count Leadership as Service or Teaching

Another important strategy for assisting faculty in pursuing leadership opportunities is to find ways for leadership to be visibly valued by the institution. Faculty find it especially difficult in pretenure years to exercise leadership for organizational change as well as meet other teaching, research, and service requirements. Department chairs or deans can facilitate change by recognizing leadership in those areas that count toward tenure and promotion requirements. While acknowledging leadership in service seems intuitive, institutional administrators can go further by substituting leadership for teaching or acknowledging it within the faculty member's teaching responsibilities. For example, faculty engaged with their students in community-based research can be awarded a teaching credit for advancing student research in the field (perhaps a laboratory credit). Or faculty who teach a course that places students in community-based work could be allocated more than one course credit in recognition of their leadership and interdisciplinary efforts. These steps to include leadership as part of the faculty role demonstrate the institution's value of this work.

Develop Policies for Including Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Governance

Given the increasing trend toward non-tenure-track positions among faculty, it is essential to consider ways to involve these faculty members in all aspects of institutional life. Contracts for non-tenure-track faculty typically focus only on the number of courses to be taught in a specific semester. Little attention is given to the retention of such faculty across time or to their interests and potential to contribute more broadly to the institution. Typically, non-tenure-track faculty receive little mentoring, no annual reviews, and little substantive feedback on their work.²⁴ In order to capitalize on the talent and expertise of this very large and growing population, campuses must create more specific guidelines, policies, and practices for their inclusion in all aspects of faculty work life. Faculty contracts need to be altered to include specifics about expectations for teaching and student learning, service, and when appropriate, research. This articulation needs to be followed by invitations to join a Faculty Senate, committees, department meetings, and other governing bodies that develop relevant policies and approaches. While some institutions may choose not to give non-tenure-track faculty equal voting rights, ensuring that they participate in some manner is important for developing collegiality and campus leadership. Also, although non-tenure-track faculty are often interested in participating in community-based work in their teaching and research, they are often excluded from professional development where these opportunities and skills can be identified and fostered. Just like their tenured colleagues, non-tenure-track faculty should be encouraged to utilize new pedagogies and then helped to access them; to participate in professional development; and especially on campuses where their participation occurs over several years, to engage in research and other professional growth activities.²⁵

Final Thoughts

Community-based teaching and research offer significant promise for enhanced student access and learning, create new knowledge, and allow higher education to contribute to our communities.²⁶ This kind of learning and research represents a new way of thinking and acting for many campuses, a way of being that is best initiated, fostered, and sustained by shared governance within which faculty, both tenured and nontenured, play a key leadership role.

In taking this stance, it is tempting to focus only on the promise of faculty leadership as we seek to capitalize on how it can change the learning environment. However, we began this chapter by articulating the perils of the academy because it is important for administrators and other leaders to be aware of the context in which we work. We must understand the generational changes that have taken place in who the faculty is and what faculty life is like if we want to be successful in fostering faculty leadership. We must know the impact that changes related to cost savings and flexibility (e.g., rise of non-tenure-track faculty) are having on our learning environment and students. Lessons from the research university campuses that shifted to large numbers of non-tenure-track faculty ring clear. Many of these decisions were not intentional choices but simply institutional drifts most often characterized by lack of planning or thought. They were the result of the pressures around costs and revenues in the midst of decentralized hiring processes, departmental autonomy, lack of a cohesive faculty staffing plan, and no administrative hiring guidelines.

At a time when the public is clamoring for meaning in higher education, connections to their colleges and universities, and cost-effective learning, it is important for campus leaders to weigh the costs and benefits of their decisions. Campuses need to recognize and capitalize on the untapped potential of faculty who desire to use new pedagogies and research paradigms, who have a vision for change, who are developing leadership skills, and who think about their work in connected and community-based ways. In the future, let both Jan's and Don's efforts be successful.

Notes

1. Peter D. Eckel and Adrianna Kezar, *Taking the Reins: Institutional Transformation in Higher Education* (Westport, CT: American Council on Education and Praeger, 2003); Adrianna Kezar, Rozanna Carducci, and Melissa Contreras-McGavin, *Rethinking the "L" Word in Higher Education: The Revolution on Research in Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006).

2. Eckel and Kezar, *Taking the Reins*.

3. Studies of change caution, though, that simply fostering faculty leadership without support from the top is often problematic. Studies of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) initiatives that supported individual faculty leaders but did not focus on top-down support of leadership were not as successful as efforts that created multilevel leadership within their environment, because faculty struggled to get needed resources, supportive processes such as change in rewards, and a sense of priority that comes from those in positions of authority; see University of Maryland, *Change and Sustainability in Higher Education (CASHE): Final Report* (College Park: University of Maryland, 2010). Recent change initia-

tives funded by the National Science Foundation, such as the ADVANCE grants, encourage multilevel leadership where the administration provides support for the change process, and faculty leadership is fostered to help bring more women and minorities into the STEM disciplines. This book recognizes the importance of both top-down and bottom-up leadership, but in this chapter we focus on how to foster faculty leadership, a topic mostly ignored in the leadership literature within higher education.

4. Bernard M. Bass, *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, 4th ed. (New York: Free Press, 2009); Craig L. Pearce and Jay A. Conger, *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003); Peter M. Senge, Art Kleiner, Charlotte Roberts, Rick Ross, and Bryan Smith, *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook: Strategies and Tools for Building a Learning Organization* (New York: Doubleday, 1990).

5. Jack H. Schuster and Martin J. Finkelstein, *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006).

6. Roger G. Baldwin and Jay L. Chronister, *Teaching without Tenure: Policies and Practices for a New Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001); Judith M. Gappa, Ann E. Austin, and Andrea G. Trice, *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007); Jean Waltman and Louise August, *Making the Best of Both Worlds: Findings from a National Institution-Level Survey on Non-Tenure Track Faculty* (Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Education of Women, 2007).

7. Paul D. Umbach, "How Effective Are They? Exploring the Impact of Non-Tenure Track Faculty on Undergraduate Education," *The Review of Higher Education* 30, no. 2 (2007): 91–123; Paul D. Umbach, "The Effects of Part-Time Faculty Appointments on Instructional Techniques and Commitment to Teaching" (paper presented at the thirty-third annual conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Jacksonville, FL, 2008).

8. Schuster and Finkelstein, *The American Faculty*.

9. Gary Rhoades, *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998).

10. Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades, *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

11. Schuster and Finkelstein, *The American Faculty*.

12. Mary Burgan, *Whatever Happened to the Faculty? Drift and Decision in Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006).

13. Schuster and Finkelstein, *The American Faculty*.

14. Gappa, Austin, and Trice, *Rethinking Faculty Work*.

15. Gappa, Austin, and Trice, *Rethinking Faculty Work*; Schuster and Finkelstein, *The American Faculty*.

16. Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Ann E. Austin, Pamela L. Eddy, and Andrea L. Beach, *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present* (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2006).

17. Schuster and Finkelstein, *The American Faculty*.
18. Schuster and Finkelstein, *The American Faculty*.
19. KerryAnn O'Meara, Aimee LaPointe Terosky, and Anna Neumann, *Faculty Careers and Work Lives: A Professional Growth Perspective*, ASHE Higher Education Report 34, no. 3 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008).
20. Yet faculty are aware that these commitments per se are likely not rewarded in the tenure and promotion process. We need to recognize that at some institutions, faculty members who assume leadership for change may be putting their careers at risk. The best approach to building these skills and leading the change is to align this work with recognized and credible academic goals. See Gappa, Austin, and Trice, *Rethinking Faculty Work*.
21. Schuster and Finkelstein, *The American Faculty*.
22. James M. Conway, Elise L. Amel, and Daniel P. Gerwien, "Teaching and Learning in the Social Context: A Meta-Analysis of Service Learning's Effects on Academic, Personal, Social and Citizenship Outcomes," *Teaching of Psychology* 36, no. 4 (2009): 233–45.
23. For a full review of these policies and practices, see Adrianna Kezar and Jaime Lester, "Supporting Faculty Grassroots Leadership," *Research in Higher Education* 50, no. 7 (2009): 715–40.
24. Baldwin and Chronister, *Teaching without Tenure*.
25. For more details about including non-tenure-track faculty in governance, see Baldwin and Chronister, *Teaching without Tenure*, and Adrianna Kezar, Jaime Lester, and Gregory Anderson, "Lacking Courage, Corporate Sellout, Not a Real Faculty Member: Challenging Stereotypes of Non-Tenure Track Faculty That Prevent Effective Governance," *Thought and Action* 22 (Fall 2006): 121–32.
26. Christine M. Cress, Cathy Burack, Dwight E. Giles Jr., Julie Elkins, and Margaret Carnes Stevens, *A Promising Connection: Increasing College Access and Success through Civic Engagement* (Boston: Campus Compact, 2010).