



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

LEAD2

CO-DESIGN ON CREATING AN ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT DESIGN IN HIGHER EDUCATION

(Team VUB)

I. The needs of a new leadership development design

(1) There are only 11 empirical studies in HE settings with the potential to inform LD program design (Dopson et al., 2018) and most of them are not up-to-date.

(2) Relational theory-new approach to leadership and leadership development (Day, 2000; McCauley & Palus, 2020). Based on relational theory, recent leadership literature increasingly considers leadership is a “collective phenomenon that is distributed or shared among different people potentially fluid, and constructed interaction” (Denis, Langlely, & Sergi, 2012, p.212). In this light, leadership is contextual and located in the relational processes through which the communal achievements of organizing, collaborating, and adapting were constructed and produced (Day, 2000; Denis et al., 2012; McCauley & Palus, 2020).

A rational viewpoint of leadership has significant effects not only on the approaches in which leadership is conceptualized but also on design of leadership development training. Day (2000) made a clear distinction between leader development and leadership development. The former notion, which is based on a traditional conceptualization of leadership, emphasizes enhancing individual-based knowledge, skills, and competencies related to formal leadership role. The later one, which is based on a new conceptual approach to leadership, refers to building networked relationships among people that promote collaboration and resource exchange in order to achieve institutional values. From this perspective, leadership development goes beyond the singular emphasis of enhancing capacity building for individuals to strengthening networks within and between organizations (Day, 2000; McCauley & Palus, 2020). Unfortunately, this new theoretical approach has not been reflected in the existing leadership development designs.

II. Theoretical background to design the model

1. Globalization and the changing nature of higher education

Over the past few decades, global society has undergone substantial changes in the context of globalization and technology. The knowledge and information technology evolution not only affect the way of people's lives but also challenge many old business models. Within this context, higher education institutions around the world have been facing radical challenges which force them to reinvent their institutions in term of content-wise and organizational structure (Antoine & Van Langenhove, 2019). Radical change forces directly connected with academic institutions include technological revolution, changes in funding, international competition, maintaining standards. In new higher education contexts, university leaders are required to be more distinctive, cooperative, and flexible in order to deal with the inherent complexities of administration, finance, academia, etc. in managing the institution (Pani, 2017).

2. Relational theory of leadership and leadership development

In the last few decades, a large body of knowledge on leadership has emphasized individual leaders and their interactions (Reyes et al., 2019). For that reason, leadership is generally defined as a property of individuals and their interactions with followers (McCauley & Palus, 2020). Based on relational theory, recent leadership literature increasingly considers leadership is a “collective phenomenon that is distributed or shared among different people potentially fluid, and constructed interaction” (Denis, Langley, & Sergi, 2012, p.212). In this light, leadership is contextual and located in the relational processes through which the communal achievements of organizing, collaborating, and adapting were constructed and produced (Day, 2000; Denis et al., 2012; McCauley & Palus, 2020). One of the main arguments for this conceptual approach, as provided by McCauley & Palus (2020), is that individuals are not simply independent entities who enter into relationships but rather relational constructions. This new viewpoint of leadership has been broadly developed in a number of studies. For example, Rost (1993) conceptualized leadership in the new century as a collaborative endeavor among group members rather than the tasks carried out by or behavior of an individual themselves. Uhl-Bien (2006) defines leadership as a social influence process leadership as a “social influence process through which emergent coordination (i.e., evolving social order) and change (i.e., new values, attitudes, approaches, behaviors, and ideologies) are constructed and produced” (p. 668). Dinh, Caliskan, & Zhu (2020) offered leadership in higher education settings as an influence of one or more people with an academic profile on academic behavior, attitudes or intellectual capacity of others based on commitment and power in order to achieve managerial, structural, and institutional vision values (p.14).

3. Key features of leadership development program in new HE contexts

Research on leadership development accompanied by training design has not been explored rigorously across changing academic institution settings (Dopson et al., 2018). Despite the scarcity of research on this field, several key features of leadership development program in new HE contexts were revealed and highlighted.

** Adapt leaders' needs at different levels of seniority*

Due to the rapid and vigorous changes occurring within universities over the last few decades, there has been a substantial change in the role and responsibility of academic leaders (Sewerin & Holmberg, 2017; Author et al., 2018). In the new contexts, university leaders are required to be more distinctive, cooperative, and flexible in order to deal with the inherent complexities of administration, finance, academia, etc. in managing the institution (Pani, 2017). Consequently, academic leadership development which meets the ongoing needs of academic leaders is stressed (Jooste et al., 2018; Ladyshevsky & Flavell, 2011; Scott, Coates, & Anderson, 2008; Tran & Tran, 2020).

Within academic leadership, there are distinguished differences between departmental, faculty and university level leadership (Scott, Bell, Coates, & Grebennikov, 2010). While Head of Program focuses to directly working with student, Deans and Heads of Schools often deal with budget management, external relations or identifying new opportunities, DVCs and PVCs frequently focus on reviewing teaching activities and organizational development (Scott et al., 2010). Therefore, the needs for leadership development are different between seniority groups of leaders

** Practice-based learning*

Practice-based learning is not a new approach in adult educational settings as it has been discussed in a number of theoretical studies (Dewey, 1938; Jarvis, 1987; Fenwich, 2003). There is new theoretical support in the literature for leadership development design in the 21st century (Day, 2000; McCauley & Palus, 2020). Relational approach to leadership development emphasizes situating leadership development within real-time settings (McCauley & Palus, 2020). To that end, interactive workshops, in which learners have opportunities to collaborate with each other on a strategic project and learn how to address on-going challenges based on shared experience, are emphasized (McCauley & Palus, 2020).

** Foster networking and collaboration*

The new conceptual approach to leadership development highlights the importance of social connectedness as an integral part of the program (Day, 2000; McCauley & Palus, 2020).

Leadership development scholars have recently emphasized inclusion of social networks across institutional levels into leadership training program (Day & O'Connor 2003; Cullen, Willburn, & Chrobot-Mason 2014). Day & O'Connor (2003) point to the role of networking as vital outcomes of the training based on the argument that the program contributes to enhance mutual understanding among learners, build commitments, trust and extend professional networks. Cullen, Willburn, & Chrobot-Mason (2014) highlight that promoting social networking in leadership development can enrich connectivity within and between institutional organizations.

REFERENCES

- Antoine, A., & Van Langenhove, L. (2019). Global challenges and trends of university governance structures. In C Zhu & M. Zayim-Kurtay (Eds.), *University Governance and Academic leadership in the Eu and China* (pp. 233–245). IGI Global.
- Cullen, K., Willburn, K., & Chrobot-Mason, D. (2014). *Networks: How Collective Leadership Really Works*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Day, D. . (2000). Leadership Development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 581–613.
- Day, D. ., & O'Connor, P. M. . (2003). Leadership development: Understanding the process. *The Future of Leadership Development*, 11–28.
- Denis, J. ., Langley, A., & Sergi, V. (2012). Leadership in the Plural. *Academy of Management Annals*, *6*(1), 211–283.
- DopsonS, Ferlie, E., McGivern, G., Fischer, M. ., Mitra, M., Ledger, J., & Behrens, S. (2018). Leadership Development in Higher Education: A Literature Review and Implications for Programme Redesign. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *Forthcoming*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.18104.39686>
- Jooste, K., Frantz, J., & Waggie, F. (2018). Challenges of academic healthcare leaders in a higher education context in South Africa. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *46*(4), 692–708.
- Ladyshevsky, R. ., & Flavell, H. (2011). Transfer of training in an academic leadership development program for program coordinators. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *40*(127–147).
- McCauley, C. ., & Palus, C. . (2020). Developing the theory and practice of leadership development: A relational view. *The Leadership Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101456>
- McCauley, C., & Palus, C. (2020). Developing the theory and practice of leadership development: A relational view. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *xxx(xxxx)*, *xxxx*.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101456>

- Pani, A. (2017). Academic leadership: concept, Attributes and Practices. *University News*, 55(49), 17–25.
- Scott, G, Bell, S., Coates, H., & Grebennikov, L. (2010). Australian higher education leaders in times of change: the role of Pro Vice- Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellor. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32(4), 401–418.
- Scott, Geoff, Coaters, H., & Anderson, M. (2008). *Learning Leaders in Times of Change: Academic Leadership Capabilities for Australian Higher Education*. Sydney: University of Western Sydney, Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Sewerin, T., & Holmberg, R. (2017). Contextualizing distributed leadership in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(6), 1280–1294. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1303453>
- Tran, L., & Tran, N. (2020). Leadership in international education: leaders’ professional development needs and tensions. *Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00494-1>
- Zhu, Chang, & Zayim-Kurtay, M. (2018). University governance and academic leadership: Perceptions of European and Chinese university staff and perceived need for capacity building. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 8(4), 435–452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2018.1458636>
- Zhu, Chang, & Zayim-Kurtay, M. (2019). *University Governance and Academic leadership in Eu and China*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.