SUCCESSION PLANNING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN TEXAS PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

by

Serenity Rose King

APPROVED BY SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

____
L. Douglas Kiel, Chair

____
Meghna Sabharwal

____
Sheryl L. Skaggs

____
James Harrington

To my first mentor and leader, Devin G. King, and to all those currently on the bench

SUCCESSION PLANNING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN TEXAS PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

by

SERENITY ROSE KING, BA, MA

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The University of Texas at Dallas

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT DALLAS

August 2019

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, thanks to those who taught me about leadership in my youth: my brother, Devin, my parents, Dennis and Doris, Grandma Rose, Mammaw King, and coaches Brad Borden and the late Sandra Thornton. I appreciate the support of my staff and colleagues, and in particular, I wish to recognize Robert S. Nelsen, Richard Huckaba, Thom Chesney, Greg Morris, Sheila Pineres, the late Cy Cantrell, Andy Blanchard, Kevin Lemoine, Jessica C. Murphy, Juan Gonzalez, Inga H. Musselman, Kim Laird, Hobson Wildenthal, Richard C. Benson, and my advisor, Doug Kiel, all of whose expertise and perspectives taught me more about leadership than I could glean from a lit review. I am grateful to my committee, in particular Sheryl Skaggs whose counsel throughout the years has been invaluable. Thanks to my friends, including Hillary Campbell, Beth Cook, Kim O'Brien, Lisa Bell, and Rhonda Black for the "gentle" nudges to finish. I am incredibly grateful for Cristen Casey, whose quieter encouragement brought me a sense of calm otherwise absent in my world. I am grateful to my niece, Ashley Rose, for her unwavering belief in me through more than half of her life, and to my nephew Haiden Michael, who outgrew his long curly hair and affinity for Monster Trucks before I finished but whose laugh remains an inspiration. Thanks especially to Courtney, who has been through this doctoral journey with me from day one—a journey that included the loss of grandparents and mentors, five combined surgeries, and numerous professional stressors and accomplishments for each of us; thanks for the laughter amid the crying and the cursing, Dr. Brecheen.

June 2019

SUCCESSION PLANNING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN TEXAS PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Serenity Rose King, PhD
The University of Texas at Dallas, 2019

Supervising Professor: Doug Kiel

At many institutions of higher education in the United States, those in leadership positions are of retirement age. In addition, public higher education, as a portion of the public sector, faces additional scrutiny from external stakeholders who have far greater demands for accountability, including institutional integrity, and transparency as the public questions the value of higher education. The public has several concerns, among them that higher education does not focus on seeing students through to degree completion, that many of those degrees fail to prepare students adequately for the workforce, that student debt is skyrocketing, that Title IX violations are inadequately addressed, and that the academy infringes upon freedom of expression. This has led to what is commonly referred to as "A Crisis in Confidence in Higher Ed." The expected leadership turnover due to impending retirements, the greater external stakeholder expectations, dwindling enrollments, demographic shifts, and reduced funding combine to put the academy as a whole in what is commonly referred to as the "Higher Education Leadership Crisis." To address these two interrelated crises, higher education must strengthen its "bench depth" by prioritizing the development of its next generation of leaders.

Drawing on literature in the private sector, public sector at-large, and higher education in general, this concurrent mixed methods research project is a case study of the extent to which public academic universities in the State of Texas engage in formal succession planning and formal leadership development programs. The study employs the usage of a survey, which is supplemented by website reviews and unstructured interviews by the researcher, who is herself a mid-career administrator at a Texas public university.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The American economy's workforce constantly evolves. While some jobs become obsolete, new jobs are created. Likewise, the ebb and flow continues as high school and college graduates enter the job market, other workers retire, and some workers leave for career advancement opportunities. Effective leaders, particularly those who can adapt to a constantly changing workforce and evolving workplace needs, are crucial to provide continuity in an organization's lifespan. Thus, the need for human resource managers and executive teams to address workforce changes, while still maintaining their organizations' desired performance level, has led to a host of umbrella processes including human capital management, strategic human resource management, and talent management. Central to the success of these critical functions are succession planning and leadership development.

Succession planning—described as "an ongoing, purposeful and systematic identification of qualified and appropriate successors to leadership" (Jarrell and Pewitt 2007, 298) and as a "deliberate and systematic effort by an organization…[to] retain and develop intellectual and knowledge capital for the future and [to] encourage individual advancement" (Rothwell 2004, 29)—has long been a practice and topic of research in the private sector. Yet formalized succession planning is far less prevalent in public sector research even though the federal government, particularly military academies, have practiced succession planning and leadership development for years. In addition, it is unusual because the private sector literature often references workforce changes in the public sector and public higher education in particular (Rothwell 2005). Although succession planning literature is expanding in higher education, the majority of available information discusses a by-product of succession planning: leadership development programs.

NEED FOR SUCCESSION PLANNING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

The United States' Bureau of Labor Statistics' *Occupational Outlook Handbook* projections have led to widespread discussion of the aging workforce and its implications for the future of the U.S. economy. Stark are the forecasts indicating that more than 60% of future national job openings, including one-fifth of the senior executive positions in *Fortune* 500 companies, will be open soon due to retirements (Rothwell, Jackson, Knight, and Lindholm 2005, xiii). Public higher education in particular is confronted with this evolving workforce issue. In the most recent five-year study of American college presidents, their average age is 62, and more than half reported that they expect to vacate their position in five years or less (American Council on Education 2017). Further, over 80% of existing provosts, the position from which a majority of presidencies is filled, reported no desire to assume the role of president (Lederman and Jaschick 2019). The need for succession planning and leadership development in higher education goes beyond just responding to a numbers gap, though. Its organizational structure, historical model for promotion into academic administrative roles, and shifting societal expectations all present additional challenges that require deliberate succession planning and leadership development.

Organizational Structure of Higher Education

Higher education is a unique context within which to discuss succession planning and leadership development. It is not that the basic principles of leadership, leadership development, and succession planning do not work within higher education, but they do need to be adjusted to fit the academic construct. One of the biggest differences in higher education from other sectors is the organizational structure. The most common ways that organizations organize themselves has been with hierarchies. Within that hierarchy, "power or authority increases as you move up the ranks, while numbers of people increase as you move down the ranks," and in that structure, the person at the top—whether the commander-in-chief in the military or the chief executive officer in companies—has a tremendous amount of power and authority (Buller and Cipriano 2019, 33). In higher education, while there is a reporting structure that gives supervisory oversight in similar ways, the influence and the authority is much more distributed, and institutional culture and values are driven more from the bottom-up. Higher education institutions are, in this way, much more decentralized for the sake of decision-making, relying more on shared governance and pure democratic principles (Buller and Cipriano 2019; Leaf 2019).

Shared governance is another essential tenet of higher education that separates it from other organizations. Shared governance is the notion that all stakeholders, and in particular faculty, have a voice in administrative decisions and how the institution is governed and hence, how it operates. For example, policies and curricular decisions are made at the faculty level, and insofar as they have significant latitude to make decisions that impact a student's degree completion, staff advisors have consequential authority. Organizational performance depends in large part on how entities organize themselves, but there is often an overemphasis on organizational structure separate from social structure (Sherman 1968). Higher education, unlike other sectors, relies then more on a strong social hierarchy that is not monolithic but based instead on a "pyramid of pyramids;" no matter how high up in the organization one goes, there is no top or end to the hierarchy. Faculty report to program heads, program heads report to department chairs, department chairs report to the deans, deans report to the Provost, the Provost is one of many Vice Presidents reporting to the president, the President reports to the Board and is responsible to regional accreditation, the Board, appointed by governors, are responsible to the state, and regional accreditors are responsible to the Department of Education; all are responsible to the public (Buller and Cipriano 2019, 37).

Historical Model of Promotion into Administrative Ranks

In many cases, faculty culture actively works against succession planning and leadership development because "taking an appointment as a department chair is seen as a demotion or simply a temporary term of service" (Barden and Curry 2013, 36), and frequently those who do accept a position are viewed by their peers as sacrificing themselves for the good of the department. In fact, all too often, even junior faculty who have not yet reached tenure take on an interim position of chair when senior colleagues go on sabbatical or retire. These interim positions, expected to be for short durations, can sometimes drag on for years, and the dynamics of leading a department and making decisions that might carry severe consequences during tenure review make it nearly impossible to be effective, instead rendering a key role in the organization into what effectively amounts to paper pushers. In no other industry does someone with such stature get forced into a management role. Even permanent leaders in higher education are often pulled from the faculty ranks against the faculty member's wishes; leading faculty "is often referred to as herding cats, and faculty training often does not provide support for those thrust into leadership roles" (Hornsby 2012, 97). Although much of the organizational structure discussed in the previous section details the faculty's role in curricular and policy matters, faculty are still often isolated from aspects of the institution that involve fiscal realities; thus, many faculty view administrative accountabilities as a sort of proverbial black box (Barden and Curry 2013).

Changing Public Expectations of Higher Education

Further complicating the issue is that the role of the academic leader has evolved and continues to evolve, so simply forcing faculty into administrative roles without proper training is not sustainable (Appadurai 2009). Leadership in the academy now demands "skills in conflict negotiation and resolution, influencing without formal authority, coaching, problem-solving, communication, change management, and community development" (Hornsby 2012, 97). The change in leadership challenges is easiest examined in the reporting from university presidents. In 2012, presidents cited their biggest challenges as relations with faculty, legislators, and governing boards, while indicating that they spent most of their time on fundraising, budgeting, community relations, and planning (American Council on Education 2012). In 2017, the Aspen Institute, along with a task force of 35 university and community college presidents, released a report entitled *Renewal and Progress: Strengthening Higher Education Leadership in a Time of*

Rapid Change that identified broader issues including alcohol abuse, sexual assaults, and mental illness as the big issues that face presidents. That same year, respondents in the *American College President Study* identified financial concerns as their top challenge, followed by faculty resistance to change, and a lack of time to think; also included in their top ten responses were problems inherited from the previous leadership and difficulty cultivating leadership in others (American Council on Education 2017). Finally, *Inside Higher Ed's* 2019 survey of college and university presidents indicates that presidents feel they were ill-prepared in the areas of enrollment management, fundraising, and digital learning prior to assuming their roles (Lederman and Jaschik 2019). This evolution of changes coincides with declining public support for higher education.

In a Gallup survey released last year, public confidence for higher education dropped by nine percent from 2015 to 2018 such that now less than half of Americans report they have a great deal or quite a lot of confidence in higher education (Jones 2018). No other institution (religion, military, etc.) saw a decline greater than five percent. The previous year, a report from the Pew Research Center found that more than half of Republicans say colleges have a negative impact on the direction of the United States (Doherty, Kiley, and Johnson 2017). The public is concerned with access, affordability, and quality (Marken 2019). Similar concerns come from within academia, as the 2018 Association of Governing Boards annual survey respondents rated price as their top concern; interestingly, that same survey indicated that only 23% of board members or trustees reported that they believe public perceptions of higher education are negative (Association of Governing Boards 2018). Still, responding to what Gallup eventually termed “A Crisis in Confidence in Higher Ed,” the Association of American Colleges and Universities, in conjunction with the American Conference of Academic Deans, titled their January 23-26, 2019 annual meeting, “Reclaiming the Narrative on the Value of Higher Education” (Association of American Colleges and Universities 2019). Numerous sessions detailed the need for a new commitment to academic leadership.

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Because of this rich context within which to view succession planning and leadership development, the purpose of this particular dissertation is to examine the state of succession planning and leadership development implementation at Texas’ public universities. Thirty-seven public universities in the state are included in the study. This research thus seeks to answer the following two research questions:

R1: To what extent are formalized succession planning development initiatives implemented on the campuses of Texas’ public universities?

R2: To what extent are formalized leadership development initiatives implemented on the campuses of Texas public universities?

For the purpose of this dissertation, “formalized succession planning” refers to a deliberate plan and procedure for identifying successors for leadership positions. “Formalized leadership development” is defined as an organized program or initiative aimed at improving the available “bench depth” of organizational leadership. On the other hand, “informal leadership development” refers to the day-to-day activities that increase leadership skills without defining a particular outcome or set of outcomes. The latter may include special project assignments or committee memberships. Organizations need not have succession planning in place to have a formal leadership development program; likewise, an organization may have a formal succession plan but not a leadership development program. This dissertation examines the presence of either or both succession planning and leadership development programs in Texas public universities.

Given the limited research on this topic in public higher education, this research includes elements of both basic and applied research. This research thus attempts to enhance knowledge of succession planning in Texas' public higher education institutions, while informing institutional responses to changing workforce demographics. The research examines: (1) why formal and informal succession planning initiatives and leadership development are important to existing and future university administrators; (2) what barriers exist to formalized succession planning at Texas' public universities; (3) how formalized succession planning tactics are implemented at four-year institutions in Texas; and, (4) how leadership development theories inform formalized succession planning practices and leadership development programs at four-year institutions in Texas.

Of the limited literature dedicated to higher education, much of the peer reviewed research is specific to community colleges (Levin 1996; Wallin, Cameron, and Sharples 2005; Luna 2010; Bumphus and Neal 2008; Cameron 2013; Eddy 2013), and in 2013, The Aspen Institute released a comprehensive report entitled "Crisis and Opportunity: Aligning the Community College Presidency with Student Success" that discussed a new paradigm needed for executive leadership at community colleges (The Aspen Institute 2013). This dissertation aims to expand information for four-year institutions, including other related dissertations (Christie 2005; Richards 2009; Mercer 2009; Luzebetak 2010; Smith 2011; Keller 2018). Thus, this study focuses exclusively on Texas' public four-year institutions.

Although the literature suggests that few institutions of higher education actively conduct formalized succession planning, the literature as detailed in the following chapter also reveals several formal and informal leadership development activities. For example, national leadership academies and institution-specific leadership development programs are designed to provide individuals with requisite skills and abilities in preparation for middle and future senior administration positions within higher education (Gonzalez 2010; Alcala et al 2007; Lumby 2012, Academic Impressions 2011, 2018, 2019). Because of the aforementioned changes in public expectations, better understanding of succession planning and leadership development in higher education is necessary.

CONTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC AFFAIRS LITERATURE

Dwight Waldo wrote in *The Enterprise of Public Administration* that, "inevitably, government will be asked to solve problems" (Waldo 2001, 171). As discussed in section four of the fifth edition of *Classics of Public Administration*, editors Jay M. Shafritz, Albert C. Hyde, and Sandra J. Parkes discuss how public management "emerged in the 1980s and 1990s as a significant field in its own right in public administration" (Shafritz, Hyde, and Parkes 2004, 381). Organizational performance, including movements such as Total Quality Management, or TQM, influenced both private and public sector organizations. The passage of the Government Performance Results Act, established in 1993, also contributed to a new level of thinking about public sector performance. In essence, since then, the public sector, whether at the federal or state levels, have sought to reinvent themselves as they respond to “the American critique” (Shafritz, Hyde, and Parkes 2004, 383).

The American critique demands that governments and public sector agencies be held accountable as “public reason, trust, and the common good are the three pillars of contemporary democratic leadership” (Ruscio 2008, 12). The public expects only one type of public leadership: good leadership. Hence, leadership cannot be neutral; it is instead “a moral necessity” within which “its actions and achievements are measured by the supreme public values that themselves are the profoundest expressions of human wants” (Burns 2003, 2). Scholars assert that administrators in the public sector face a moral imperative and an ethical obligation to be effective public managers that guard against administrative evil (Terry 2002; Cohen and Emicke 2002; Cooper 2006; Newell, Reeher, and Ronayne 2008; Ruscio 2008; Adams and Balfour 2009). The public expects public sector officials to safeguard the monetary and social interests of the general public. Leonard D. White wrote in 1926 that “public administration is, then, the execution of the public business” whose objective “is the most efficient utilization of the resources at the disposal of officials and employees. These resources include…human resources bound up in the hundreds of thousands of men and women who work for the state” (White 1926, 58).

Public institutions of higher education face intense scrutiny from the public to respond to societal expectations and hence are embedded within the public sector. Debate exists on the extent to which institutions of higher education are responsive to these increasing expectations. Higher education trends are often driven by social and economic contexts "which are closely related to changes in political contexts" (Brennan 2008, 383). Although this dissertation recognizes public higher education as a subset of the public sector, it does not intend to separate higher education from other state agencies. Rather, it wishes to highlight the dynamic nuances of the academy.

The State of Texas serves as an appropriate setting for this study because of the diversity of the state both in terms of its growing economy and its higher education options. Yet, despite its vibrant economy, growing population, and proliferation of institutions of higher education, the proportion of Texans enrolled in higher education is behind other states and is in decline (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board 2013). In 1999, the state appointed a committee to develop a statewide higher education strategic plan. That plan, termed *Closing the Gaps by 2015*, outlined specific statewide goals for student participation, student success, excellence, and research. While the state was successful in meeting some of its goals (success and excellence), it fell short in areas of participation and research (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board 2016). The state's current strategic plan, 60x30TX, has four goals designed to achieve the overarching goal that by 2030, at least 60% of Texans ages 25-34 will have either a certificate or a degree (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board 2015). The continuity of sustainable, effective leadership at Texas public universities is integral to the state's ability to reach its higher education goals.

Higher education funding accounted for $15.9 billion dollars in the state's overall 2012-2013 biennium budget; health-related institutions received over $8 billion dollars, general academic teaching institutions received nearly $5.9 billion dollars, and two-year institutions received nearly $2 billion (Texas Legislative Budget Board 2012 and The University of Texas System 2013). In the 2015 84th Legislative Session, the last session for which an impact summary is available, the state's leadership increased overall funding by 3.6%, and appropriated $14.7 billion in General Revenue to support all of higher education (The University of Texas System 2015).

The current and most recent three legislative sessions also saw several efforts to increase public accountability, transparency, and efficiency among its higher education institutions. In 2013, legislators filed 938 bills, 635 by the House and 303 by the Senate, aimed at improving education—just fewer than 400 of those bills were specific to higher education (Texas Legislature Online 2013). In 2015, more than 150 bills were passed that impacted higher education, including 40 bills directly impacting academic issues (The University of Texas System 2015). In the current legislative session, significant attention has been paid to address student transfer issues, freedom of expression on college campuses, and, of course, appropriation funding. Hence, future leaders of Texas institutions of public higher education need to possess the temperament and skills requisite to navigate this public policy environment.

METHODOLOGY

The research strategy includes a concurrent mixed methods approach (Creswell 2009) in that it blends a combination of survey responses, web searches, and unstructured interviewing and conversations that the researcher had over five years in the general course of performing her professional duties as a mid-level administrator at a Texas public research university; this includes roles as a member of the Texas Council of Chief Academic Officers since 2008 and the institutional leader primarily responsible for regional accreditation since September 2011 (officially designated as liaison in April 2015). Collectively, the group of Texas public universities comprise a case study, and the results of the study indicate a baseline that could inform future research.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study does not attempt to support a particular hypothesis rooted in one theoretical base, but it does seek to answer research questions through a theoretical lens including the evolution of various leadership theories to augment the notion that deliberate leadership planning is needed as the higher education workforce evolves and as the environment of higher education becomes more complex. Chapter 2, Literature Review, is divided into four subsections: leadership theory, succession planning and leadership development in the private sector, succession planning and leadership development in the public sector, and finally, succession planning and leadership development in higher education. Chapter 3 details the methodology and research design employed, a description of the survey instrument, supplemental data points, and the results. Chapter 4 contains a discussion of the research results and presents recommendations stemming from the key findings; Chapter 5 concludes with future research suggestions and a call for public institutions to be even more deliberate in their leadership development at all levels and across all organizational divisions.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

LEADERSHIP THEORY

Research on leadership is expansive partly because leadership is hard to define but easier to categorize. Indeed leadership theory is vast, constantly evolving, and sometimes self-contradictory, resulting in such titles as *Leadership Can Be Taught: A Bold Approach for a Complex World* (Parks 2005), *Leadership BS: Fixing Workplaces and Careers One Truth at a Time* (Pfeffer 2015), and *The Dichotomy of Leadership* (Willink and Babin 2018), each positing against one another's underlying premises. Numerous such examples exist because no one unifying theory exists; instead, leadership theory is typically described in schools of thought. Scholars David V. Day and Jon Antonakis describe this evolution in their text *The Nature of Leadership* edited in 2012. The scholars divide leadership research into nine major schools of thought that they label Biological/Evolutionary, Information-Processing, New Leadership, Relational, Skeptics, Contextual, Contingency, Behavioral, or Trait. Within these categorical groups are specific models of leadership defined by certain leadership styles, some of which are prescriptive and others that are normative (Day and Antonakis 2012).

Leadership behaviors follow three main categories: transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire. Leadership scholars Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass recognized a model, which they term Full Range Leadership, that incorporates each of these behaviors (Avolio and Bass 2002). Bass defined transformational leadership as leaders affecting followers, and asserts that charisma, insofar as it inspires influence, is necessary but insufficient on its own (Bass 1990). Indeed, charisma, without competence, is dangerous, as Max Weber first warned (Weber 1946; Lipman-Blumen 2006). The full range leadership model inspired authentic transformational leadership. Authentic leadership is often said to be necessary in order to enact change. Because public expectations require that institutions be responsive to changing needs and evolving trends, change management leadership is critical for leaders in higher education.

Change Management

Change management literature is organized into two broad categories that Burke refers to as revolutionary and evolutionary (Burke 2008). The former describes change that is sudden, unplanned, and that significantly alters an organization's mission and purpose, whereas the latter refers to gradual, incremental change. While the distinction between the two is clear in definition and theory, the difference in practice is not as easily distinguishable. Organizations' environments are changing faster than the organizations themselves (Burke 2008); thus, the need for change may be immediate and jarring, but the implementation of that change occurs at a slower rate. This is particularly true with public sector organizations in which the environment, political and social, can demand changes at such a rate that organizations are unable to fully implement change initiatives before newer and quicker response is demanded by their external stakeholders' latest or deepened interests. This rapidly shifting environment means that organizations do not have the opportunity to move through the traditional change model of "unfreeze, change, freeze" prescribed by Lewin (Lewin 1947).

While most of the change management literature focuses on the private sector, one theoretical stream that suitably describes organizational change in the public sector emerges from early institutional theory and its nuanced contemporary, neo-institutionalism (Ashworth, Boyne and Delbridge 2009; Fernandez-Alles and Llamas-Sanchez 2008). Institutional theory largely situates organizational change in efforts toward gaining legitimacy. Unlike other theories that suggest organizational change is related to better performance, institutional theory asserts that "organizations adapt their internal characteristics in order to conform to the expectations of the key stakeholders and their environments" (Ashworth, Boyne and Delbridge 2009, 165). The challenge, though, is that key stakeholders can exert varied, and sometimes conflicting, expectations and pressures on public sector organizations. Public sector organizations, particularly large bureaucratic institutions, often respond to this fast-changing environment with merely incremental adjustments that "may produce excessive entropy and decrease an organization's alignment with its environment" (Kiel 1989, 547).

Old institutionalism is the sociological view that organizations face deterministic institutional pressures that must be accepted in order to obtain and maintain the legitimacy and financial and physical resources necessary to persist (Kondra and Hinings 1998). This historic perspective prescribes to Weber's "iron cage" notion that organizations, and thus managers, are trapped by institutional conventions. The theory posits that individual firms are restricted to established rules and norms that must be adhered to in order for the firm to maintain its legitimacy. This legitimacy is perceived by stakeholders in relation to the firm's peers; thus, the concepts of competition and relevance are integral to institutional theory.

Another tenet of institutional theory is the role isomorphic pressures play. These isomorphic pressures determine an institution's level of compliance with stakeholder demands (Ashworth, Boyne, and Delbridge 2009; Fernandez-Alles and Llamas-Sanchez 2008; Kondra and Hinings 1998; Kaplan 1982).

Neoinstitutionalism, which mostly analyzes convergent (or evolutionary) change, builds upon old institutionalism but provides a framework in which organizations take an active, rather than reactive, role with strategic responses to institutional pressures (Fernandez-Alles and Llamas-Sanchez 2008). Institutional theory asserts that institutions operating within a socially responsible paradigm react passively and with unplanned changes whereas neoinstitutional theorists contend that organizations' responses to external pressures can be measured and strategic. Neoinstitutionalism explains both competitive and institutional forces and is particularly useful in describing change management in public organizations. Public services face greater external pressure to be accountable and responsive; indeed, their legitimacy, resources, and efficacy are often determined by public opinion (Fernandez-Alles and Llamas-Sanchez 2008; Kee and Newcomer 2008; Kiel 1989; Robertson and Seneviratne 1995; Salipante and Golden-Biddle 1995). Legitimacy is, therefore, more essential to demonstrate than efficiency. Also, stakeholder intervention is more common with public service organizations, thus subjecting them to increased regulations.

Christine Oliver's work, including the five C's: cause, constituents, contents, control, and context, makes a direct contribution to the field of neoinstitutional theory and its relevance for the public sector (Oliver 1991; Fernandez-Alles and Llamas-Sanchez 2008). According to Oliver, the ‘cause’ is the reasons why an organization is experiencing pressures to conform. These reasons include demonstration of public good benefits, social responsiveness or legitimacy, or productivity. Although more prevalent in private sector, public sector organizations are also increasingly being asked to demonstrate their efficiency and effectiveness (Robertson and Seneviratne 1995; Kee and Newcomer 2008). Such accountability measures have resulted in isomorphism, which may have three origins: coercive, such as legally imposed regulations; normative isomorphism from trades and unions; or mimetic pressures to imitate policies or practices from other fields (Fernandez-Alles and Llamas-Sanchez 2008). Thus, an organization’s ‘cause’ can be their coercive isomorphic pressures.

Oliver states that there are five strategies organizations can use to respond to such pressures: acquiescence, compromising, avoidance, defiance, and manipulation (Oliver 1991). Fernandez-Alles and Llamas-Sanchez then build upon these five strategies by categorizing three tactics within each. The tactics for acquiescence include habituation, imitation or compliance; the tactics for compromising are balancing, pacifying, or bargaining; the tactics for avoidance are concealment, shielding or escaping; the tactics for defiance include dismissal, challenge, and attack; and the tactics for manipulation are cooption, influence, and control. Organizations as a whole may not even consciously employ these strategies or tactics; in fact, the individual change of employees and the organization change of an entire agency or institution may not be employing the same strategies or tactics simultaneously. Sometimes, though, the responses are deliberate, and the tactics employed are measured and planned.

Higher education presents an interesting context within which the coercive isomorphic pressures elicit varied strategies identified by Oliver. Just as the literature on change management in public sector organizations is limited compared to the private sector (Robertson and Seneviratne 1995; Ashworth, Boyne, and Delbridge 2009; Fernandez-Alles and Llamas-Sanchez 2008; Kondra and Hinings 1998), change management research focused on higher education is also scarce but growing (Scott 2010; Storberg-Walker 2004). In these few exceptions, case studies have yielded contradictory findings providing either positive (Buller 2015; By, Diefenbach and Klarner 2008; Van Loon 2001; Newton 2000) and negative (Noumair, Winderman, and Burke 2010) support of change theory.

Gender and Leadership

In addition to change management, gender provides another nuanced context within which to examine leadership within higher education. Across all sectors, despite decades of improvement, women remain underrepresented in professional leadership roles in comparison to males (Carli and Eagly 2012; Ely, Insead, and Kolb 2011; Duehr and Bono 2006; Sczesny et al. 2004). Women are most underrepresented at senior level positions, and their representation also varies by industry, with particularly low representation in technological industries (Adams and Weiss 2011). Other scholars have found, though, that women are over-represented in glass cliff, or precarious, leadership positions (Ryan and Haslam 2005; Sabharwal 2015; Pasquerella and Clauss-Ehlers 2017). Currently, women represent only 2.2% of *Fortune* 500 chief executive officers and 15% of those companies' board members; the increases in leadership positions that women saw in previous decades has now considerably slowed in recent years (Ely, Insead, and Kolb 2011). This is true despite that research demonstrates positive relationships between female leadership at the board—as opposed to executive—level and female representation at the managerial ranks (Skaggs, Stainback, and Duncan 2012). In addition, when other industries, including philanthropic and education institutions, are accounted for, women still hold only 26% of all chief executive positions (Carli and Eagly 2012).

Early scholars and economists theorized that there was a pipeline problem, but this has proven not to be the case as women hold 51% of managerial and professional specialty positions, and since the early 2000s, have surpassed males in obtaining bachelor's degrees (Duehr and Bono 2006). Thus, other explanations must exist for the slow pace of women's senior leadership advancement.

In their chapter for an edited volume on the nature of leadership, eminent gender leadership scholars Carli and Eagly summarize years of their research into five succinct explanations: (1) human capital investments and family responsibilities, (2) leadership styles of women and men, (3) evolutionary psychology—men are naturally dominant, (4) prejudice, discrimination, and stereotypes, and (5) organizational barriers (Carli and Eagly 2012). Although human capital theory posits that women's greater domestic responsibilities undermine their investment to obtain senior leadership roles, evidence does not support this. In fact, rather, studies show that both men and women report little to no differences in career commitment; however, human capital explanation does reflect that women devote more time to family than career (Carli and Eagly 2012, 439). Women do take breaks for motherhood, and according to the authors, there is ample evidence that women's careers do suffer from this.

The second explanation shows that early research on leadership styles of women and men was conducted by experiments, scales, and instruments that were themselves gender-stereotypic (Carli and Eagly 2012). General leadership theory grew to include transformational and laissez-faire leadership style in addition to transactional leadership style, and Eagly conducted a meta-analysis that revealed female leaders are more transformational than males (Carli and Eagly 2012). Women were more likely than males to be supportive and encouraging to their subordinates. Transformational leadership theory does, though, attribute characteristics that have been described as communal, or feminine, so even these theories and their experiments are embedded in gender stereotypes.

The third explanation posits that males “possess biologically based attributes that ideally suit them for leadership” (Carli and Eagly 2012, 447). Evolutionary psychologists believe that biological gender differences lead to differences in behavior that in turn influence leadership behavior. While research does support that sex difference results from socialization and development, it does not necessarily follow that these sex differences positively influence leadership behavior. Again, the notions here are grounded in gender stereotypes. Stereotypes exist for a reason, of course, so that is not to say there is no merit in the assumption that males are more aggressive than women and are more prone to asserting themselves over others; it is, however, problematic to assume that these qualities provide men a leadership advantage.

The fifth explanation suggests that because men have historically created organizations, the organizations are also designed for males. That is, men’s needs and experiences are considered more than those of women. For example, Carli and Eagly note that organizations often reward those employees who are able to put in long hours and push aside outside responsibilities, including family responsibilities. As a result, women who bear the primary responsibility for the home and family are unable to provide demanding companies such commitment. In addition to preventing women from spending extra hours at the office, these home and family responsibilities prevent women from creating social capital in the workplace (Carli and Eagly 2012). That is, rather than hit the bar with the boys, women must head home to help the kids with their homework. Again, these barriers reflect a gender stereotype that attributes certain responsibilities to women and other freedoms to men.

The fourth explanation is intentionally skipped because it is unclear how it was an explanation on its own. Each of the other four explanations also have vestiges of gender stereotypes. Gendered stereotypes are categorical beliefs that an individual ascribes to behavioral characteristics due to his or her gender. Typically, women are stereotyped as communal whereas men are stereotyped to be more agentic (Diekman and Eagly 2000; Carli and Eagly 2001; Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt 2001; Duehr and Bono 2006). Communal characteristics are those that are concerned with putting others before self and have more collaborative attributes whereas agentic characteristics describe assertive, independent, and confident attributes. In the literature, leadership roles have been aligned with agentic, or masculine, characteristics (Diekman and Eagly 2000; Carli and Eagly 2001; Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt 2001; Duehr and Bono 2006).

Some critics argue that although *de jure* discrimination no longer exists, a *de facto* discrimination based on gendered stereotypes remains. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, many articles and books described management work as feminine (Sczesny et al. 2004; Duehr and Bono 2006). And while many organizations enacted policies and practices to eliminate deliberate gender discrimination, a “second-generation form of gender bias” that is a “powerful yet invisible barrier to women’s advancement that arises from cultural beliefs about gender, as well as workplace structures, practices and patterns of interactions that inadvertently favor men” persists (Ely, Insead, and Kolb 2011). Further, scholars have found a remaining gap between current colleagues and the next generation’s male leaders. In fact, studies show that gender stereotypes held by male graduate management students more closely resemble those of male managers from two decades ago than male managers now (Duehr and Bono 2006; Sherman et al. 2010). Hence, gendered stereotypes, and the obstacles they present women in the workplace, still exist, although they may no longer always take the form of blatant and deliberate policies or practices.

Change management and gender and leadership were introduced here because those remain two areas of concern when it comes to succession planning and leadership development within higher education. Both are discussed again within the higher education section, but first it is important to provide a brief explanation of how succession planning and leadership development generally became important within the private sector, and then how the public sector also employed and adapted strategies to fit within its context.

PRIVATE SECTOR SUCCESSION PLANNING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Succession planning and leadership development are key areas of concern in the private sector. In 2010, in the United States alone, over $25 billion was spent on executive and management development (Goldman, Wesner, and Karnchanomai 2013, 63). According to a survey conducted of 248 American companies in 2013, leadership development staff “increased by 12 percent overall” from the previous year which was the equivalent of “3.4 staffers for every 100 leaders participating” (Meinert 2014, 14). Given the financial allocations, it is important that these efforts are effective (Groves 2007; Day et al 2014).

Succession planning has been a topic of scholarly inquiry in the private sector literature for years. While several attribute its beginnings to Walter Mahler’s dealings with General Electric in the 1970s (Rothwell, Jackson, Knight, and Lindholm 2005), succession planning first appeared in the literature in 1945 regarding New Jersey Bell Telephone Company’s Chief Executive Officer, Chester Barnard, and his deliberations to replace his management team with officers in other companies within Bell (Barnard 1945).

As mentioned in the introduction chapter, succession planning is not replacing people with the next highest person in the organizational chart. If this were true, then companies potentially could fill vacancies with unwilling and underprepared successors. Succession planning novices do confuse it with this type of replacement planning. Replacement planning, though, can be characterized as a reactive, narrow, restricted approach to risk management, whereas succession planning is characterized as a proactive, organized, flexible approach to planned future development (Wolfe 1996). Succession planning is more thorough and entails a systematic, long-term approach to meeting the present and future talent needs of an organization; adequate succession planning requires time, diligence, and periodic evaluation (Wolfe 1996; Charan, Drotter, and Noel 2001; Rothwell, Jackson, Knight, and Lindholm 2005).

Though more often described than defined, the most accurate meaning of succession planning is a “defined program than an organization systemizes to ensure leadership continuity for all key positions by developing activities that will build personnel talent from within” (Wolfe 1996, 4). When done effectively, succession planning presents organizations with a host of rewards. Rothwell and his colleagues identify six specific benefits that succession planning yields its organizations: enables organization to assess talent needs by establishing competency models; allows leaders to identify and to tap key people to fill critical work functions; provides avenues for discussions about how to develop talent; defines career pathways through the organization; provides for a higher return on investment from employees; and leads to a clear and attainable promotion process (Rothwell, Jackson, Knight, and Lindholm 2005).

Although there is no one size fits all model for succession planning, scholars suggest that the systematic approach involve multiple stakeholder input and multiple phase implementation (Goldsmith 2009; Wolfe 1996; Rothwell 2005; Berger and Berger 2004; Frisch 2001). While it is true that the pool of stakeholders should be composed of primarily insiders, corporate boards are an important source of external input (Ward 2000). After all, corporate boards are responsible for hiring and firing chief executive officers. While the executive team may have a better grasp of personnel, boards often have a deep knowledge of the company’s resources (Ward 2000). The recommended phases include assessing and defining needs, benchmarking, soliciting buy-in, developing strategic action plans, identifying leadership positions, determining essential job and interpersonal skills, predicting future needs, and selecting evaluation metrics (Wolfe 1996; Rothwell 2005; Rothwell, Jackson, Knight and Lindholm 2005; Mangiamele 2010).

Rothwell, Jackson, Knight and Lindholm's book was written in 2004 and many of the projections used in the chapters were the Bureau of Labor Statistics 2004-2014 projections made well before the economic recession had yet to peak. Thus, the number of job openings, retirements, and available workers used throughout their study did not materialize as projected, but the authors did address other circumstances that could adversely affect the American workforce. In fact, one could add an economic recession to the list the scholars did identify: corporate scandals, terrorist attacks, and sudden illnesses (Rothwell, Jackson, Knight and Lindholm 2005). The fact that external influences greatly impact succession planning creates a need for succession planning to evolve. The scholars assert that in order to understand fully the impact that each of these external factors can have, a comprehensive integration of succession and career planning is necessary, and the majority of their study discusses how that integration is best accomplished. This integration of two program components is similar to the tenets of talent management, which is a holistic approach to organization performance (Berger and Berger 2004; Stevens 2001).

Career planning is best described as employee development. Although career planning originated in the 1980s, it faded into the background before its latest emersion in a new form (Rothwell, Jackson, Knight and Lindholm 2005). Current career planning is designed to assist individual employees in recognizing their career goals, and it helps them keep their skills current to stay competitive in the job market. It is influenced by individual characteristics of the employee, such as educational status, physical and psychological abilities, and socioeconomic status. Career planning is a process by which to develop or to enhance individual competencies.

While succession planning focuses on the organization's methods to meet its talent over time, career plans assist individual employees in attaining their career goals by providing guidance on the recommended methods to do so. Career planning is micro, or a bottom-up, development program and succession planning is typically a macro top-down program, but they complement one another in a crucial way. In fact, without succession planning, "career planning can be a roadmap leading to an uncertain destination" whereas without career planning, "succession planning is a wish list" (Rothwell, Jackson, Knight, and Lindholm 2005, 25).

Traditional practices of succession planning focused on chief executive officer replacement (Charan 2005). Despite studies on the prevalence of succession planning in the private sector, a 2009 survey conducted by the executive search firm Heidrick & Struggles and Stanford University determined that 69% should be readily available to fill a vacant position, but only 54% of those respondents were grooming internal candidates for those positions (Minton-Eversole 2010, 22). Internal candidates, while they know they are in the talent pool, do not regularly communicate with the sitting chief executive officer (CEO) about their expectations of the necessary capabilities. Part of this may be attributed to the fallout from 2002 passage of Sarbanes-Oxley, which led to corporate boards seizing more control of the succession plans rather than allowing the chief executive officers to control the process (Citrin and Ogden 2010).

Scholars suggest that original succession planning "shrieks of outdated top-down control philosophies" that are dangerous because if organizations do not "find out the real, rather than the assumed, career expectations" then their succession plans may not be reliable

(Stevens 2001, 3). Stevens further asserts that most of the succession planning in the late 1990s "are based on the premise that ambitious people have and want only" to move upward in their career (Stevens 2001, 3). This is not necessarily true. Despite popular opinion, not everyone is driven primarily by promotion; instead, many employees desire lateral mobility (Stevens 2001). Thus, Stevens suggests succession planning should resemble "a grid-like pattern" with possible successors plotted "upwards, sideways, or downwards" (Stevens 2001, 5). Since succession planning is more about establishing a resilient workforce, this bottom-up approach ensures adaptability at more tiers within the organization chart.

Since succession planning has been a constant presence in practice and the literature of private sector, it is easy to assume that the private sector has it all figured out. This is not necessarily true, however. Many companies are concerned about their programs' effectiveness (Collins and Holton III 2004; Goldman, Wesner, and Karnchanomai 2013). In fact, various survey data suggest that only 14% of companies are satisfied that their succession plans are successful to a high or very high degree (Ketter 2010). Large companies, in particular, "are weak in succession planning, with successors identified for just 10 percent of their first-level leaders, 19 percent of their mid-level leaders, 24 percent of senior-level positions, and 36 percent of executive positions" (Meinert 2014, 14). In 2007, the executive research company, Aberdeen Group, surveyed 245 organizations to determine a best practices strategy to succession planning (Martin 2007). The Aberdeen Group developed performance criteria related to vacancies filled, successor performance increase, and increased bench strength and measured each of the 245 companies according to those criteria (Martin 2007).

The study compiled the data to determine best-in-class practices to showcase succession planning tactics that succeeded—and failed. The data showed that the organizational levels for best-in-class succession planning remains at the executive level with 72% of the respondents identifying that level as opposed to 67% upper-middle, 52% middle, 30% exempt, 29% clerical, 22% hourly, and 15% contract (Martin 2007, 9). The report produces a comprehensive illustration of strategies used by the private sector. Lucent Technologies, for example, has a division specifically devoted to developing strategies and collecting feedback on their succession planning efforts (Vedpuriswar 2001, 26).

The Aberdeen report also offers a list of warnings on failures of succession planning. It is difficult to isolate why a succession plan fails. It varies from organization. Sometimes the plan is not the problem, but the person is. For example, in the late 90s, Coke's CEO Roberto Goizueta stepped down and replaced himself with his pre-determined successor, Douglas Ivester. Ivester had proven himself to be an invaluable complement to Goizuetta; however, when Ivester assumed the top duties, it was determined that he did not have the interpersonal skills needed for the job (Vedpuriswar 2001). Thus, sometimes succession planning fails because the qualities that made an employee an effective second-in-charge are not the same qualities needed for the CEO position. The candidate should be able to develop those qualities. Thus, some scholars suggest that the responsibility of the current CEO is not only about choosing the next CEO but also about coaching, mentoring, or developing that successor (Goldsmith 2009).

SUCCESSION PLANNING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Although the literature on succession planning and leadership development in the public sector is less abundant than literature in the private sector, succession planning and leadership development has long received attention in the public sector (Robertson and Seneviratne 1995). In fact, two special issues of *Public Personnel Management* in 2004 and 2007 were devoted to succession planning (Kiyonaga 2004; Calo 2007). Still, much of the early literature and practice occurred at the federal level rather than at the state and local levels. Indeed, the earliest practices of succession planning and leadership development can be traced to the federal government's five military academies, the first founded in the early 1800s. These service academies serve as the foundation for the undergraduate education and training of future commissioned officers in the United States Armed Forces, and their programs include not only military leadership training but also character, or ethical, leadership training. Further, in the twentieth century, the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) determined that succession planning in the government was necessary due to the projected retirements of government workers (Schall 1997). Hence, the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) was the first non-military federal agency to undertake serious actions to develop and to implement initiatives designed to prepare its workforce; the GAO and the Office of Inspector General (OIG) later served as the evaluators of other federal agencies by offering suggestions for their succession planning processes, including linking succession plans to strategic plans (United States Government Accountability Office 2005).

Specifically, the OIG and GAO evaluate succession planning efforts against seven key principles for succession planning: a commitment and active support of top leadership; a direct link between the organization's mission, and its strategic plan and outcomes; identification of the critical skills and competencies that will be needed to achieve current and programmatic goals; development of strategies to address gaps in mission critical and other key positions; leadership training programs that include formal and informal training for all levels of supervisors, managers, and potential leaders; strategies to address specific human capital challenges, such as diversity, leadership capacity, and retention; and a process for evaluating the costs and succession planning efforts and the return on investment it provides for the organization (United States Office of Inspector General 2007).

The public sector and private sector have distinct differences that necessitate differences in their approach to succession planning. In the public sector, civil systems exist that prohibit by law the naming of individuals to fill positions without competitive job searches (Rothwell 2005). This impedes how a public organization can develop their talent management pool. Also, the public sector leadership model involves merit, open competition, and seniority that private sector leadership does require (Lynn 2001). Because an agency director is typically a political appointee who carries out the will of an elected official, the goals and performance expectations of an organization can intentionally change when the elected official vacates the office. Hence, succession planning in public agencies is more often an integrated, holistic approach, sometimes called "workforce planning or human capital management initiatives" (Rothwell 2005, 51). Federal, state, and local agencies all differ among themselves as well as between each level, so, just as with private sector succession planning, there is no one-size-fits-all succession planning model that works best in the public sector. Scholars agree, though, that the basic process should involve planning, selection and training of staff, sustainability, and evaluation (Jarrell and Pewitt 2007; Pynes 2004).

The literature includes studies about the effects of managerial succession on organizational performance (Hill 2005). In addition, some scholars have taken the opposite approach and studied the impact of public service performance on turnover on the top management (Boyne, James, John, and Petrovsky 2010). These studies contribute to the literature on how succession planning fits within the broader field of strategic human resource management and organization theory. They also provide case studies that are informative to public sector administrators. Case studies are, in fact, a way in which public agencies study the implications of succession planning on public agencies.

Another prominent succession planning and leadership development initiative at the federal level occurs within the Office of Personnel Management's Center for Leadership Development. The center dedicates itself to developing strong leaders within the Federal Government by bringing in leadership development professionals who provide federal high-performing aspiring leaders, managers, or executives with personalized services that help propel those individuals' performances. The center, which has existed for more than fifty years, works to "create, share, and apply knowledge and skills to address the challenges faced by public sector organizations; develop the values and competencies that are the foundation of public service; offer state-of-the-art learning experiences" (United States Office of Personnel

Management 2019). They approach leadership development with a multilevel program, and their program for senior leaders—the Federal Executive Institute—has served more than 25,000 senior federal leaders since 1968.

The Federal Executive Institute (FEI) has a campus in Charlottesville, Virginia, not far from the University of Virginia (UVA), where participants have access to UVA's research and athletics facilities. FEI uses more than 150 faculty members from around the nation representing universities such as Harvard University, Georgetown University, and Syracuse University to deliver the program's content. One critical component to the program is what they term The Lab, which is both a space and a practice of human-centered design approaches to innovation; to date, over 2,000 government employees were taught human-centered design at the Lab, which provided those workers with the skills to blend strategy, design, qualitative research, and entrepreneurial thinking to approach complex public sector or cross-sector challenges (United States Office of Personnel Management 2019). As such, the program builds learning communities of both participants as well as the faculty. The Center for Leadership Development and the FEI serve as a resource for all public agencies.

The Office of Personnel Management also offers public agencies resources on succession planning and models for their own workforce management needs. The state government succession planning process of Georgia Merit's System's model of succession planning is one such prominent example. Georgia's flexible model of succession planning involves seven steps: pre-planning; communicating the plan; identifying leadership characteristics; assessing bench strength and other pre-measures; assessing talent; developing talent; and evaluating the succession plan (Brooks 2005). The pre-planning step involves determining who the succession planning team will be, what the program objectives and measures will be; communicating the plan involves informing stakeholders about determining goals and measures. Step three, identifying the leadership characteristics, is a complex step that begins with identifying the competency levels, competency scope of impact, and leadership results of the program. Those three areas are then balanced against one another and used to develop the essential characteristics of future leaders in the given positions.

Matrices are used to assess the existing talent, and that data is then used to inform development strategies that will be used to aid the members of the succession planning pool. The final step of the process, evaluation, is a mix of simple and sophisticated measures of assessment, ranging from stakeholder satisfaction surveys to cost-benefit and return on investment analyses (Brooks 2005). This process is both extensive and intensive; the rigor of the process does position Georgia to handle effectively and efficiently any workforce issues they are presented with whether by external or internal influences. Other problems of the Georgia Merit System notwithstanding, the data-driven approach to succession planning has proven to be effective for them.

The examples exemplify a more holistic approach to succession planning that is common in the public sector. This is not unlike the integrated approach to succession and workforce planning that Rothwell and his colleagues championed. In fact, in a contributing article to the 2004 special issue of *Public Personnel Management,* Rothwell and Stan Poduch take this integrated approach and apply it directly to public organizations. The authors contend that a unique feature of the public sector is the need for succession planning at virtually every level of the organization. In addition to threats from the external factors, such as an aging workforce, government organizations also face threats of massive employment loss due to forms of terrorist attacks (Rothwell and Poduch 2004).

Unlike succession planning that only focuses on key positions, Rothwell and Poduch argue for a need of technical succession planning in government workforces. Technical succession planning focuses more on succession planning across the organization chart, much like the grid-like succession plans called for in the private sector literature. Planning across the institution entails ensuring that people with specialized knowledge share that knowledge with other stakeholders within the organization. Unlike succession planning, technical succession planning acknowledges, indeed rests upon, the fact that individuals carry tacit knowledge that is essential to carrying out the government missions (Rothwell and Poduch 2004). Technical succession planning preserves the institutional knowledge that resides within job experience and not job descriptions. The authors outline seven steps to conducting technical succession planning: making the commitment to capture specialized knowledge; clarifying what work processes are key to an agency's mission; clarifying who possesses specialized knowledge gained from experience; clarifying how those processes are performed by those who have the specialized knowledge; capturing the specialized knowledge about those work experiences; maintaining and transmitting that specialized knowledge; and continuously assessing and addressing knowledge gaps (Rothwell and Poduch 2004).

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Department of Transportation (PennDOT) is one public agency that has developed and implemented a technical succession plan. PennDOT uses position analysis workbooks to transfer tacit knowledge from experienced employees to newer employees; these workbooks are designed to capture tacit knowledge that needs to be transmitted through cross training, formal courses, and on-the-job training (Rothwell and Poduch 2004). The experienced workers are called to organized brainstorming sessions in which they explain what they do on a daily basis, how they do it, what they must know to do it, and how they learned it; that information is then put into a "job map" that is given to newcomers via the training sessions (Rothwell and Poduch 2004, 414). PennDOT felt the position analysis workbook sessions had a positive impact on the transmission of data from veteran employees; it provided tangible documents that expressed knowledge otherwise left in the heads of the most experienced employees. In addition, the process itself helped PennDOT "to uncover areas in which the work process itself can be improved or even redesigned"; and in addition, the technical succession planning process "slashed that unproductive breaking-in period of newcomers" (Rothwell and Poduch 2004, 415).

Other states also produce succession planning reports for their agencies, such as "Succession Planning: Ohio's Talent for Tomorrow and Beyond" (Ohio Department of Administrative Services 2011), "Workforce and Succession Plan: The Department's Commitment to the Development of Its Employees and Future Leaders" (California Department of Consumer Affairs 2009) both of which heeded warnings discussed at the Council of State Government's plenary session entitled, "Who's in Charge? Succession Planning Before the

Crisis" at the 2009 annual Council of State Government's conference (The Council of State Government 2009). This session was in response to reports that two-fifths of local and state government employees could retire within 15 years (Pynes 2004).

In their 2007 article in the *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, then-doctoral students Karen M. Jarrell and Kyle Coby Pewitt discuss how the municipality of Plano, Texas developed their succession plan, known as the Management Preparation Program of Plano. According to Jarrell and Pewitt, the 2001-hired Director of Human Resources, LaShon Ross, examined existing initiatives in both public and private sectors to determine effective strategies to address the city's problem that 46% of their senior management would be eligible for retirement by 2005 and 70% would be eligible by 2009 (Jarrell and Pewitt 2007). Ross was unable to locate examples from local governments, though. An article authored by a member of the International City/County Management Association posits that the dearth of focus at the local government level on succession planning, particularly after multiple warnings (Calo 2007), could be due to the fact that the recession hit, and local governments had to shift their focus from future concerns back to immediate concerns (International City/County Management Association 2012).

Ross found much of the existing literature to focus on the private sector or federal agencies. She reported that the majority of her research led to only "informal programs that merely identified and selected persons to fill specific positions" rather than providing plans or programs to develop the skill of the existing talent pool (Jarrell and Pewitt 2007, 303). Thus, the Management Preparation Program of Plano was fairly innovative at the time of its implementation in 2002. The program is targeted to middle managers, and it uses a multitier, 12-month program designed to improve competencies in interpersonal skills, public speaking, technical skills, and the ability to be flexible while problem solving (Jarrell and Pewitt 2007). The program continues to evolve today, but several early participants were promoted within the city's workforce. Internal stakeholders assess the program periodically, but other municipalities often use it as a benchmark for their own efforts. Thus, this pioneering succession planning effort in Plano, Texas proved to be successful.

In addition to succession planning, public sector literature also addresses leadership and leadership development in public service (Popovich 1998; Condrey 2005; Svara 2009; Van Wart 2011). Programs to train organizational leaders exist at all levels within the public sector, including the Counsel of State Governments and International City/County Management Association (Seidle, Fernandez, and Perry 2016). Further, studies found that public sector leadership development programs are effective (Van Wart 2013; Seidle, Fernandez, and Perry 2016); in particular, leadership training programs that expose participants to both transformational and transactional theory and that "combine coaching, classroom instruction, feedback, and experiential training can improve the performance of leaders" (Seidle, Fernandez, and Perry 2016). These programs all address the underlying dynamics of leadership in public service (Van Wart 2011).

HIGHER EDUCATION SUCCESSION PLANNING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Higher education traditionally is slow to follow trends in the private sector due to the unique nature of the academy. In fact, succession planning has only recently become an area of significant interest in higher education. In 2013, a search of the phrase ‘succession planning’ in library power search databases returned less than 100 hits (BusinessSearch Premier 2013). At that time, a search in the *Journal of Higher Education* resulted in only one primary source, Columbia University’s Robert Birnbaum’s article on measuring institutional performance pre- and post- presidential succession (Birnbaum 1989). In addition, at the 2008 annual conference of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, only three people—including the organizer—attended a round table discussion on succession planning; the following year, though, that same round table discussion drew 50 participants (Barden 2009). Higher education, though, is confronted with the same dynamic, challenging, and evolving workforce issues that private and public sectors face.

Pipeline

Higher education leadership has a pipeline problem (American Council on Education 2006). In 2007, the American Council on Education (ACE) reported that nearly half of all college presidents were 61-years-old or older. Projections made then about the possible retirement of these individuals, even just half of the individuals, caused concern among education researchers and practitioners, particularly as the academy had come to realize it could quite readily lose one-quarter of its existing presidential leadership (American Council on Education 2007, 2008). In addition, only 40% of the existing chief academic officers at the time, holding titles such as provost or vice president for academic affairs, reported a desire to fill a presidential position (American Council on Education 2008). In 2012, the situation worsened, as the percentage of presidents aged 61 or older increased to 58% (American Council on

Education 2012). In the most recent report, in which the average president age is 62 years old, 54% reported that they expected to leave their current post in five years or less (American Council on Education 2017). In addition, the number of provosts willing to fulfill a presidency dropped to just 19% in 2017 (Strikwerda 2017).

The role of provost has evolved. Provosts are now expected to be leaders in innovation and student success (The Chronicle of Higher Education 2019). Emerging trends in higher education have also changed the role of the provost to be more internally focused on accreditation, compliance, risk management, and faculty retention such that provosts have "become managers of processes…deans, by contrast…have become more like presidents" advocating externally for support (Strikwerda 2017). This suggests, then, that attention must be paid to the presidential pipeline, going further down into the organization chart to deans and other positions. This is particularly important given that faculty and staff's career paths are now more fluid, leading to decreased institutional loyalty (Bisbee and Miller 2006). In the fall 2006 issue of *The Presidency*, ACE reported that succession planning works effectively at sub-presidential levels, and that presidents should mentor lower in the ranks because "even if you might not be grooming your immediate successor, you may be nurturing the person that will sit in your chair a decade after you leave" (American Council on Education 2006). Even then, the pipeline numbers lower in the ranks are still stark. For example, in 2012, the University of Michigan reported that 39 percent of its faculty and 35 percent of its staff was eligible for retirement by December 2017 (Woodhouse 2012). While the numbers alone are concerning, examining them even more closely identify additional concerns.

Gender and Higher Education Leadership

Succession planning and leadership development needs are not specific to just aging workforce issues. As discussed in the previous private and public sector sections, succession planning is not merely replacement hiring, and a person performing satisfactorily at one level in an organization may not perform well after progression to the next organizational level (Gonzalez 2010; Rothwell 2005). There are, then, other factors to consider than simply filling a vacated position. Diversity is one such important driver for succession planning and leadership development in academia. ACE reports that women and minorities are underrepresented as presidents and chief academic officers, particularly at doctorate-granting institutions, at which not a single Hispanic served as provost or vice president of academic affairs at institutions responding to the 2008 ACE survey (American Council of Education 2007, 2008). In fact, the report revealed that "the numbers of women and minorities in presidential positions at colleges and universities have not increased significantly since 1998" (Gonzalez 2010, 1). From 2006-2011, the percentage of women presidents rose just three percent to 26% whereas the number of minority presidents actually declined from 14 to 13 percent (American Council of Education 2012). Five years later, the percentage of women presidents had risen to just 30% and the number of racial/ethnic minority presidents rose to 17% (American Council of Education 2017). The gains, though, in women presidencies have largely been made at the community college level, where 34% of presidents are women compared to just 22% at doctoral-granting institutions (Pasquerella and Clauss-Ehlers 2017).

Historically, the lack of female leaders had been blamed on an educational attainment pipeline issue, specifically that there were just too few qualified women among the ranks of the bench-depth. This is no longer true, as data on "educational attainment show that women make up more than 50 percent of students in all degree programs; since 2006, the majority of doctoral degrees have been awarded to women" (Gangone 2016). Instead of educational attainment serving as the pipeline barrier, it appears that the pipeline issue is instead one of professional promotion. Specifically, women are disproportionality represented at lower ranks of faculty rather than among full professors or administration (Sherman et al. 2010; Behr and Schneider 2015, 20).

Higher education, with its blended hierarchy that includes several leadership positions at all levels within that hierarchy, provides a rich context within which to examine female leadership. One such study, "Gender and the Ladder to Deanship," surveyed more than 700 sitting deans within the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences; 212 individuals responded to the survey, of which 39% were women. Results of the survey indicate that women were overrepresented at master-granting institutions relative to men but were underrepresented almost two-to-one at doctoral-granting institutions. Notably, more than half of the women who responded had become dean since 2010 (Behr and Schneider 2015, 20). These results are similar to many examined in a two-volume edited set of research studies, scholarly essays, and personal narratives on the challenges women leaders in higher education face (Dean et al. 2009).

One telling narrative about a female education leader is that of Delta Kappa Gamma (DKG) Society's founder Annie Webb Blanton. Blanton, an early suffragist who was born in 1870 and died in 1945, founded DKG in 1929 (Tang 2011). Blanton's story is remarkable in that she lived during the historical period when many women were excluded from education and employment as well as not having the right to vote. Thus, she led during a period in which discrimination against women not only existed but also was intentionally institutionalized. Blanton led both social and political movements to give women equal opportunities to education, employment, and politics, but "equality in opportunities does not necessarily translate to equality in outcomes" (Tang 2011, 46). Serving as the first woman to be elected president of the Texas State Teacher's Association, Blanton ran for state office. Like many women leaders of that time, Blanton was accused of being ungodly for her social and political activism and was attacked by her opposition as an atheist and a witch (Cottrell 2011; Tang 2011). Despite her opposition's slander, Blanton became the first woman in Texas elected to a statewide office as state superintendent of public instruction in 1918 (Cottrell 2011).

After years of teaching at both secondary and post-secondary institutions, Blanton founded DKG at age 58. By this time, she had enough political, social, and cultural capital to build such an organization, but Blanton knew that in order for DKG to be successful, it could not merely be a sorority for women educators "but a professional honorary Society of women educators with an emphasis on promoting professional and personal growth of its members and excellence in education" (Tang 2011, 48). Blanton's DKG co-founders helped focus on expansion throughout Texas, but Blanton spent her time focusing on organizing other state chapters. In addition to her network outside of Texas and her own organizational skills, Blanton was able to build DKG nationally by the way in which she framed DKG's role and purpose. Blanton gave DKG "cognitive legitimacy" via its mission statement and "sociopolitical legitimacy" by labeling it an honor and professional organization (Tang 2011, 49). Although DKG faced early opposition by males and even female educators themselves, the initiative overall was a success, and DKG, which expanded internationally seven years after Blanton's death, now has "more than 100,000 members in 17 countries" (Tang 2011, 47).

DKG provides women with a network of mentors and mentees. Research has shown that mentors have a "critical effect on the career paths of women who aspire to advance in higher education administration" (Brown 2005, 659). Many women in higher education report mentorship as a top need for their professional development (Brown 2005, Sherman et al. 2010, Tessens, White, and Webb 2011). The college presidency still remains numerically dominated by males (Brown 2005, Isaac et al. 2009, Longman and Anderson 2011; American Council on Education 2008, 2012, 2017) and is an area in which having a mentor is crucial because "even women with outstanding credentials" must be "vouched for by powerful individuals in leadership positions" (Brown 2005, 659; Moore 1982). In a 2005 study of 91 female presidents about their mentor and mentee relationships, 64% of the women reported serving as mentors and 58% reported having primary mentors; nearly 67% of those mentors were male, which supports that cross-gender mentor relationships are just as vital to women's advancement in higher education as same-gender mentor relationships (Brown 2005). Of course, since the top position is still dominated by males, it follows that these women would have male mentors; the responsibility now lies with these current female leaders to mentor the next generation of female leaders.

Women leaders seem to be aware of this responsibility; in 2009, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Dean of the College of Science at The University of Texas at El Paso noted that many times in her career, she was the only woman in her position, and “I became pretty tired of being that single person. I thought it was incumbent on me that I not be the last” (Morrobel-Sosa 2009, 3). Blanton and Morrobel-Sosa are examples of “pioneering women” who “didn’t have a set of recipes to follow. They worked to find the right ingredients and the right combinations to lead” (Gangone 2016, 22). Indeed, these women, like many senior women in higher education now, got to their position without “leadership development programs or book on effective leadership, on how to lean in, or how to be more confident. There were no apparent mentorships or sponsorships,” and instead these women “intuited, and they practiced, and they intuited, and they practiced, and they did that with their leadership over and over again” (Gangone 2016, 22).

A 2009 study by Isaac, Behar-Horenstein, and Koro-Ljungberg examines a small sample of a group of potential female presidents in an attempt to illustrate that because power is multidimensional, the usual binary approach (male/female) to gender and leadership research does not account for how women use power to their advantage. The typical binary opposition of women and men in leadership gives a hierarchal edge to agentic, described in masculine discourse, over communal, ascribed to feminine characteristics, traits (Eagly et al. 2002; Issac et al. 2009). This gendered and societal norm dichotomy positions more women in “glass cliff” leadership roles; that is, women are selected to lead an organization already in crisis (Ryan and Haslam 2005; Sabharwal 2015; Pasquerella and Clauss-Ehlers 2017). The goal of the authors is to deconstruct the male/female binary opposition by illustrating how women actually use their power. A group of ten administrators from one university were selected for the study. Five associate deans and five deans representing five male-dominated (majority of faculty are men) and five female-dominated (majority of faculty are women) colleges were interviewed via semi-structured interviews about their background, leadership, and power (Issac et al. 2009).

The textual data revealed that the women deans credited their fathers as being their first mentors and role models. A woman by the pseudonym Dean Sasser said that although her father supported her, he did so by tying gender roles to her career by remarking that education is a good profession for women (Isaac et al. 2009). The textual data also illustrated that the women's identities were not either/or but rather the women's "identities swayed between the masculine and feminine, between becoming their fathers yet becoming their own quintessence, the purest part of themselves" (Isaac et al. 2009, 139). Indeed, the language the women used evoked both traditional masculine (agentic) and feminine (communal) descriptions.

A woman by the pseudonym of Dean Highe also revealed that she never aspired to be a leader: "I just got an idea in my mind about how I wanted to live my life…how I wanted to relate to [others], and people tell me 'you are a leader'…but it isn't because I set out to become 'a leader'" (Isaac et al. 2009, 140). When the women were asked to define leadership, the results varied by male-dominated and female-dominated colleges as well as by position (dean or associate dean). Even so, overall, the language the women used exemplified a "patriarchal discourse” (Isaac et al. 2009, 142). In addition to helping the authors achieve their goal of deconstructing the male/female binary opposition, the study also reveals that the relics of gendered stereotypes are employed, even if unconsciously, by female leaders as well as men. This creates paradoxes and conflicts for women leaders, and it reveals a gap in leadership development that still exists for females.

In an attempt to address that gap at one institution, The Ohio State University created the Presidents and Provost’s Leadership Institute (PPLI) in 2005. PPLI is a two-year leadership program for tenure or clinical-track faculty designed to develop a pool of women and underrepresented minority faculty who might move into leadership programs. The Ohio State University had been attentive to gender issues since 1999, when it established The Women’s Place (TWP) “to serve as a catalyst for institutional change to expand opportunities for women’s growth, leadership, and power in an inclusive, supportive, and safe university environment” (Hornsby 2012, 98). One of the first project’s in which TWP engaged was to determine why more women than men left the university; after collecting data on this project, the university noticed that while the numbers of women faculty had increased, the number of women administrators had declined. After conducting a campus-wide needs assessment, TWP partnered with the university’s Human Resources department to launch the program. At the time it began, it was a unique program because it provided faculty with formal development prior to assuming leadership developments rather than after they had been appointed into their roles; in this way, “it serves as a quasi-succession planning program” (Hornsby 2012, 99).

Authors Sherman, Beaty, Crum, and Peters wrote another study that uses biographical narrative inquiry to recognize emerging themes in gender and higher education leadership (2010). These four women—three of whom represent departments of educational leadership, one of whom represents a department of lifelong education, and all of whom were, at the time of the article, young professors—have dedicated their professional lives to advancing women leaders in education; however, they realized they had neglected their own voice and have left their story, as the lyrics from the Natasha Bedingfield song used throughout their article indicates, 'unwritten.' The four authors questioned why they spent "enormous amounts of time pushing limits for other women and fail to do the same for ourselves" (Sherman et al. 2010). The authors individually wrote their narratives and then shared them with one another to analyze how gender has influenced their professional lives. The narratives included blatant discrimination and disrespect, such as male students insisting on calling the women by their first names, to subtle second-generation gender bias such as tenure policies and their disregard for maternity leave.

The article presents each woman's story in total and then concludes with four emerging themes found in all of the narratives. The first theme is what they term action-oriented mentoring, and the authors implore senior women to pay it forward by matching themselves with young faculty or, even better, female graduate students (Sherman et al. 2010). The second theme is valuing home and person in which the authors suggest ways in which institutions can provide opportunities for women "to move seamlessly between their competing home and professional roles" (Sherman et al. 2010, 750). Although all four women were granted tenure within the traditional time period, they did suggest that tenure is one particular area in which institutions could review policies to ensure they are no longer discriminatory.

The third theme is called living within gender, age, and skin, and here the authors advocate for mandatory gender and cultural sensitivity training not only for faculty and staff but also for students as well. The women felt this to be particularly important in cases in which male graduate students are much older than the female professors because those students were more likely to make discriminatory comments than colleagues. The final theme is termed celebration of youth and womanhood, in which the authors provide advice for aspiring women leaders. Acknowledging that they are but four voices, the authors primarily encourage other women to begin discussions and action oriented-behaviors on their campuses.

Examining issues in gendered terms can sometimes be viewed as controversial. This is especially true now in a time in which “the very concept of gender has gained nuance and fluidity…with important implications for transgender, gender nonconforming, and cisgender students, faculty, and staff” (Campbell 2015, 3). Yet, research shows that “men are judged on their potential” whereas “women are evaluated on past performance” (Pasquerella and Clauss-Ehlers 2017, 8). Further, more and more institutions are faced with gender disparity issues that continue to plague them publicly, such as increasing sexual assaults, wage gaps, and gender-biased hiring practices or “opportunity hoarding” that can impact their reputation (Campbell 2015; Skaggs 2018). Hence, leveraging succession planning and leadership development programs to account for gender disparity in leadership roles will help those institutions be responsive to these issues.

The Rise of Nontraditional Leaders and External vs. Internal Candidates

Traditional paths to leadership positions in the academy have worked their way from faculty ranks (Cavanaugh 2017). Historically, there was a value placed on discipline excellence and scholarly achievements (Davis 2008); that is, an institution's star instructors or star researchers were typically promoted with administrative titles and duties. These individuals rarely have had access to leadership theory or leadership development. As was discussed in Chapter 1, not all faculty are willing administrators, and many do not consider these appointments to be promotions (Buller and Cipriano 2019). This, combined with external pressures from boards, is causing more institutions to recognize that in addition to encouraging faculty to take on more administrative roles, institutions also need to recognize and develop potential institutional leaders without faculty status; indeed, "the way to the top need not begin with tenure" (American Council on Education 2006, 40). This approach, though, is not always well received, particularly among the most senior-level faculty (Flaherty 2017).

In some cases, this nontraditional pathway is extended even beyond the difference between an administrative staff person or nontenure track faculty member assuming the presidency. In many cases, there is also an increasing number of presidents who are coming from the private sector or other areas of the public sector, such as the military or government (Beardsley 2017; Toppo 2018). Although the 2017 ACE study indicates that the share of presidents coming from outside higher education dropped to 15% in 2016 (American Council on

Education 2017), others have noted that the ACE survey asks presidents about their most recent previous position but fails to take a deeper look at their full career path. Doing so reveals that as many as "46% of university presidents began their careers" in nontraditional career paths (Toppo 2018).

Another nuance to the pathway is the requirement for national searches and the consideration of external candidates. Hiring trends constantly swing back and forth from majority of external hires to majority of internal hires. In some decades, a long devotion and lengthy career at one institution was not uncommon; in fact, in the 1970s, the majority of senior executives had only been at one or two institutions, making the traditional pathway to administration: faculty, department head, dean, vice provost, provost, president all within one institution (Bisbee and Miller 2006). But by the 1980s, 75% of successful administrative candidates were external hires; again, in the 1990s, this shift returned to 60% of successful candidates being hired from within (Bisbee and Miller 2006).

It is not known what causes the constant shift, but there does continue to be debate on which set of candidates, internal or external, are the most value-added for the crucial positions determined by succession plans. Some benefits of having internal hires are that the individuals are familiar with the culture and already possess an understanding of the institution's goals. Effective networks and personal relationships built on trust and reciprocity are already in place in order for the successor to handle the new responsibilities easier (Bisbee and Miller 2006). On the other hand, external candidates present an organization with an opportunity to develop different ideas, methodologies, and philosophies (American Council on Education 2006). In fact, executive search firm leaders suggest that the reason succession planning is little used in higher education is because “transition is a time for fresh energy, innovative ideas, and new directions” that are not likely to materialize if the successor is a product of the existing system (American Council on Education 2006). In some cases, the external president is viewed “as a symbol of hope” versus a former president who was viewed “as a symbol of despair” (Levin 1996, 30).

Leading Change to Respond to Public Concerns

Succession planning and leadership development, as previously discussed, alleviate stakeholder anxiety because they communicate deliberate, strategic, and future-focused decision-making. Like its private and public sector counterparts, higher education also has multiple stakeholders—including the parents, current and potential students, and legislators who are investors of a sort—who also value certainty and continuity, so the relative paucity of succession planning discussion and implementation in higher education appears to be an oversight of the academy (American Council on Education 2006).

As noted in Chapter 1, institutions and their leadership teams are facing new challenges, including external factors that force institutions to “develop unique responses to emerging trends in funding, shifts in enrollment patterns, and unexpected events” (Parkman and Beard 2008, 29). This external pressure to increase accountability and responsibility has reshaped how the academy views its leadership. Leadership styles in academia, such as those described by Clark Kerr as “the shrewd fox” and “the visionary hedgehog,” can impact a university’s success (Gonzalez 2007, 3). Kerr, the first chancellor of the University of California Berkeley and the twelfth president of the University of California system, is referred to as "one of the fathers of higher education" (Gonzalez 2011, ix). He was a strong proponent of succession planning and leadership, although his famous speech given at Harvard University in 1963 about the university's role, now published as *The Uses of the University*, is controversial (Kerr 2001). Despite how some may view his particular points, which essentially argued that the research universities were a multiversity with multiple communities, he is inarguably one of the most outspoken higher education leaders who recognized early that the academy needed to change, it needed more visionary hedgehogs, in order to have a viable future. Although his speech was nearly more than fifty years ago, academic institutions are still facing an academic reform movement in which they must again adapt; except now, the change is constant (Diamond 2002, 2017; Buller 2015).

Since the pipeline issue is well known and well-documented, and an ensuing need for succession planning and leadership development is well understood within the academy, it is important to understand better why institutions are slow to engage in them. In order to understand this, in 2008, higher education search firm consultants Witt/Kieffer conducted a survey of college and university presidents and board members asking them about their approach to formal succession planning for their executive leadership. The preliminary results of the survey were presented at the 2008 Association of Governing Board's annual meeting. The search firm subsequently released a summary entitled "Succession Planning Takes Hold in Higher Education," in which they stated that 76% of institutions "practice succession planning in some capacity" (Witt/Kieffer 2008). The summary included a couple of supportive quotations as well, sharing that one respondent’s institution had discovered in the previous year that “almost all of our key positions would be eligible for retirement and could walk out on the same day if they chose…that really alarmed us and [sic] started our development of a comprehensive leadership development program across the university” (Witt/Kieffer 2008).

The researcher of this dissertation first encountered that summary as she was researching a final paper in one of her doctoral courses in 2010; she was skeptical of the assertions, so much so that not only did it lead to her research topic for this dissertation but also caused her to reach out to Witt/Kieffer to ask follow up questions, and they generously provided the author of this dissertation with the complete raw data from their respondents. The survey had 135 responses for an 8.4% response rate, which suggests that a far greater number of institutions that did not respond were not engaging in succession planning or leadership development.

Upon a closer look at the survey instrument, it is clear that the headline is somewhat misleading: the question to which 76% of the respondents answered ‘yes’ was: “Does your institution practice succession planning—however informal” (Witt/Kieffer 2008). Respondents have broad latitude to interpret the phrase “however informal.” Even so, the full-text data was encouraging. When asked which aspects of succession planning respondents anticipated various constituents at their institutions would be willing to undertake, 90% of the respondents answered, “identifying and nurturing talent within the organization to cultivate future leadership.”

The final question allowed for free-form answers: “Please share any thoughts you have about succession planning, including any barriers that you perceive at your institution (e.g., tradition, issues of shared governance, scale of institution, financial considerations, etc).” The responses had emerging themes noted as barriers: affirmative action concerns, faculty resistance, requirements for open searches, a limited understanding of the concept, and shared governance. This prompted the author of this dissertation to explore this further with her own project described in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The objective of this research is to describe the state of formal succession planning and formal leadership development in Texas public universities. It is an applied research project that seeks to address a conceptual problem—higher education leadership preparedness, effectiveness, and adaptability—and to understand how prevalent succession planning and deliberate leadership development programs are at each of the 37 Texas public universities (Booth, Colomb and Williams 2008). The 37 public institutions include four independent institutions, and 33 institutions that comprise six university systems.

The research began with a survey distributed in March 2014 and concluded in April 2019. The study was lengthened due to the researcher's professional responsibilities and part-time student status, and the extension allowed the researcher more time for reflection and for developing her own professional experiences (e.g., attending conferences and having more conversations with public university senior leaders across the state of Texas) that enriched her understanding of the research topic. Although the total number of institutions remains the same at 37, the specific list of public institutions has changed during the five-year span due to a consolidation of two institutions and to the addition of an upper-level institution; the complete list is included as Appendix A. The research presented here seeks to answer the following two research questions:

R1: To what extent are formalized succession planning development initiatives implemented on the campuses of Texas' public universities?

R2: To what extent are formalized leadership development initiatives implemented on the campuses of Texas public universities?

As mentioned in the introduction section, for the purposes of this dissertation, formalized succession planning refers to a deliberate plan and procedure for identifying successors for leadership positions. Formalized leadership development is defined as an organized program or initiative aimed at improving the available "bench-depth" of organizational leadership. Public academic universities in Texas were selected because Texas has one of the largest and most diverse higher education systems in the nation and because, when the literature review began for this research project, much of the existing research focused on community colleges. Thus, the intent is to fill a gap by determining what public universities have implemented. Although a particular hypothesis was not articulated, the researcher's underlying premise is that Texas public institutions were not actively participating in formalized succession planning despite the assertions of the 2008 national survey conducted by Witt/Kiefer discussed in the previous chapter. Due to her familiarity with Texas public institutions through her membership in the Texas Council of Chief Academic Officers, which is an organization comprised of the state's provosts, vice provosts, or associate provosts, and due to the reactions she often received when she mentioned a need for more leadership development in higher education, the researcher also surmised that formalized leadership development programs were uncommon at Texas public universities.

This study employs a concurrent mixed methods research design, a concept that originated in 1959 when Campbell and Fisk used multi-methods to study psychological traits (Creswell 2007). Concurrent mixed methods are procedures used when a researcher “merges quantitative and qualitative data in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of the research problem” (Creswell 2007, 14). This enabled the researcher to understand how succession planning and leadership development programs are implemented on campuses.

Qualitative research, which emphasizes process and meaning rather than outcomes, uses inductive reasoning to provide rich situational context (Creswell 2007, Trochim and Donnelly 2008, Hatch 2002). This dissertation is exploratory in nature and relies on the participants’ views. Although succession planning and leadership theories inform the researcher’s understanding of why succession planning is needed in higher education, in this context, they are not intended to frame deductive research. Rather, the qualitative process of gathering data from individuals allowed inductive trends to emerge from the data. The researcher used a survey, which was supplemented with matrices developed from web searches of each institutions’ websites in 2016 and again in 2019, and participated in numerous unstructured interviews with eighteen colleagues, including leaders in the senior ranks, at her own institution as well as those elsewhere in the state.

Collectively, the sample of 37 public universities represent a case study of Texas public universities. Case studies, bound by activity and time, are chosen when a researcher intends to explore an in-depth process within the context of real-life (Stake 1995; Yin 2009). According to Yin (2009), case studies are particularly suited for instances in which multiple factors impact the ability to understand the phenomenon under investigation. Merriam (1998) contends that case studies are useful as means to inform policy, to evaluate programs or processes, or to study educational innovations.

Some other scholars who have examined succession planning and higher education chose the case study method (Christie 2005; Richards 2009; Mercer 2009; Luzebetak 2010; Smith 2011). Mercer found that the case study method "was an effective method of gaining a holistic perspective of leadership succession planning in a higher education context" (Mercer 2009, 96). The case study method in particular is suited for those who have an interpretive or constructivist worldview because it allows for the data to stand as a function of interpretation and personal interaction (Merriam 1998).

SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND SAMPLE

The researcher developed and, upon Institutional Review Board approval, distributed a survey that included both quantitative closed-ended and qualitative open-ended questions. The survey, recreated as Appendix B, included 32 questions, but skip logic was used, so no respondent would have had to answer every question. In March 2014, the questionnaire was distributed to each of the 37 public institutions in Texas using the online survey tool, Qualtrics. Surveys were sent to presidents, with a copy to Human Resources, and recipients were asked to forward the survey to the most appropriate person to complete the survey for that institution. Of the 37 institutions that received the survey in 2014, ten institutions began the survey, with several questions answered by nine institutions, but only eight surveys were completed for a completion rate of 80% and a response rate of 22%.

Due to statistical conclusion validity issues with the sample, statistical analysis was not conducted on the quantitative data. In addition, the researcher's institutional review board approval guaranteed that data would only be presented in the aggregate without identifiable information; hence, the researcher was unable to provide cross-tabulations of the limited data because the tables, if cross referenced with publicly available data, could be used to identify specific institutions' responses. Instead, qualitative analysis was used to analyze the qualitative answers for keywords and the emergence of themes. The survey asked participants if they would agree to an on-site semi-structured interview as a follow-up, but only one of the respondents elected to be contacted. This particular individual also happened to be one of the researcher's closest colleagues who stepped down from his position as a university president just a couple of months after he completed the survey. Thus, he, like eighteen of the researcher's internal and external colleagues, provided information more through unstructured interviews. Unstructured interviews use probing, and the researcher used the silent probe, the echo probe, and the phased-assertion probe during her interactions with colleagues at conferences, quarterly meetings, and typical workplace interactions (Bernard 2006). Finally, the researcher developed a matrix to supplement the eight responding institutions' answers in 2016, and the researcher updated this matrix in 2019 (see Table 4.1) by evaluating institutions' websites for publicly available leadership development or succession planning information for all institutions, including those that elected not to respond to the survey.

Reliability and validity in mixed methods research differ from that in quantitative research (Merriam 1998; Gibbs 2008; Yin 2009; Creswell 2009). To maintain validity, the researcher employed triangulation which includes participant checking tactics, peer debriefing and presenting negative or discrepant (Merriam 1998; Creswell 2009). In addition, the researcher fully discloses that her position as a mid-level administrator—assistant provost and associate provost as of November 2018—at one institution within The University of Texas System—in addition to her gender, culture, and background—presents biases that another researcher without the same position, gender, culture, and background may not have. The researcher's network includes mentors who are in senior leadership positions across the state of Texas and beyond. This includes multiple presidents, provosts, deans, vice provosts, and other administrators in the academy; thus, it was not uncommon for a typical dinner, meeting, or conference conversation to become an unstructured interview about this research topic. The researcher had informed these individuals of her project, and the conversations were intentional with the individuals understanding that their feedback could be quoted. In addition, the researcher was provided countless opportunities throughout the years to first-hand observe participants discussing succession planning and/or leadership development in a higher education setting.

RESULTS

The survey began with a series of quantitative, close-ended questions. The first question asked participants if their institution was part of a university system; if they answered yes, they were directed to a question, reflected in Table 3.1 University System Affiliation, that asked respondents to select their affiliated System. The University of Texas System (UT System) institutions account for 56% of the limited respondents. At the time the survey was distributed, UT System included nine academic institutions, so five responses from that System also accounts for 56% of all UT System institutions. This large number of responses could be due to the fact that the researcher is a member of the UT System and was relatively known at many of those institutions in 2014, or it could reflect the UT System's attention to leadership development, or both. Regardless of factors, it biases the sample with overrepresentation from one system. Texas A&M System accounted for 22% of the respondents, but the two A&M System universities that responded represent only 17% of that system's number of institutions.

Table 3.1. University System Affiliation

Please select your university system.	
System	**Count**
Texas A&M System	2
Texas State System	0
Texas Tech System	0
The University of Texas System	5
University of North Texas System	1
University of Houston System	1
Total	9

In an effort to determine if institutional size mattered, the survey then asked respondents to approximate their total headcount, their total number of full-time employees, and their annual budget. Table 3.2 Size of Institution-Enrollment indicates that two-thirds of the respondents were at large institutions.

Table 3.2. Size of Institution-Enrollment

What is the approximate total enrollment at your institution?	
Answer Choice	**Count**
Less than 10,000 headcount	1
10,000-20,000 headcount	2
More than 20,000 headcount	6
Total	9

Again, this is influenced by sample size and overrepresentation from UT System, whose institutions have the highest total enrollments of any in the state (The University of Texas System 2019).

Table 3.3 Number of Full-Time Employees indicates that whereas six of the nine institutions reported that they had more than 20,000 headcount enrollment, seven of the nine institutions reported an FTE of 5000 or fewer. Again, the representation by UT System institutions, which are some of the fastest growing in the nation let alone the state and whose infrastructure has not kept pace with their enrollment, can partially explain that inverse relationship.

Table 3.3. Number of Full-Time Employees

What is the approximate number of full-time employees at your institution?	
Answer Choice	**Count**
Less than 2,500 FTE	3
2,500-5,000 FTE	4
5,000-7,500 FTE	0
More than 7,500 FTE	2
Total	9

Finally, Table 3.4 Annual Budget indicates that only seven respondents answered the question. This might be due to a desire not to disclose this information, or the answer was unknown. The responses indicate that their median estimated annual budget was $270 million.

Table 3.4. Annual Budget

What is the approximate annual budget of your institution?
Responses
$2.4 billion
$550 million
$500 million
$270 million
$170 million
$160 million
$85 million

In an effort to understand more about the institution's culture and mission, the survey asked respondents an attribute question regarding their admissions policy and their student demographics. Table 3.5 Other Attributes reflects the answers, which indicate response error. Only nine responses were received, but the total number of either open enrollment or selective enrollment adds to ten. This was an oversight of the researcher who neither provided definitions nor made the responses conditionally dependent upon one another.

Table 3.5. Other Attributes

Select all that apply to your institution.	
Answer Choice	**Count**
Open enrollment	2
Selective enrollment	8
Hispanic-serving	4
Historically Black College and University	0

After the quantitative institutional demographic questions, two yes/no binary questions about succession planning were presented. Table 3.6 Succession Planning Binary Responses illustrates the answers to each question from nine respondents.

Table 3.6. Succession Planning Binary Responses

Question	Yes	No
Formal succession planning refers to a deliberate plan or procedure for identifying successors for leadership positions. Does your institution practice formal succession planning?	0	9
Has succession planning been discussed at your campus for possible future implementation?	7	2

The researcher's underlying premise going into this research project was that public academic institutions in Texas were not participating in formalized succession planning, and 100% of the responses indicated that her premise was correct. The researcher was surprised, though, that 78% of the institutions answered that succession planning had been discussed at their campus for possible future implementation.

Table 3.7 Succession Planning Barriers includes the seven free-form text responses from those 78% respondents, although two of the responses had identifying words removed as denoted with an ellipsis so that the respondents could remain anonymous.

Table 3.7. Succession Planning Barriers

What barriers to formal succession planning exist on your campus and how have they hindered discussions or efforts to develop a succession plan?
Responses
Limited understanding of how senior leader development and succession planning can benefit educational institutions.
It was never attempted before.

Affirmative action and EEO requirements, supported by statute and *policy*, require *open searches* for most professional positions on campus. Consequently, it is difficult to "groom" talented faculty and staff for leadership positions knowing that they will have to compete in a *national search* for the position for which they are being prepared. *Shared governance* can also be an impediment in an academic environment. *Faculty-based* search committees are not always in alignment with administrative strategies regarding talent acquisition and development.
Tenure process keeps *faculty* in one place too long not affording others opportunities and lessens their accountability. *Lack of understanding* by leadership of the need or concept of succession planning for faculty and staff. Staff not considered essential enough by the academics to commit to programs and opportunities that would promote growth.
We discuss this informally all the time. Which departments or divisions have in place logical successors to their heads or chairmen? Most do. When you say "succession plan," you surely don't mean a chart which tells everyone what will happen in case he or she dies, is fired, or resigns. The circumstance surrounding a vacancy and the timing often dictate the succession strategy. What makes this difficult is the extreme challenge one faces in putting together the right upper-management team. … In some cases, I had to get rid of long-standing and poorly placed leaders. In other cases, I myself made bad hires in my first years. Hard to discuss "succession" if you are not satisfied with what is in place. Thoughts of succession come, I think, after one is satisfied that the existing positions are in fact well filled.
…System is changing all the processes for appointments. The System has to *approve* everything; therefore, a succession plan is impossible.
External searches are required for administrative and executive leadership positions. Generally, interims are excluded from applying.

Commonalities exist among these responses. Two respondents noted a “lack of understanding” and a “limited understanding” of succession planning and its benefits. Three respondents noted open and external search requirements, and one respondent explicitly identified affirmative action and equal employment opportunities requirements whereas another respondent alluded to those requirements being put into place at their System level. Two of the respondents indicated that a disconnect exists between faculty-based practices, such as tenure and shared governance, and the ability to engage in succession planning. These themes echo the themes of the 2008 Witt/Kiefer survey discussed in Chapter 2. One respondent describes a challenge often discussed by practitioners in higher education but not readily found in the literature: how a new senior leader handles leaders he or she inherited at the middle ranks. The response suggests, though, that individuals had obtained leadership positions without being fully prepared for them, thus underscoring the need for leadership development programs.

The next question, summarized in Table 3.8 Formal Leadership Development Yes/No Responses, asked respondents about the prevalence of such a formalized leadership development program on their campus. Eight respondents, or 89%, reported that they do offer formalized leadership programs.

Table 3.8. Formal Leadership Development Yes/No Responses

Question	Yes	No
For purposes of this study, formal leadership development refers to an organized program or initiative in which increased leadership capability is an intended outcome. Are there other formal leadership development initiatives other than succession planning that do occur on your campus?	8	1

The eight respondents were then asked a series of questions about their leadership development programs, and this is the point at which one of the respondents stopped answering questions and did not complete the rest of the survey.

The first question asked respondents about their leadership's targeted participants. This question, illustrated by Table 3.9 Formal Leadership Development Targeted Participants, was asked to determine if there were limitations, such as faculty only, or just one particular division, such as Academic Affairs but not Student Affairs, as well as if it was limited to certain tiers within the organization's hierarchy.

Table 3.9. Formal Leadership Development Targeted Participants

Who are the targeted participants for formal leadership development initiatives on your campus?
Responses
Primarily first-level supervisors and mid-management levels.
Directors, faculty and staff with leadership potential and interest
None specifically.
In general, they are front-line administrators, both faculty and professional staff, who show potential for leadership development.
Middle management, senior management, staff wanting to move up, young people just hired. We have a very active and many-layered leadership development program, distinct from a "succession plan."
We have two initiatives. One is for Hispanic women--an NSF ADVANCE grant. We have expanded it to all corners. We also have a LEAP program for department chairs, directors, and above.
Department chairs, directors, deans, VPs, faculty and staff leadership.

The seven responses indicate that none of the institutions restrict participation to faculty, nor do they restrict participation to only the highest levels of the organizational structure.

The next question asked respondents who had the responsibility for identifying participants in the program. This question, summarized in Table 3.10 Formal Leadership Development Selection, was asked to understand better the selection process as well as to determine how many institutions allowed for self-selection into the program. To the extent that institutions embrace the notion that not every person who wants to lead can lead, the researcher wondered if institutions had screening processes.

Table 3.10. Formal Leadership Development Selection

Who identifies the participants for formal leadership development initiatives on your campus?
Responses
Self-enrollment requests with manager approval.
Varies
N/A
Senior leadership (deans, VPs, president)
Participants may be nominated by their supervisors, or they may self-select.
The Provost, Vice Provost, Vice President for Business Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs, Presidential Fellow, President.
They are nominated by their direct supervisor or by colleagues.

Two of the seven responses explicitly stated that participants could self-identify for the program whereas two responses, “varies” and “N/A,” are unclear if they include self-selection. This is a limitation of the structure of the question; the researcher should have explicitly asked if self-selection was allowed, and then asked who else identified participants.

The next question, captured in Table 3.11 Formal Leadership Development Intended Outcomes, asked respondents to share the intended outcomes of the formal leadership development program. This question sought clarification on whether intended outcomes were stated in general terms, such as objectives, or with measurable outcomes that could be evaluated to determine the program’s effectiveness and value.

Table 3.11. Formal Leadership Development Intended Outcomes

What are the intended outcomes of the formal leadership development initiatives on your campus?
Responses
Improve overall leadership and management engagement.
develop mid-management capabilities
N/A
Cultivation and development of future campus leaders; "grow your own."

We/I want each person who works at this university to think carefully about the trajectory of his or her career. Where is it heading? Is more education or academic preparation required? If so, when can it begin? And no one should assume that the job he or she holds today is the final professional iteration.
We are trying to generate the next generation of leaders.
To familiarize and involve the identified candidates with decision making process, particularly budget allocation. We also pay for prospective leaders to attend national leadership development programs such as ACE, MLI, etc.

None of the six narrative responses stated outcomes in measurable terms. It is uncertain, though, whether the question was clear enough that respondents understood that more formal, measurable outcomes could be listed here or whether they existed.

The respondents then were asked what the program duration was. The answers to this question included vague responses such as “short-term” and “not sure” as well as “several different programs. Might be one semester, one year, or several weeks” (King 2014). Of the responses provided, only the “one-year” duration was stated by more than one respondent. Hence, the responses do not identify a particular commonly used program length. This indicates that program duration may vary depending on goals, audience, and interest.

The next question asked respondents who manages the formal leadership program, and Table 3.12 Formal Leadership Development Coordinator illustrates the responses.

Table 3.12. Formal Leadership Development Coordinator

Who leads the formal leadership development initiatives on your campus?
Responses
System HR - Talent Management group, with campus partners.
Provost's office
N/A
Mostly outsourced.

Spread throughout the colleges. Our Student Affairs division, especially aggressive and effective on this campus, has led the way in setting up leadership programs for students and for administrators/staff.
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (ADVANCE grant) and Presidential Fellow (LEAP)
Usually a VP, but I have led one as president.

Again, the answers to this question do not indicate that programs are typically run out of any one office, but the Provost's Office was identified in two of the responses. One answer specifically identified the Talent Management group within human resources, and two answers suggested that multiple divisions run the various programs. Hence, no consistent "ownership" of the programs appears across the sample. This question was asked in part to determine if there were any underlying assumptions about who the leader of such development programs should be. If the Provost's Office consistently administered the programs, was there a signal that the facilitator or leader should be someone with an academic affairs background, or if Human Resources led the majority of the programs, could that signal that the content was more on leadership theory or general organizational behavior concepts. Absent a consistent answer to this question, though, there are fewer inferences that can be drawn on who the leader of the leadership development program typically is.

The final question about the institution's leadership development support was a binary question on whether institutions identified participants for external formal leadership development initiatives and included as examples System-wide based programs in addition to a national program such as ACE. Seventy-five percent of the respondents answered that their institution does identify participants for external formal leadership development programs.

The final set of four questions focused on the respondents themselves. The first of these four questions asked respondents to provide their title. Five of the eight respondents were presidents, one was a Human Resource Manager, one was a Human Resource Director, and one was a Provost. The next question asked whether the respondents had attained their position as an external hire or whether they were promoted within the organization. Seventy-five percent of the respondents were external hires. The next two questions, illustrated by Table 3.13 Succession Planning Comparison and Table 3.14 Formal Leadership Development Comparison, asked the respondents to compare their current institutions with their most recent previous institutions with respect to active participation in succession planning and in leadership development programs.

Table 3.13. Succession Planning Comparison

How does succession planning at your current university compare to succession planning at your most recent previous institution?	
Answer Choice	Count
Current organization more actively participates in succession planning	3
Current organization less actively participates in succession planning	3
Both organizations participated in succession planning equally	1
Neither organization participated in succession planning	1
I have not worked for another university	0
Total	8

All of the respondents had worked at more than one institution, so the answer was relevant for all of them. The same number of responses indicated that their current organization was more active than those who responded that their current organization was less active. Only one response answered that neither organization participated in succession planning. Because all of the responses to the question asking whether current institutions practiced succession planning was "no," the researcher infers that the participation referred to in this answer is related to discussion of succession planning rather than implementation of it.

Table 3.14. Formal Leadership Development Comparison

How do formal leadership development programs, excluding succession planning, at your current university compare to formal leadership development programs offered at your most recent previous institution?	
Answer Choice	Count
Current organization more actively participates in formal leadership development programs	3
Current organization less actively participates in formal leadership development programs	3
Both organizations participate in formal leadership development programs equally	1
Neither organization participates in formal leadership development programs	1
I have not worked for another university	0
Total	8

The answers to this question are identical to the previous answers; a limitation of this question is how long ago the respondents were at their previous institution. That information, and a more sufficient sample size, might help identify whether there were increases or decreases over certain time periods, or if it was just random.

In fall 2014, the researcher was disappointed with the number of non-responses to the survey, although she is aware that nonresponse in social science surveys were, and are, a problem in that response rates have been declining for decades (Tourangeau and Plewes 2013). After discussing the results of the survey with peers, including her advisor, the researcher decided to supplement the responses with a review of the websites at institutions for which no survey response was received. The researcher did basic web searches from the institutions' main home page. The researcher used the same set of keyword searches to search for succession plans, succession planning, and leadership development programs. The researcher ignored hits that discussed succession planning as an area of research for faculty members and only considered succession planning related to organizational employment. The researcher started this in 2015 but did not complete it; hence, the researcher conducted the searches again in 2016 but rather than only researching the institutions that had not completed the survey, the researcher examined each of the 37 institutions. Differences from the time of survey distribution include that The University of Texas Pan American and The University of Texas Brownsville consolidated into The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley in 2015, and Sul Ross Rio Grande College is now included in the THECB's public universities listing. The researcher performed the same web searches in April 2019.

The researcher is aware that there are limitations to this tactic. These limitations include the choice of keyword searches, the optimization of results on the institutions' websites, and whether or not initiatives have a web presence. In other words, just because an institution's leadership development program could not be found online does not necessarily mean that an institution did not have one. In addition, as scholar Karl Weick asserts, many organizations undergo on-going, continuous, cumulative change, so a website search could have different results within a day (Weick and Quinn 1999). The complete results of the 2016 and 2019 searches are contained in Appendix C, but with respect to changes, there were no changes to the number of institutions (zero) that had succession plans posted; in 2016, twelve institutions included information about succession planning on their websites, but this decreased to eleven in 2019.

The number of institutions that had leadership development program information on their website in 2016 was nine compared to 16 in 2019. According to the Texas Women in Higher Education network, twelve Texas public universities have female presidents, and of the 16 institutions that have leadership development programs, six are led by female presidents (McGuire 2017). Two institutions that did have leadership development information on their website in 2016 no longer do; it is unclear whether their programs terminated, but both are coastal universities that may have had their budgets impacted by Hurricane Harvey, which hit in 2017.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the surveys reveal data on where Texas public institutions were with respect to formalized succession planning and formalized leadership development programs in 2014; the two in-depth website reviews, in 2016 and then again in 2019, highlight an increase in participation in such initiatives. Together this information, combined with the researcher's professional experience, inform ideas for possible additional research as well as inform the proposal to launch a new program at an institution that has not yet implemented their formalized leadership development program.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this research study provide an interesting reference point with respect to the current state of succession planning and leadership development programs in Texas public universities. Because of the researcher's professional position at the time of this study, she was not surprised by the results that no public institution in Texas has a formal succession plan. It is encouraging, though, that a few institutions have begun having succession planning conversations, mostly led by Talent Management teams within the Human Resources department, with mid-level staff in all divisions or with senior-level administrators in non-academic affairs areas, to discuss the need for succession planning. This suggests that institutions are aware that disruption from constant employee turnover can have a negative impact on unit or institutional performance; it also suggests an awareness that employees need and want to be engaged. Further, the results of the website searches conducted three years apart indicate an overall increase in formalized leadership development offerings. This is encouraging. While it us unknown without further analysis whether perceptions have changed about the value of these programs, their proliferation does suggest an awareness that the academy as a whole needs to prepare the next generation of leaders, whether those leaders will be within the same institution or just other institutions within a particular state or the academy as a whole. The question, then, becomes, how do institutions make these programs worthwhile and reach their primary purpose.

As with the 2008 Witt/Kiefer survey, the respondents in this research project suggest that shared governance, diversity initiatives, perceived values of external searches, and faculty tenure serve as barriers to formalized succession planning procedures. However, although none of the respondents reported any sort of plan or process for deliberate succession planning, eight of the nine respondents reported that their institutions offered an organized program or initiative in which increased leadership capability is an intended outcome of the program, and responses to the intended outcomes of the leadership development programs include "grow your own" attempts at cultivating future campus leaders (King 2014). This is, in and of itself, a type of succession planning process. It may just be that the framework for having the conversations in higher education at the time of survey distribution was still too nuanced, or it might be that the "succession plan" phrase elicited connotations more of a continuity plan flowchart as reflected by the respondent who answered "…you surely don't mean a chart which tells everyone what will happen in case he or she dies, is fired, or resigns" (King 2014).

One of the most interesting paradoxes of this research topic is that whereas higher education is typically the entity to develop theory but be silent on practice, and industry is often skeptical of theory but a staunch supporter of practical applications, succession planning seems to be an area in which higher education is more accepting of the practical elements but does not embrace the underlying principles. Still, a basic tenet of higher education is that the academy essentially takes what works for them—where "them" can be private industry, other institutions, faculty, staff, Administration, faculty in other disciplines, students, or the public, depending on what is being considered—and completely mold it into what makes sense for us—where "us" again varies depending upon the topic under consideration. Thus, the research presented in this study suggests encouraging signs that the academy is evolving, and that more institutions are realizing the need for formalized succession planning processes including formalized leadership development programs. This is underscored by a respondent's supplemental comment made to the 2014 survey:

> "Your question about the degree of leadership/succession planning, whether more or less now, is perhaps not quite the right one. Intentional discussions of leadership and leadership training are relatively new in higher education. Traditionally, we have filled the top posts with faculty who have volunteered, been drafted, or simply wanted to try running the zoo. That is no longer the case. We study leadership, and we talk about how it is not a question of who wants or becomes the boss, but rather how we together achieve the goals and aspirations of our institutions and of our hearts. That is a new discussion. I would expect that any administrator at the job as long as I have been will tell you what I am saying: Insofar as this discussion breaks beyond the somewhat pointless ruminations about 'what will happen if I die or quit,' it is a new one" (King 2014).

This shift is certainly underscored not only by the literature review and with what has occurred in Texas public universities over the past five years, but it also reflected in the responses to the researcher when her colleagues throughout the years have inquired about her dissertation topic.

As stated previously, the researcher's professional role has allowed her to supplement her scholarly interests with first-hand professional experience in higher education leadership development; while this professional role has largely been beneficial to the researcher, it has on occasion also proved to be a challenge. Early encounters with respected senior colleagues, all of them themselves in leadership positions, at both the researcher's own institution as well as other institutions in the state occasionally devolved into debate about the validity of the topic. Whereas the intensity of the scrutiny varied depending upon who was providing it, the general doubtfulness was all too common in the first several years of the researcher's work. Examples of early anecdotal comments include, "leaders cannot be developed," to "no one who is actually any good wants to go into administration," to "no one who is sane wants to go into a position that lacks authority but carries a huge burden of responsibility," to "power changes people; how they act before they actually get promoted is different from how they behave once they have assumed the role," to "only people who are bought and paid for can be pulled from the classroom to the ivory tower; to do so, goes against their very fabric of teaching, research, and service in the first place" and to the lesser informative, "that's nutty." Multiple colleagues internal and external to the researcher's institution commented on a phenomenon of "failing upward" in which some faculty members or managers who were ineffective at lower level positions were removed from those positions only to be placed in other positions that were higher in the organization chart. This further eroded those colleagues' respect for administrative roles, questioning their own senior leadership's views of the positions. It also caused a portion of these colleagues to question when senior administrators showed an interest in supporting the colleagues' career paths into administration if that was a genuine interest in their aptitude for leadership, or if it was instead sending a message that they were ineffective in their current position. This mixed or at least inconsistent messaging also contributed to a deterioration of the perceived value of leadership.

These early conversations surrounding the point of the researcher spending her time investigating this topic seemed to reflect more on why would or should institutions of higher education engage in succession planning or leadership development. The comments, more prevalent than may come across in the few examples provided, seemed to indicate a fundamental disagreement that succession planning and leadership development was necessary or important for higher education institutions. The "administrators come and go, but faculty are forever" type comments, made with literal shrugs of the shoulders, seemed to indicate leadership development was more of a concern for the top levels of the organization only, and that the institution would outlast any damages done from destructive or at least ineffective leadership.

The researcher deliberately chose public institutions to comprise her sample because it is her belief that one of the chief reasons that higher education institutions should engage in leadership development is that public higher education is a public good. This was first discussed in the introduction section as well as the literature review section. As public universities are public bureaucracies, leaders of such entities have external pressures from the public for accountability and transparency, and hence public leaders have an ethical obligation to uphold the institutional integrity of their organizations (Selznick 1949; Terry 2002). As Larry Terry, Sr. argues in his 2002 text, *Leadership of Public Bureaucracies: The Administrator as Conservator*, public leaders can "properly be regarded as legitimate stewards of public trust" only after they are successful in all three legal, managerial, and institutional constructs of effective organizations (Terry 2002, xi).

The American Society for Public Administration's Code of Ethics, originally developed in 1984 and revised in 2013, include eight principle statements, recreated in Appendix D, that commit public service workers in all sectors to responsible professionalism. As public universities are themselves public service organizations, it is interesting to the researcher how few of her colleagues consider themselves public employees. On multiple occasions throughout the years, the researcher has heard both first- and second-hand accounts of colleagues statewide feeling as though they are not State of Texas employees. While state law does allow for some exceptions, such as holiday closings and retirement systems, for higher education institutions, state institutions are still generally considered state agencies. Hence, the researcher feels as though leaders in public institutions would benefit from membership in ASPA and subsequently adhering to ASPA's code of ethics. Regardless of membership status, the principles in the code of ethics can be used to inform the leadership development programs.

As time passed on this study, the researcher observed a second, increasingly common, strand of conversations surrounding the topic. Whereas the early conversations focused mostly on why, or even if, there was a legitimate need for such programs, there was a gradual shift in conversations to how should such programs be structured and implemented. Some of the researcher's close colleagues had also been participants in external, national leadership development programs described in the literature review section from ACE or Harvard, and there was even concern for how relevant those sessions were at the local level. Comments included "that's great, but [these leadership strategies] would never work on my campus," or "that [program] is impractical" or "none of us know what we are doing; we are just learning from one another's mistakes or rare successes." Hence, the questions and conversations were no longer stuck on "why" institutions should engage in leadership development but rather "how" they could design leadership development programs that worked for their institutions.

BEST PRACTICES

One entity keenly aware of this shift was Academic Impressions, the leading higher education professional development organization in the nation. Based in Denver, Colorado, Academic Impressions hosts 80+ workshops or conferences each year on topics specific to six general elements of higher education: academic affairs, advancement/alumni relations, business affairs, enrollment management, leadership, and student affairs. The organization has existed for 16 years; during that time, they have trained over 50,000 faculty and staff at more than 3,500 institutions through either online or in-person in-depth learning experiences (Academic Impressions 2019). Using their network of more than 500 higher education experts, combined with the research done by their own staff, they offer practitioners a mix of theoretical perspectives combined with multiple case studies.

In April 2010, Academic Impressions conducted a survey of senior and mid-level higher education managers at both public and private institutions. They received 176 responses, and 48% of those graded their institutions with a C, D, or F letter grade when assessing the level of commitment the respondents felt their institution had toward the individual's development as a leader; fewer than 20% of the respondents indicated that their institutions offered a formal mentoring or coaching program; and only one-third offered any kind of formal internal leadership development program (Academic Impressions 2011). Respondents also answered the open-ended "How is your institution responding to the waves of faculty and administrators who will be retiring in the next five years?" with responses such as "no institution-wide strategy," "not doing anything," "seat-of-pants approach," and "hoping problem goes away," reinforcing the comments in the literature review section that higher education faced a leadership crisis ten years ago (Academic Impressions 2011). Fast forward to 2017, in which the advertisement for their Phoenix, Arizona conference entitled "Building a High-Impact Leadership Development Program in Higher Education" stated "over 70% of institutions are currently planning to invest in an in-house leadership development program" (Academic Impressions 2017). The information suggests that in just six years, there was a 40% national increase in the number of institutions actively participating in formalized leadership development. An increase is also realized in the Texas public universities as reflected in the web search results in 2016 versus 2019.

Although there does not appear to be a definitive study on why institutions made such a deliberate shift over the past few years, the literature review section highlighted many higher education surveys that illustrated a colloquial doom and gloom situation with respect to anticipated retirements and ensuing pipeline issues. Further, the increasing external pressures for accountability and transparency—from not only governing agencies, including regional accreditors, but also from parents, students, and politicians—combined with the public's declining perception that higher education was a valuable commodity, may have underscored that the next wave of leadership could not rely on traditional leadership styles. Regardless of which particular factor weighed heaviest on individual institutional decisions, it is clear that as a whole, the academy has at least acquiesced to the idea that the problem should be addressed.

The fact that it has done so and that the trend continues may exemplify efforts, whether conscious or sub-conscious, to bridge the knowing-doing gap. Stanford professors Jeffrey Pfeffer and Robert I. Sutton authored *The Knowing-Doing Gap: How Smart Companies Turn Knowledge into Action* in 2000 in an effort to answer the question: if so many managers know the path to improved organizational performance, why is it so difficult to get there? (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2000). Pfeffer and Sutton argue that the answer is less with the managers themselves and more with the embedded forces that prevent organizations from being able to transition from knowledge into action. Said another way, they argue that the gap has less to do with the human capital elements of an organization and more to do with the culture that prevents organizations from being able to transition from theory to practical applications.

Academic Impressions understands this. The author of this dissertation attended their November 2018 two-day, intensive, conference in Chicago, Illinois entitled Building an In-House Leadership Development Program in Higher Education. The philosophy of that conference, and similar conferences that they offer semi-annually, is that a leadership development program will only be successful if its participants find it relevant to their situation. The author of this dissertation, a native Texan, often repeats a common Texas saying: the only thing worse than not having a football team in the State of Texas is having a losing football team; in that similar vein, the main takeaway from this conference was that the only thing worse than not offering a leadership development program was offering one that is completely ineffectual. The experienced facilitators represented three established leadership development programs: Clemson University, Marquette University, and The University of Alabama. In addition, Patrick Sanaghan, President of the Sanaghan Group, an organizational firm specializing in leadership development, executive coaching, strategic planning, and leadership transitions facilitated the two-day conference. Dr. Sanaghan has 25 years of experience in which he has worked with over 200 campuses.

The focus of the two-day conference was to enable attendees to understand what, according to Academic Impressions, a High-Impact Leadership Program (AI HILP) involves and how one can be implemented back on the attendees' campuses (Academic Impressions 2018). Academic Impressions' approach to leadership development is that the humanity of the leader, rather than their intelligence, is essential to the success of a program. Specifically, AI HILP teaches that leaders must have people skills, humane values, and self-awareness in order to lead effectively; without those skills, they believe higher education “leaders, no matter how bright or technically competent, are dead in the water as are their organizations” (Academic Impressions 2018). Sanaghan underscores this in what the author of this dissertation believes to be perhaps the most salient book on higher education leadership, *How Higher-Ed Leaders Derail: A Survival Guide for Leaders*, by describing what he terms the peril of smartship thusly:

> In higher ed, there is a widely-held myth that the smartest person in the room should lead; Therefore, we often take for granted that someone who is smart can lead, and we don’t take steps to develop or prepare our people for leadership positions. Many mid-career leaders in academia are placed in leadership positions too quickly and without adequate support. They may rely too heavily on a mentor, or freeze in the face of difficult decisions, finding themselves in over their heads, and find themselves isolated and derailing. All leaders are smart, but not all smart people are leaders. Too much focus on IQ and not enough on EQ (emotional intelligence) creates the conditions for toxic leadership. Things are moving too fast and are too complex for one person to figure it out, no matter how smart. Effective leaders trust their people, convene appropriate stakeholders to help make sense of the path ahead, and seek regular and open feedback. There is a humility and creativity needed in leadership, especially in an industry changing as rapidly as higher education” (Sanaghan 2018, 1-2).

Sanaghan’s text continues to address four leadership dynamics that are especially hard to identify and correct in higher education: derailment, seduction of the leader, arrogant leadership, and micromanagement. The strategies to overcome these four dynamics underlie the AI HILP, namely “a high-impact program focuses on the applied social psychology of the leader’s role and who the leader is; The HILP helps reveal what the leader brings to the role as a person and how she or he may best use who they are as a leader to bring people along to achieve important goals” (Academic Impressions 2018). Among the goals of a HILP is to build participants self-awareness and ability to develop themselves. The format of the conference allowed participants to experience this through several engaging activities that allowed for interactive networking with peers who were also about to begin, or who had just begun, their in-house program, as well with the experienced practitioners representing some of the more established programs.

Equally important, the experienced facilitators and Academic Impressions staff imparted to conference attendees which leadership development programs are not considered high-impact programs. Although these sample programs still can be useful, they represent more of a portion of a high-impact leadership program than a substitution of one: a program that focuses on only one particular role (such as department chairs only), a program that focuses only on one particular aspect of the institution (e.g., academic affairs versus university-wide), a program that addresses only current issues in higher education (i.e., enrollment management, Title IX, technology in the classroom, etc.), a program that deals only with policy or procedure (i.e., tenure and promotion, hiring, etc.), and a program that engages only the cognitive aspects of learning (lecture, discussion) rather than engaging participants in activities (Academic Impressions 2018).

The information shared at the conference reinforces other best practices from established programs. Tufts University employees Mary Y. Lee and Regina Corrao shared their viewpoint in an article written for University Business Magazine entitled “Creating a Community of Leadership: Lessons Learned from Managing an Academic Leadership Development Program,” in which they underscored their three-year experience with their program (Corrao and Lee 2011). Their recommendations include leveraging existing human resources expertise and partnerships because it is “not just fiscally smart, it’s effective” (Corroa and Lee 2011, 20). Leadership aspects that are areas of shared concern include managing conflicts and underperformers, communicating effectively, managing change, and mentoring and coaching effectively. They suggest supplementing this with faculty-specific real-life scenarios using issues faculty confront in their day-to-day work. This underscores what both Sanaghan and Academic Impressions communicate: participants must be engaged in order for the program to have relevance.

PROPOSAL FOR HIGH-IMPACT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Combining the information from the researcher’s survey, the supplemental web searches, the literature review, and the lived professional experiences of the researcher, the following section is the researcher’s proposal for an in-house high-impact leadership development program at her own institution. The section is consistent with the results of this project’s survey and web searches about how perceptions of leadership development has evolved in higher education; specifically, and in the interest of full disclosure, this exercise was first undertaken by the researcher as a student in November 2011 for her organized leadership course, PA 7305. To illustrate how the researcher herself has evolved as a leader, the researcher will leave the original 2011 text but then provide any relevant updates to each section with additional current commentary.

Overview and Objectives

Original 2011 text: The entire president’s cabinet will be responsible for the final development of the program, nominating candidates, the selection of each cohort, and evaluating final projects. The program should be administered, or “taught,” by faculty who understand both the literature and the practice of leadership. Qualified individuals are currently employed, and their expertise should be used and compensated. While the curriculum will include literature on theories and recent leadership scholarship, the program ideally will prepare students for existing leadership positions within the university. Thus, various university stakeholders (Academic Senate, Staff Council, etc.) will be able to provide input on what the leadership program should include, what some of the initial goals should be, and they should be provided an annual report on the effectiveness of the program. In fact, this opportunity to begin a leadership development program should be linked to a broader strategic succession planning initiative. It is recommended that the university identify the leadership positions at all levels of the university and reevaluate the corresponding job descriptions, including ideal skill sets and qualities individuals should have. Then, using that information, the university can make more informed goals for the leadership development program. The university should allow one year for review of positions and the formation of the program’s objectives and curriculum. The leadership development program will be a one-year program.

Although specific program objectives will be created through the stakeholder input process, some broad objectives are to (1) increase one’s awareness of their individual leadership styles and traits, (2) to improve one’s efficacy in existing leadership roles (3) create alignment between an individual’s role, position, and the university’s vision and values, and (4) provide opportunities for “action-learning initiatives” that result in real organizational change or improvements (Day and Antonakis 2012, 125).

2019 update: The most glaring change that the researcher would make to this is that the president's cabinet would no longer be responsible for selecting the cohort. One person should have administrative oversight of the program but should receive nominations from all vice presidents, deans, and other appropriate managers. Particular attention should be paid to striving for a gender and ethnic parity among the nominee pool. Further, the person administering the program need not be a faculty member him/herself, but that s/he should partner with existing faculty with expertise in the area for guest lectures. Gathering feedback from multiple stakeholders on the goals and content of the program should remain a bottom-up exercise to foster ownership and buy-in of the program.

Leader Identification Process

Original 2011 text: Traditional paths to leadership positions in the academy have worked their way through faculty ranks. Historically, there was a value placed on discipline excellence; that is, an institution's star teachers or leading researchers were promoted with administrative titles and duties. Faculty in research areas that demand little collaboration report lacking the adequate interpersonal skills necessary for some key leadership positions, and this contributes to low efficacy. Many institutions, though, are also recognizing a need to develop potential institutional leaders without faculty status because, more frequently, "the way to the top need not begin with tenure" (American Council on Education 2006, 40). Thus, this leadership program is neither limited to any one division (academic affairs, student affairs, business affairs, research, etc.) nor is it limited to any one level of employee. Faculty program heads who aspire to be deans are welcomed alongside an advisor who wishes to be a director.

This approach provides benefits as well as additional challenges, but it reflects an intrinsic value of The University of Texas at Dallas: a collaborative, multi-disciplinary approach to innovative ideas.

Each member of the president's cabinet may submit nominations. These nominations can either be solicited from a vice president's direct reports or from the vice president's own assessments. While a minimum number will not be specified, a maximum of 20 nominations for any one cohort will be enforced. Nominations will be solicited in an online system, and the system will lock once 20 non-duplicated names have been provided.

Updated 2019 text: The researcher has had these early ideas reinforced by this dissertation study as well as the information learned as a practitioner, including that from being exposed to existing programs through Academic Impressions. No changes to this section.

Leader Selection Process

Original 2011 text: The selection process includes four steps. The first step, and perhaps the most important, is a nominee's acceptance of their nomination to the program. The second step includes a readiness self-assessment. Although instruments exist to measure leadership aptitudes and leadership readiness assessment (Kouzes and Posner 2002), the goal here is to measure one's motivation for assuming a leadership role. Leadership traits and states matter little if an individual does not aspire to be in a leadership role. Several leadership motivation assessments exist and DuBrin's is recommended, but the program's administrators could also develop their own (DuBrin 1998).

The third step in the selection process is a personal essay that gives qualitative evidence to supplement the quantitative measures indicating a nominee's ambition to be a leader and thus interest in participating in the program. These qualitative factors lend themselves to subjectivity, but the program's administrators should develop a rubric for scoring the essays.

The fourth step in the selection process is the deliberation of the candidates. Using the essays and DuBrin's leadership motivation assessment instrument, each member of the president's cabinet should privately score and rank participants. The cabinet should then meet to deliberate and discuss the candidates' composite rankings until they agree on the number of participants. A minimum number will not be specified because the quality of nominations may not warrant a specific number; however, a maximum of eight individuals will be selected to participate in the program.

2019 update: The researcher still believes in the value of understanding leadership motivations but has learned from existing programs that this might be best done while a participant in the program. Hence, rather than having the motivations completed prior to selection, this would instead be one of the activities in the program itself. Further, as indicated previously, the cabinet would no longer review the nominees' materials but rather the program administrator would assume this responsibility.

Curriculum and Timeline

Original 2011 text: As alluded to in the rationale discussion of this leadership development plan proposal, the leadership program must be relevant to The University of Texas at Dallas. Participants, particularly faculty, will not support a program that is not useful.

The program cannot be too heavy-handed with theory and instruments. The program must strike a balance between pedagogy and practice; that is, the program must allow participants to translate “ideas into action and science into sound practice” (Day and Antonakis 2012, 133). Thus, the curriculum here will include a mix of instruments, theory, and practice. The following calendar will be used:

Table 4.1. Leadership Development Plan Curriculum 2011

Month	Meeting Times	Topics	Assignment/Instruments
One	Two-hour meetings in week 1 and week 3	Leadership Basics	Big Five Personality Test Individual goals of program
Two	Two-hour meetings in week 1 and week 3	Leadership Theories	Authentic Leadership Questionnaire for Assessment and Development (ALQ) Self-Only
Three	Two-hour meetings in week 1 and week 3	Well-Being, Emotional Intelligence, Psychological Capital	Emotional Intelligence, PsyCap Questionnaire, Five-Factor Wellness Inventory
Four	Two-hour meetings in week 1 and 3 One-hour meeting with selected mentor in week 1 and 3	Mentor-Transformational Models	Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Five	Two-hour meetings in week 1 and 3 One-hour meetings with selected mentor in week 1 and 3	Mentor-Shared Leadership, Governance Structures, Advisory Boards, Donors	Leader Sociograms
Six	Two-hour meetings in week 1 and 3	Follower-Relational and Followership	Leader-Member Exchange Theory Models
Seven	Two-hour meetings in week 1 and 3 Meetings with followers	Follower-Situational	Leader-Behavior Description Questionnaire

Month	Meeting Times	Topics	Assignment/Instruments
Eight	No formal meetings	Project Selection	Topic from list or create own with mentor approval
Nine	No formal meetings	Project Work	Include research
Ten		Presentation	One hour presentation (including 15 minutes of Q&A)
Eleven	No formal meetings of participants; Cabinet 2-hour luncheon	Cabinet Reviews Presentations; Participants Review Program	Cohort conducts evaluation survey of program; conducts a narrative (no instrument) evaluation of self based on week's one goals
Twelve	Hour dinner ceremony	Graduation Ceremony	Two projects highlighted at ceremony

In the first month, the cohort will meet for two hours in weeks one and three. The instructor will give a broad-based overview of leadership and leadership research. Participants will be asked to write and provide a brief narrative of their individual goals. The participants will take a Big-Five Personality Test and will discuss the results of those tests as a class. In month two, basic leadership theories (schools of thought per Day and Antonakis 2012) will be discussed. Participants will take the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire for Assessment and Development (ALQ). The ALQ was chosen because it provides a baseline that participants can use to develop a plan to enhance their leadership effectiveness in four general areas: self-awareness, transparency, ethical/moral, and balanced processing (Mind Garden, Inc.). The self-only instrument is selected rather than the 360 because it is early in the program.

In month three, the instructor will provide information on emotional intelligence, psychological capital, and human well-being. Participants will take the PsyCap Questionnaire instrument (Luthans, Youssef and Avolio 2007), the Five-Factor Wellness Inventory (Mind

Garden, Inc.), and an emotional intelligence scale that The University of Texas at Dallas Human Resources Management program currently offers its employees through Employee Relations Training. These instruments were chosen because they increase awareness of psychological and physical wellness that impact decision-making and leadership styles.

In months four and five, participants will select a mentor who is a member of the president's cabinet. They will meet with these individuals to determine what are some of the key administrative issues that demand the mentor's attention and brainpower. During month four, the instructor will discuss Transformational Leadership Models, and participants will take the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Mind Garden, Inc.) This test is selected because it was developed by top scholars in the field, Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio, as the best assessment instrument that identifies characteristics of a transformational leader. It also contains a retesting program so that participants can evaluate their progress. In month five, the instructor will discuss shared leadership. Participants will be asked to complete a leader sociogram (Pearce 2002) that illustrates their networks at The University of Texas at Dallas. In addition, participants are asked to review the UT System Board of Regents and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board websites and discuss these governance structures, as well as relationships with advisory board and donors, with their mentors.

Months six and seven include instruction on Relational and Followership and Situational Leadership theories. As a member of the president's cabinet once said in a meeting, "everyone is a follower. Students follow faculty, who follow program heads, who follow deans, who follow the provost, who follows the president, who follows system, who follows the board, who follows the governor, who follows the public, who is the student who follows their peers…" It is essential that aspiring leaders understand the leader-member exchange, and thus, they will be instructed on those models as well as be asked to complete the leader-behavior description questionnaire (Fisher College of Business The Ohio State University). Participants and at least two subordinates, to ensure the subordinates feel at ease, will meet to discuss the LBDQ.

In month eight, the instructor is relieved of his duties. Participants will be asked to select a topic from a prescribed list of action-learning projects developed by members of the president's cabinet. Participants may, with mentor approval, create their own project. These projects could include topics such as plans to increase student retention, plans to improve academic advising, plans to improve dining hall services, plans to increase campus safety, plans to increase student diversity, plans to expand the athletics offerings, or plans to increase physical infrastructures.

In month nine, the participants will continue work on their projects. Participants will being their projects in month eight and continue through month nine. In month ten, participants will give to the president's cabinet a one-hour presentation of their project and plan. The project should include a reference list of either literature read or other institutions consulted for their project. The presentation should be 45 minutes with a 15-minute period for questions and answers. The results of the project should have enacted actual processes at The University of Texas at Dallas and should not be theoretical in nature.

In month eleven, the cabinet will rank the presentations with a prescribed rubric developed by the cabinet. The rubric should include scoring for collaboration. Also in month eleven, the cohort will conduct a narrative evaluation based on their stated goals in week one. Rather than shared with the instructor only, though, these narratives will be shared with the president's cabinet. In the final two months, the cabinet will also identify and select the next round of participants. In month twelve, a dinner graduation ceremony will take place in which two participants who had the most impressive action-learning project will be highlighted. At this ceremony, it is inevitable but not prescribed that informal evaluations and assessments will occur during the mingling. More formalized follow-up evaluations will be conducted six-months post-graduation, as described in the following section.

2019 update: This is the section of the proposal that the researcher would alter the most. It is possible that in 2011 the researcher suffered from an overconfidence bias and the peril of smartship herself, but now the researcher suggests that a hybrid approach to content will be the most valuable. Namely, the program should be constructed such that participants have more real-life scenarios. General introductions to leadership theory and change management theory (Burke 2008) should be included, as should deliberate discussions of emotional intelligence conceptual models (Goleman 1995, Sidle 2019, Hay/McBer 1999), negotiations (Lewicki, Saunders, and Barry, 2010), decision science (Beach and Connolly 2005, Bazerman and Moore 2009) and various instruments, but as has been learned, each meeting of the program needs to include engaging discussion of real-life, practical applications of leadership issues. Hence, the focus would be more on case studies. Journaling and reflective essays should also be incorporated into the program. Further, a 12-month program is too long, and the researcher instead suggests eight half-day or 3-hour meetings in the months of

September, October, November, January, February, March, April, and May. December is skipped due to an abbreviated month from winter break combined with semester-end duties, such as final grading and commencement activities.

Success Assessment Measures

Original 2011 text: The program's success will be measured in both long-term and short-term criteria. The long-term success measures include career advancement: that graduates of the program advance in leadership roles either within The University of Texas at Dallas or at other higher education institutions. The other is that efficacy, as reported by self and others, increases in current roles. It is expected that this efficacy will take time to materialize, and thus, these criteria would not be measured until at least six months post-graduation. The short-term success criteria include graduates' satisfaction with the program as measured by the evaluation survey, and progress toward individual's goals as measured by the self-study in month eleven. Subordinates, peers, and supervisors should be able to detect improvements in graduates as well.

2019 update: The change made here would be the self-study would not be in any particular month but rather iterative and on-going from the reflective writing exercises.

Budget

Original 2011 text: The Leadership Development Plan, and the overall strategic succession planning initiatives, would include both indirect and direct costs. The latter can be more accurately estimated:

Direct Costs:

Instruments: $500 (8 students x five proprietary* instruments at an avg. cost of $125)
Copyright Fees: $1000 (for non-proprietary instruments)
Instructor Compensation: $2500 (4 hours a month for seven months)
Dinner: $1200 (8 students plus significant other, cabinet, president, invited guests)
Certificates/Distinctions: $500
Total: $10,200

Indirect Costs with no estimated monetary amounts:
Human Resources time for initial job description revision process
Mentors' time
Followers' time
Cabinet's time
President's time for ceremony
Promotions and/or raises for successful graduates

*Although Mind Garden Inc. is cited in this proposal, there are various means to acquire instruments. Budget evaluation should be included in the overall program review, and cost-efficient means to acquire instruments should be explored, and no one company/website may be the best solution.

2019 update: The initial proposal would not include a budget, other than an estimated salary proportionate to the time allocated for the administrator leading the program. According to several participants at the Academic Impressions conference, pinpointing the budget for a leadership development program is difficult to do, as some of the costs are just reallocations and indirect costs. Also, start-up costs can vary depending on space and equipment needs to refreshments. Hence, it is not unusual to wait until year three or four before realizing what the annual allocations to sustain an internal leadership development program are. Rather than propose a budget, the researcher instead encourages all senior leadership at the institution to be mindful of the cost of not having a program.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A leadership development program that begins in 2019 should focus less on what any one person or group thinks should be included in the program and instead focus on what the needs and wants from the institution's stakeholders are. This turns shared governance from a barrier to leadership development programs into a strength. Rather than launch a high-impact leadership development program immediately, an institution could instead start with various components of the comprehensive program, particularly at an institution that does not have any formal sub-component program, such as those only for faculty chairs or only focusing on a particular aspect of the academy. In other words, instead of having a top-down approach to the leadership development program, the program could be organic from the bottom up and reflect the aspirations of the larger community.

The targeted participant pool for a high-impact leadership development program ideally would focus on what participants have in common rather than on what professional aspects separate them from one another. The notion that an academic dean could not learn from a staff program coordinator, or that an experienced mid-level staff administrator could not learn from an inexperienced faculty member perpetuates the inability of developing leaders to enhance one of their most important skills: working with those across campus who have different expertise than themselves. To further encourage collaboration, effective communication, and institutional identity, best practices suggest that the leadership development program should provide access to as many components of the institution as possible; that is, rather than one person facilitating every meeting, those with specialized expertise should be invited guests to participate in relevant conversations. The real-life scenarios that are presented to the participants for deliberation need to address challenges from multiple areas of the university. While traditional chain-of-command interactions still have their place in modern higher education, and certainly reporting lines need to be respected, the benefits of collective insights gleaned from expanding those who have a voice should not be diminished. Said another way, leaders must bring in those off the bench more frequently.

While the researcher concedes that some real barriers to formalized succession planning for certain positions may exist in higher education, many of those barriers could be overcome if the academy as a whole agreed to a culture shift. First, leaders need to self-educate themselves on succession planning. It need not just be with employment; succession planning could be beneficial in an academic institution for committees. Build succession into governing committees with vice chair(s) where appropriate. Shared governance, insofar as it provides an opportunity to increase communication, transparency, and stakeholder input, can then be leveraged as a strength rather than be viewed as an obstacle as indicated by the survey respondents. Healthy tensions among various dichotomies within higher education (faculty-staff; faculty-administration; faculty-students; administration-governing entities; faculty-other faculty) can lead to critical introspection of the organization. Dissent and non-conformity are critically important to guard against mediocrity. Thus those tensions, when still grounded in mutual respect with a Kantian ethical principle of reciprocity, can provide a healthy leadership culture (Paton 1964). Knowing though that incivility on college campuses is on the rise, higher education leaders must prioritize collegiality; when poor leadership can cause relationships to deteriorate, and when there is a break in trust and respect, employee engagement and employee morale decline (Cipriano and Buller 2019).

To overcome this, leaders need to understand that they themselves are human, that they lead humans, and that humans are imperfect. Hence, emotional intelligence must be a component of any modern leadership development program. As noted by Academic Impressions, in “an enterprise like higher education, where all leaders are intelligent...emotional intelligence accounts for more than twice the difference in effective leadership over cognitive abilities” (Academic Impressions 2019). Recognizing the importance of emotional intelligence across all sectors, the *Harvard Business Review* released their Emotional Intelligence Series in 2018, a six-book series that features “essential reading on the human side of professional life” on Authentic Leadership (George et al 2018), Happiness (Gilbert et al 2017), Influence and Persuasion (Morgan et al 2018), Empathy (Goleman, McKee, and Waytz 2017), Resilience (Goleman, Sonnenfeld, and Achor 2017), and Mindfulness (Goleman, Lange, and David 2017). These books provide practical, short, readings that can be provided to program participants.

Emotional intelligence is important because it helps guard against what Sanaghan refers to as the Seduction of the Leader, which is a phenomenon in higher education that results from leaders believing that they are receiving honest and thoughtful feedback but in reality, many followers do not speak truth to power and do not provide frank, honest feedback to leaders; this in turn leaves the leaders isolated and uninformed, or occasionally, deliberately misinformed through good intentions (Sanaghan 2018). Both leaders and followers who have high emotional intelligence create dynamics that foster more direct feedback. This candor is critical to establish trustworthiness. When leaders lack emotional intelligence, or when frustrations mount and their emotional intelligence wanes, it can cause them to breach their own standards of professionalism. As was illustrated by several comments made to the researcher during the course of this study that were shared in the previous chapter, cynicism can take hold of leaders and impact their ability to be effective.

This cynicism can be contagious, and anyone can be damaged by it. The researcher attended a March 4-5, 2019 Emotional Intelligence Workshop for Higher Ed Leaders hosted by Academic Impressions in Denver, Colorado; at this conference, the researcher received results of the EQ-I 2.0—which is an assessment that measures four areas: stress management, which includes flexibility, stress tolerance, and optimism; self-expression, which includes emotional expression, assertiveness, and independence; decision making, which includes problem solving, reality testing, and impulse control; and interpersonal, which includes interpersonal relationships, empathy, and social responsibility—that she and other participants had completed prior to arrival in Colorado (Multi-Health Systems 2011). The researcher's score for optimism was not only in the low range, but it was more than 30 points lower than a score the researcher had received on the same test six years earlier.

Much of the literature and the results from the research suggest that there is a focus on emerging leaders, which is incredibly important. Some of the leadership development programs discussed at the Academic Impressions conference suggest that a high-impact leadership development program is one in which even senior leaders who have been in their positions or similar positions for several years avail themselves of this training. This is particularly important for senior leaders, including presidents and vice presidents, with respect to how they lead through a crisis. In 2018, the Chronicle of Higher Education's Leadership Insights series included an issue entitled *Managing a Crisis: What Every College Leader Needs to Know.* In addition to sections on preparing leaders to handle a crisis and on dealing with the aftermath of a crisis, there is a section of case studies on how to handle crises. The goal of every leader—every institution—should be not to become a case study for poor leadership in that series or in Higher Education Administration or Public Affairs/Public Administration graduate degree programs across the country.

This dissertation topic provides a point-in-time case study of the state of formalized succession planning and formalized leadership development programs at public universities in Texas. It is informed by a 2014 survey completed by eight institutions, a 2016 web page search, a 2019 web page search, and the researcher's lived experiences as a 19-year practitioner in higher education. It is not without limitations, but rather than focusing on what is not, the value of this dissertation is that it provides a baseline for additional research, of which many opportunities abound. Those and final thoughts follow in the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

FUTURE RESEARCH

Numerous possibilities exist for future research building upon the information provided in this study. First, further analysis through surveys or in-depth interviews with current directors or facilitators of these Texas public universities' leadership development programs could take place to determine best practices for program curriculum, nomination/selection processes, size and composition of cohort, program duration, and budget. A survey could also be given to participants to determine how leadership programs are assessed/evaluated. For example, what are the stated outcomes of each program, what are the indirect and direct measures of those outcomes, and what are the results? Researchers could also examine evaluation data from the perspective of the directors/facilitators of the programs, the perspective of the supervisors of participants in the programs, or the perspective of participants' views of the program itself and of their efficacy as leaders as a result of participation in such programs. Further, the sample could be expanded to include Texas community colleges, and the potential for comparison between two-year and four-year institutions could help provide additional insights. In addition, an analysis of senior leadership's support of and involvement in the program to determine any impact on organizational buy-in could be an interesting nuance as well.

In addition, an oversight of the researcher's survey was not including a question about the respondents' gender. Due to limited responses, the researcher knows the gender of the survey respondents, but did not present this information in order to not make the responses identifiable. Comparing how Texas' results compare to other states, including the California system, with respect to the usage of leadership development programs and succession planning also could be of particular interest. Although there are several opportunities to learn from the institutions that have implemented programs, perhaps the most interesting future research question now is why, after the practice has grown in prevalence, are some institutions still failing to implement programs?

With respect to these opportunities for future research, the information in this study provides a point-in-time baseline. The challenge, as previously noted, is that this is a fluid topic, and despite perceptions that higher education is slow to adapt, abrupt changes to institutional culture can occur with the loss of an advocate/champion of intentional leadership development, a presidential change, and/or funding cuts. More likely, though, iterative changes to existing programs occur each year, as just with the participants, the leadership development programs themselves are in a constant state of growth and adaptation in order to be value-added for participants, supervisors, institutions, and the academy in general.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

A combination of the research for this dissertation as well as the lived experiences of the researcher leads to several conclusions. Although the researcher is encouraged that there has been an increase in the number of Texas public institutions that are now participating in formalized leadership development programs, the fact remains that only two institutions engage in succession planning, and it appears that 57% of the 37 public universities still do not have a formal leadership development program. To help address this gap, the Texas Council of Chief Academic Officers (TCCAO) last year launched the Texas Academic Leadership Academy, hosted by Sam Houston State University, which is “an intensive, year-long leadership experience for faculty and staff looking to enhance their leadership capacities in academic affairs” (Texas Council of Chief Academic Officers 2018). This is a great starting point, but it is a program currently with capacity limitations and restricted to only academic leaders. In a state as large as Texas, this program cannot be as effective if it were scaled up to meet the statewide demand without a commiserate scaling up in funding to support it.

Because the State of Texas does have such a large complex higher education system, particularly when one includes community colleges, and because the Texas Legislature and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board are heavily involved in regulating that system, then a state-specific, state-based, and state-funded higher education leadership development program should be developed to augment the national programs offered by the Aspen Institute, ACE, and Harvard. Likewise, all state higher education Systems and independent institutions should prioritize funding for leadership development programs on their own campuses as well as supplement those programs with access to national best practices, similar to how the University of California Santa Cruz has invested in a university-wide membership for Academic Impressions, granting all staff and faculty a Pro level membership which provides access to hours of training (University of California Santa Cruz 2019). This funding should not be considered a perk or a fringe benefit but rather should be considered as integral to a university’s operations as advising students. The University of Texas System, under former

Chancellor and Navy Admiral William McRaven, did intend to engage in a System-wide leadership program to augment what each institution was offering at the campus level, but the momentum for that initiative slowed. Texas A&M System does offer a Faculty Fellows program that enables their faculty to be involved in System-level leadership opportunities, but they have no such opportunity for staff. As the two largest systems with the state's flagships, it is incumbent upon them to serve as examples for the rest of the state. Instead, they are lagging behind their peers, such as The University of North Texas' System-wide talent management and leadership development program (University of North Texas System 2019).

Higher education can no longer afford to be reactionary with respect to leadership development and succession planning. Rather than view succession planning strategies through the private sector lens, public higher education, as a public entity, would be better served to examine how the public sector—local, state, and federal governments—have adopted succession planning practices to overcome some of the affirmative action and open search concerns and adapt those accordingly. The GAO's seven principles of succession planning can be used as a framework from which to build. Just as all institutions have an obligation to educate their students, they also have an obligation to proactively invest in the development of their employees. Because employees at all levels of the hierarchy can lead, and because the most important need in leadership development right now is developing the pipeline or bench depth, employees at all levels should have access to this leadership development, irrespective of their position in the institutional hierarchy. Likewise, to the extent that an institution of higher education has not yet embraced a flatter, more matrix-like organizational structure, it needs to do so because the complexities of issues that face higher education now and in the future in the face of intense public scrutiny require a comprehensive, university-wide, response that traditional siloed organizations are ill-equipped to address.

Although instituting organizational changes that require a shift in culture can be difficult, change management requires that members of an organization understand and buy in to the process (Kotter 2012; Buller 2015). One way to garner buy-in is to involve constituents in the development of the leadership development programs and in the succession planning processes. Existing succession planning efforts among the Human Resources staffs can be expanded beyond those areas to a university-wide conversation about deliberate identification of crucial positions. Another way is to share successful models, which do exist (Academic Impressions 2018). Leadership development programs at institutions such as The Ohio State University, Clemson University, Cornell University, Marquette University, The University of Alabama, and Tufts University, among others, provide models on how to establish programs that fit within institutional culture and context. In addition, strong models exist for a System-wide program, such as those at the University of California system and at the University of Minnesota system. A further examination of two of these programs—Clemson's university-wide program administered through the president's office and Alabama's university-wide program administered by the Provost's Office—provides a foundation upon which to build a new program. Both of these programs were highlighted at the Academic Impressions November conference the researcher attended.

Clemson's President's Leadership Institute is "a nine-month leadership development program that is designed to support and develop professional and personal leadership within a diverse and inclusive community of faculty and staff" that is currently in its second year (Clemson University 2019). The Clemson program consists of a cohort of 25 faculty and staff that were nominated into the program by University leadership; faculty are nominated by the deans or by the Provosts and staff are nominated by Vice Presidents or other senior administrators. The program runs August through May with seven all-day meetings as well as an overnight trip. The program articulates nine goals: (1) enable personal and professional growth for every participant; (2) ensure high levels of familiarity and interaction among faculty and staff from all areas of the university; (3) offer opportunities for dialogue and discussion on topics important to the state of [the] university and its environment and constituents; (4) provide an in-depth, clearer understanding of the internal structure and unique characteristics of [the] university landscape; (5) create dialogue and discussion on topics important to the state of [the] university and its constituents; (6) explore issues and opportunities facing higher education in general and those specific to Clemson such as [the] mission, strategies, priorities, governance, stakeholders, and internal/external relations; (7) broaden perspectives of Clemson's impact at a state, regional, national, and international level; (8) ensure strong university leadership for the future; and (9) improve the university's overall performance (Clemson University 2019).

In order to achieve these goals, the program's curriculum covers Clemson's history and character; Clemson's impact across the state, including its public service activities; personal leadership skills/leadership styles; conflict resolution; diversity and inclusion; governmental and other external relations; opportunities and challenges in higher education; strategic planning and university priorities; Clemson as a business, the financial and physical infrastructure priorities; and athletics. An important element of this particular leadership program is the President's involvement. He meets with the cohort as a group, participates in the program's graduation ceremony, and makes himself available for follow-up with previous cohorts (Academic Impressions 2018). This may prove more difficult to sustain as the number of alumni grows, but the presence of and engagement in the program from the University president gives the program legitimacy in its early stages.

Alabama's program is more established, beginning in 2010-2011, with the intention to prepare faculty and staff leaders, which again are nominated by deans and vice presidents and selected by the Office of Academic Affairs, to face the challenges and opportunities of today and tomorrow through the university's capstone competencies of "adaptability/flexibility; collaboration/building relationships; ethics/integrity; self-development; and student/customer-focused" (The University of Alabama 2019). To help achieve the values of the capstone competencies, the curriculum is designed to broaden participants' perspectives on how the vision and mission of the university is realized; enhance participants' capacity for collaboration and relationship building; strengthen practice skills essential to effective leadership; sensitize participants to the influence of culture in the academic setting; and encourage participants to think critically about higher education and the university in a dynamic environment (The University of Alabama 2019). Cohort size varies, but at least ten faculty and staff participate in the year-long program which runs September through August. The faculty who participate in this program also are a part of the Southeastern Conference's Academic Leadership Development Program, thereby reinforcing their internal and external development with one another simultaneously (The University of Alabama 2019).

Both of these programs demonstrate a close connection to their specific university's mission and values; hence, whereas external leadership programs may help participants develop their personal skills, the internal programs allow for development of the institution's leadership culture. They also exemplify how impactful good leadership development programs are at those institutions; facilitators report that their employees feel more engaged (Academic Impressions 2018). Engaged faculty and staff are generally more positive in their interactions with students. Positive interactions with faculty and staff increase student engagement; engaged students are retained students. When student retention rates increase, so, too, do graduation rates. Graduation rates are a quality indicator by which the public evaluates higher education.

The rapidly changing world of higher education demands that each level of that hierarchy is well-prepared and well-developed for the newer complexities that are confronting institutions now, as well as to be able to adapt to changes on the horizon, such as generational differences (senior faculty are no longer just educating millennials; they are now working along beside them), the next technological advances, changes in employers' expectations of marketable skills of college graduates, increased competition for international students, shifts in domestic college-going demographics, and decreased revenues, including those from dwindling endowments. University leaders must confront these challenges as well as adapt to the realities that they need to do so in a way that is more and more acceptable to the general public.

Transformational leaders that embrace an adaptive, full scale, authentic approach to leadership will be better positioned to respond to these challenges. Nothing in the current model of higher education career progression, particularly within the academic ranks, provides access to that type of leadership development without a formalized program. As the next wave of Provosts and Presidents, including those of gender and ethnic minorities, fill the vacancies across the nation, they must receive this training earlier in their careers in order to be successful at their job. Their constituents—internal and external—expect it of them. Public universities in particular are as responsible for engaging in best practices in management, including succession planning and leadership development, as are large private corporations and their public sector counterparts; arguably, they are more responsible to do so because they produce a public good: an educated population upon which democracy relies (Brennan 2008; Leaf 2019).

APPENDIX A

LIST OF TEXAS PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES AND SYSTEM AFFLIATIONS

The University of Texas	UT Arlington
The University of Texas	UT Austin
The University of Texas	UT Dallas
The University of Texas	UT El Paso
The University of Texas	UT Permian Basin
The University of Texas	UT Rio Grande Valley established 2015
	Consolidated from UT Pan American and UT Brownsville, which received 2014 survey
The University of Texas	UT San Antonio
The University of Texas	UT Tyler
Texas A&M	Texas A&M
Texas A&M	Prairie View A&M
Texas A&M	Tarleton State
Texas A&M	Texas A&M International
Texas A&M	TAMU-Corpus Christi
Texas A&M	TAMU-Kingsville
Texas A&M	TAMU-Commerce
Texas A&M	TAMU-Texarkana
Texas A&M	TAMU-Central Texas
Texas A&M	TAMU-San Antonio
Texas A&M	TAMU-Galveston
Texas A&M	West Texas A&M
Texas State	Lamar
Texas State	Sam Houston State
Texas State	Sul Ross State
	Sul Ross Rio Grande College not included in 2014 survey
Texas State	Texas State
University of Houston	UH
University of Houston	UH-Downtown
University of Houston	UH-Clear Lake
University of Houston	UH-Victoria
Texas Tech	Texas Tech
Texas Tech	Angelo State
University of North Texas	UNT
University of North Texas	UNT-Dallas

None	TWU
None	Midwestern State
None	Stephen F. Austin
None	Texas Southern

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

This study is being conducted by Serenity King of The University of Texas at Dallas, and it has been approved by The University of Texas at Dallas' Institutional Review Board. No deception is involved, and the study involves no more than minimal risk to participants (i.e., the level of risk encountered in daily life). Participation in the study typically takes less than 30 minutes and results will be published only in aggregate form. All responses are treated as confidential, and in no case will responses from individual participants be identified. Rather, all data will be pooled and published in aggregate form only. Participants should be aware, however, that the experiment is not being run from a "secure" https server of the kind typically used to handle credit card transactions, so there is a small possibility that responses could be viewed by unauthorized third parties (e.g., computer hackers). Many individuals find participation in this study enjoyable, and no adverse reactions have been reported thus far. Participation is voluntary, refusal to take part in the study involves no penalty or loss of benefits to which participants are otherwise entitled, and participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled. If participants have further questions about this study, they may contact the principal investigator, Serenity King (972) 883-6749; Participants who want more information about their rights as a participant or who want to report a research related injury may contact Sanaz Okhovat, Senior Director of the Office of Research Integrity, at (972) 883-4579. Participation in this study is voluntary, refusal to take part in the study involves no penalty or loss of benefits to which participants are otherwise entitled, and participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled. If you freely consent to participate in the study, select "Yes I have read the consent information and agree to participate" to begin the survey.

- Yes, I have read the consent information and agree to participate.
- I do not agree to participate.

Is your institution a member of a university system?

- Yes
- No

Please select your university system.

- Texas A&M System
- Texas State System
- Texas Tech System
- The University of Texas System
- University of North Texas System

- University of Houston System

What is the approximate total enrollment at your institution?

- Less than 10,000 headcount
- 10,000-20,000 headcount
- More than 20,000 headcount

Select all that apply to your institution.

- Open enrollment
- Selective enrollment
- Hispanic-serving
- Historically Black College and University

What is the approximate number of full-time employees at your institution?

- Less than 2,500 FTE
- 2,500-5,000 FTE
- 5,000-7,500 FTE
- More than 7,500 FTE

What is the approximate annual budget of your institution?

Formal succession planning refers to a deliberate plan or procedure for identifying successors for leadership positions. Does your institution practice formal succession planning?

- Yes
- No

Has succession planning been discussed at your campus for possible future implementation?

- Yes
- No

What barriers to formal succession planning exist on your campus and how have they hindered discussions or efforts to develop a succession plan?

For purposes of this study, formal leadership development refers to an organized program or initiative in which increased leadership capability is an intended outcome. Are there other formal leadership development initiatives other than succession planning that do occur on your campus?

- Yes
- No

How long has your succession plan been in practice?

- Less than one year
- 1-3 years
- 3-5 years
- 5-7 years
- 7 or more years

For which positions does your succession plan identify successors? Check all that apply.

- President
- Administrative (vice presidents) positions
- Academic (deans or department chair) positions
- Other staff (student affairs, business affairs, etc.)

Who selects which positions are included in the succession plan?

Why is succession planning valued at your institution?

Explain how your succession plan has been implemented.

How frequently is your succession plan updated or revised?

Will you provide a copy of your institution's succession planning document?

- Yes
- No
- Our succession plan is available online at the following URL:

For purposes of this study, formal leadership development refers to an organized program or initiative in which increased leadership capability is an intended outcome. Do formal leadership development initiatives exist on your campus?

- Yes
- No

Who are the targeted participants for formal leadership development initiatives on your campus?

Who identifies the participants for formal leadership development initiatives on your campus?
Do your formal leadership development initiatives have a curriculum/outline of topics that you are willing to share?

- Yes
- No
- The curriculum may be found online at the following URL:

What are the intended outcomes of the formal leadership development initiatives on your campus?

What is the duration of the formal leadership development initiatives on your campus?

Who leads the formal leadership development initiatives on your campus?

Which of the following theoretical perspectives guides your formal leadership development initiatives? Check all that apply.

- Individual Differences
- Contingency
- Transformational
- Relational
- Follower-Centric
- Shared
- Not sure

Does your institution identify participants for external formal leadership development initiatives (i.e., a System-based program or ACE)?

- Yes
- No

What is your title?

Did you reach your current position from within the organization or are you an external hire?

- Within the organization
- External hire

How does succession planning at your current university compare to succession planning at your most recent previous institution?

- Current organization more actively participates in succession planning
- Current organization less actively participates in succession planning
- Both organizations participated in succession planning equally
- Neither organization participated in succession planning
- I have not worked for another university

How do formal leadership development programs, excluding succession planning, at your current university compare to formal leadership development programs offered at your most recent previous institution?

- Current organization more actively participates in formal leadership development programs

- Current organization less actively participates in formal leadership development programs
- Both organizations participate in formal leadership development programs equally
- Neither organization participates in formal leadership development programs
- I have not worked for another university

If you indicated you would be willing to provide a copy of your succession plan or leadership development curriculum and did not provide a URL to an online document, please provide your contact information for follow-up. If you did not indicate you had a document but are willing to be contacted for follow-up questions, please also include your contact information here.

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF INSTITUTIONAL WEB SEARCHES

System Affiliation	University	Succession Plan		Succession Planning		Leadership Development	
		2016	2019	2016	2019	2016	2019
The University of Texas	UT Arlington	No	No	No	No	***No***	***Yes***
The University of Texas	UT Austin	No	No	Yes	Yes	***No***	***Yes***
The University of Texas	UT Dallas	No	No	No	No	No	No
The University of Texas	UT El Paso	No	No	No	No	***No***	***Yes***
The University of Texas	UT Permian Basin	No	No	No	No	No	No
The University of Texas	UT Rio Grande Valley	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
The University of Texas	UT San Antonio	No	No	***Yes***	***No***	***No***	***Yes***
The University of Texas	UT Tyler	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Texas A&M	Texas A&M	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Texas A&M	Prairie View A&M	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Texas A&M	Tarleton State	No	No	No	No	No	No
Texas A&M	Texas A&M International	No	No	No	No	No	No
Texas A&M	TAMU-Corpus Christi	No	No	No	No	***Yes***	***No***
Texas A&M	TAMU-Kingsville	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Texas A&M	TAMU-Commerce	No	No	No	No	No	No
Texas A&M	TAMU-Texarkana	No	No	No	No	No	No
Texas A&M	TAMU-Central Texas	No	No	No	No	No	No
Texas A&M	TAMU-San Antonio	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Texas A&M	TAMU-Galveston	No	No	No	No	***Yes***	***No***
Texas A&M	West Texas A&M	No	No	No	No	***No***	***Yes***
Texas State	Lamar	No	No	No	No	No	No
Texas State	Sam Houston State	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Texas State	Sul Ross State	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Texas State	Texas State	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	***No***	***Yes***
University of Houston	UH	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Houston	UH-Downtown	No	No	No	No	No	No
University of Houston	UH-Clear Lake	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes

System Affiliation	University	Succession Plan		Succession Planning		Leadership Development	
		2016	2019	2016	2019	2016	2019
University of Houston	UH-Victoria	No	No	No	No	No	No
Texas Tech	Texas Tech	No	No	Yes	Yes	***No***	***Yes***
Texas Tech	Angelo State	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
University of North Texas	UNT	No	No	Yes	Yes	***No***	***Yes***
University of North Texas	UNT-Dallas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
None	TWU	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
None	Midwestern State	No	No	No	No	No	No
None	Stephen F. Austin	No	No	No	No	No	No
None	Texas Southern	No	No	No	No	***No***	***Yes***
System Agency	Texas A&M	No	No	No	No	***No***	***Yes***
System Agency	University of Texas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
System Agency	University of Houston	No	No	No	No	No	No
System Agency	Texas State	No	No	No	No	No	No
System Agency	University of North Texas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
System Agency	Texas Tech	No	No	No	No	No	No

Note: In the 2019 sample, Sul Ross Rio Grande College, an upper division institution, is classified as a public university; however, it shares administration with Sul Ross State and so no separate programs for succession planning or leadership development take place at that institution.

APPENDIX D

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION'S CODE OF ETHICS

The American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) advances the science, art, and practice of public administration. The Society affirms its responsibility to develop the spirit of responsible professionalism within its membership and to increase awareness and commitment to ethical principles and standards among all those who work in public service in all sectors. To this end, we, the members of the Society, commit ourselves to uphold the following principles:

1. Advance the Public Interest. Promote the interests of the public and put service to the public above service to oneself.
2. Uphold the Constitution and the Law. Respect and support government constitutions and laws, while seeking to improve laws and policies to promote the public good.
3. Promote democratic participation. Inform the public and encourage active engagement in governance. Be open, transparent and responsive, and respect and assist all persons in their dealings with public organizations.
4. Strengthen social equity. Treat all persons with fairness, justice, and equality and respect individual differences, rights, and freedoms. Promote affirmative action and other initiatives to reduce unfairness, injustice, and inequality in society.
5. Fully Inform and Advise. Provide accurate, honest, comprehensive, and timely information and advice to elected and appointed officials and governing board members, and to staff members in your organization.

6. Demonstrate personal integrity. Adhere to the highest standards of conduct to inspire public confidence and trust in public service.

7. Promote Ethical Organizations: Strive to attain the highest standards of ethics, stewardship, and public service in organizations that serve the public.

8. Advance Professional Excellence: Strengthen personal capabilities to act competently and ethically and encourage the professional development of others.

REFERENCES

Academic Impressions. 2011. "Rethinking Higher Education's Leadership Crisis." Email to author.

Academic Impressions. "Building an In-house Leadership Development Program in Higher Education." Conference packet. Chicago, IL. November 2018.

Adams, Guy B. and Danny L. Balfour. 2009. *Unmasking administrative evil*. 3rd ed. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Adams, Susan M. and Joseph W. Weiss. 2011. Gendered paths to technology leadership. *New Technology, Work and Employment* 26 no. 3: 222-237.

Alcala, C., Buel, R., Clark, A., Gandolfi, A., Nichols, H., Sims, A. and Jeff Troutman. 2007. Strategic sharing to develop the leaders of tomorrow. CUCSA Workforce Evolution Committee. University of California Berkeley. <http://www.ucop.edu/cucsa/documents/reports/workforce_evolution_report07.pdf> (accessed September 9, 2012).

American Council on Education. 2006. Next in line? The succession planning debate. *The Presidency* Fall: 38-40.

-----------. 2007. *The American College President.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education Center for Policy Analysis.

-----------. 2008. By the numbers: On the pathway to presidency. *The Presidency* Special Issue: 20-21.

-----------. 2012. *The American College President 2012.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

-----------. 2017. *American College President Study 2017.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Appadurai, Arjun. 2009. Higher education's coming leadership crisis. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* https://www.chronicle.com/article/Higher-Educations-Coming/26495 (accessed April 10, 2009).

Ashworth, Rachel, George Boyne, and Rick Delbridge. 2009. Escape from the iron cage? Organizational change and isomorphic pressures in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19 (January): 165-187.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. "Raising Our Voices: Reclaiming the Narrative on the Value of Higher Education." Conference packet. Atlanta, GA. January 2019.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. 2018. *Trustee index. Affordability and value: The governance lens.* Washington D.C.: Gallup.

Avolio, Bruce J., and Bernard M. Bass. 2002. *Developing Potential Across a Full Range of Leadership: Cases on Transactional and Transformational Leadership.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Barden, Dennis M. 2009. Run your campus: Your next few leaders. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/article/Your-Next-Few-Leaders/44269/.> (accessed October 30, 2012).

Barden, Dennis M. and Janel Curry. 2013. Faculty members can lead, but will they? *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 59 no. 31: A36.

Barnard, Chester I. 1945. Education for executives. *Journal of Business* 18 no. 4: 175-182.

Bass, Bernard M. 1990. From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics* 18 no. 3: 19-31.

Bazerman, Max H. and Don A. Moore. 2009. *Judgement in managerial decision making.* 7th ed. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Beach, Lee Roy and Terry Connolly. 2005. *The psychology of decision making: People in organizations.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Beardsley, Scott C. 2017. *Higher calling: The rise of nontraditional leaders in academia*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Behr, Michelle and Jennifer Schneider. 2015. Gender and the ladder to the deanship. *Diversity & Democracy* 18 no. 2: 20-21.

Berger, Lance A. and Dorothy R. Berger. 2004. *The talent management handbook: Creating organizational excellence by identifying, developing, and promoting your best people.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bernard, H. Russell. 2006. *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative methods.* 4th ed. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Birnbaum, Robert. 1989. The implicit leadership theories of college and university presidents. *The Review of Higher Education* 12, no. 2: 125-136.

Bisbee, Diana C. and Michael T. Miller. 2006. *A survey of the literature related to executive succession in land grant universities.* ERIC, ED 491565.

Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 2008. *The craft of research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boyatzis, Richard, Daniel Goleman, and Hay/McBer Group. 1999. *Emotional Competence Inventory*. Philadelphia: Hay/McBer Associates.

Boyne, George A., Oliver James, Peter John, Nicolai Petrovsky. 2010. Does public service performance affect top management turnover? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 20: 261-279.

Brennan, John. 2008. Higher education and social change. *Higher Education* 18 no. 3: 381–393.

Brooks, Charles. 2005. *Succession planning: Identifying & developing high potential leadership talent.* Paper presented to IPMAAC. Orlando: May 20.

Brown, Terri Moore. 2005. Mentorship and the female college president. *Sex Roles*. 52 no. 9/10 (May): 659-666.

Buller, Jeffrey L. 2015. *Change leadership in higher education: A practical guide to academic transformation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Buller, Jeffrey and Robert E. Cipriano. 2019. *The ATLAS guide to leadership in higher education.* Raleigh: ATLAS Leadership Training.

Bumphus, Walter G. and Phillip Neal. 2008. A new solution to an aging problem. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education* 25 no. 20: 30.

Burke, W. Warner. 2008. *Organization change: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Burns, James. 2003. *Transforming leadership*. New York: Grove Press.

BusinessSearch Premier. 2013. Succession planning keyword online power search. <http://search.ebscohost.com.libproxy.utdallas.edu/login.aspx?>. (accessed July 3, 2013).

By, Rune Todnem, Thomas Diefenbach and Patricia Klarner. 2008. Getting organizational change right in public services: The case of European higher education. *Journal of Change Management* 8 no. 1 (March): 21-35.

California Department of Consumer Affairs. 2009. *Workforce and succession plan: The department's commitment to the development of its employees and future leaders.* By Bev Augustine and Cindy Kanemoto.

Carli, Linda L. and Alice H. Eagly. 2001. Gender, hierarchy, and leadership: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues* 57 no. 4: 629-636.

Carli, Linda L. and Alice H. Eagly. 2012. Leadership and Gender in *The Nature of Leadership*. David V. Day and John Antonakis eds. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc. 437-476.

Calo, Thomas J. 2007. Introduction to the special issue on workforce planning, with a particular focus on succession planning issues as a result of or relating to the aging of the workforce. *Public Personnel Management* 36 no. 4: 315-316.

Cameron, Donald. 2013. Keep the talent pipeline flowing through succession planning. *Community College Week.*

Campbell, Kathryn. 2015. From the editor: Gender equity in higher education. *Diversity & Democracy* 18 no. 2: 3.

Cavanaugh, John C. 2017. Who will lead? The success of succession planning. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 18 no.2: 22-27.

Charan, Ram. 2005. Ending the CEO succession crisis. *Harvard Business Review* February: 72-81.

Charan, Ram, Stephen Drotter, and James Noel. 2001. *The leadership pipeline: How to build the leadership-powered company.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Christie, Diana. 2005. Learning to grow our own: A study of succession planning at Douglas College. Order No. MR05124, Royal Roads University (Canada). In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305346908?accountid=7120>. (accessed June 9, 2013).

Cipriano, Robert E. and Jeffrey L. Buller. 2019. *The ATLAS guide to promoting collegiality in higher education.* Raleigh: ATLAS Leadership Training.

Citrin, James M. and Dayton Ogden. 2010. Succeeding at succession. *Harvard Business Review* (November): 29-31.

Clemson University. 2019. "President's Leadership Institute." Accessed May 24, 2019. https://www.clemson.edu/president/leadership-institute/.

Cohen, Steven and William Eimicke. 2002. *The effective public manager: Achieving success in a changing government.* 3rd ed. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Cooper, Terry L. 2006. *The responsible administrator: An approach to ethics for the administrative role.* 5th ed. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Collins, Doris B. and Elwood F. Holton III. 2004. The effectiveness of managerial leadership development programs: A meta-analysis of studies from 1982 to 2001. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 15 no. 2: 217-248.

Condrey, Stephen E. 2005. *Handbook of human resource management in government.* 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cottrell, Debbie Mauldin. 2011. Blanton, Annie Webb. *Handbook of Texas Online*. Texas State Historical Association. <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/ online/articles/fbl16>. Accessed November 6, 2011.

Creswell, John W. 2007. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

-----------. 2009. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Davis, Erroll B., Jr. 2008. Colleges need to offer clear paths to leadership. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 54 no. 45: A64.

Day, David V. and John Antonkakis. Eds. 2012. The nature of leadership. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Day et al. 2014. Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly* 25 no 1: 63-82.

Diamond, Robert M. 2002. *Field guide to academic leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diamond, Robert M. 2017. “The institutional change agency: The expanding role of academic support centers.” In *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional and Organizational Development,* by Devorah A. Lieberman and Catherine Wehlburg, 24-36. Bolton: Anker Publishing Co.

Dean, Diane R., Susan J. Bracken, and Jeanie K. Allen. 2009. *Women in academic leadership: Professional strategies, personal choices.* Sterling: Stylus Publishing.

Diekman, A and Alice Eagly. 2000. Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 10: 1171-1188.

Doherty, Carroll, Jocelyn Kiley, and Bridget Johnson. 2017. *Sharp partisan divisions in views of national institutions.* Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.

DuBrin, Andrew J. 1998. *Leadership: Research Findings, Practice and Skills.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Duehr, Emily E. and Joyce E. Bono. 2006. Men, women, and managers: Are stereotypes finally changing? *Personnel Psychology* 59: 815-846.

Eagly, Alice H. and Mary C. Johannesen-Schmidt. 2001. The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues* 57 no. 4: 781-797.

Eagly, Alice H., Karau, S. and J. Steven. 2002. Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review* 109 no. 3: 573-598.

Eddy, Pamela L. 2013. Developing leaders: The role of competencies in rural community colleges. *Community College Review* 41 no. 1: 20-43.

Ely, Robin J., Herminia Ibarra Insead, and Deborah M. Kolb. 2011. Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women’s leadership development programs. *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 10 no. 3: 473-493.

Fernández-Alles, María De La Luz and Rocio Llamas-Sánchez. 2008. The neoinstitutional analysis of change in public services. *Journal of Change Management* 8 no. 1 (March): 3-20.

Fister College of Business The Ohio State University. 2011. <http://fisher.osu.edu/research/lbdq/>. Accessed 9 November 2011.

Flaherty, Colleen. 2017. Madison professors fight to keep requirement for administrators to be academics. *Inside Higher Ed.* < https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/07/03/madison-professors-fight-keep-requirement-administrators-be-academics> (accessed July 3, 2017).

Frisch, Robert A. 2001. ESOP: *The ultimate instrument in succession planning*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gangone, Lynn M. 2016. Is it really my fault? Confronting the myths surrounding women's advancement. *Liberal Education* 102 no. 3: 22-27.

George, Bill, Herminia Ibarra, and Rob Goffee. 2018. *Emotional intelligence: Authentic leadership.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Gibbs, Graham. 2008. *Analyzing qualitative data. The SAGE Qualitative Research Kit.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Gilbert et al. 2017. *Emotional intelligence: Happiness.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Goldman, Ellen, Marilyn Wesner, and Ornpawee Karnchanomai. 2013. Reciprocal peer coaching: A critical contributor to implementing individual leadership plan. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 24 no. 1: 63-87.

Goldsmith, Marshall. 2009. *Succession: Are you ready?* Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Goleman, Daniel. 1995. *Emotional Intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, Daniel, Jeffrey A. Sonnenfeld, and Shawn Achor. 2017. *Emotional intelligence: Resilience.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Goleman, Daniel, Annie McKee, and Adam Waytz. 2017. *Emotional intelligence: Empathy.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Goleman, Daniel, Ellen Langer, and Susan David. 2017. *Emotional intelligence: Mindfulness.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

González, Cristina. 2007. Hedgehogs, foxes, leadership renewal and succession planning. *Center for Studies in Higher Education* 17 no. 7: 1-43.

González, Cristina. 2010. *Leadership, Diversity and Succession Planning in Academia*. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.8.10. Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education. 1-10. <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/docs/ROPS.Gonzalez.SuccessionPlanning.5.10.10. pdf>. (accessed January 28, 2011).

González, Cristina. 2011. *Clark Kerr's University of California: Leadership, diversity, and planning in higher education.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Groves, Kevin S. 2007. Integrating leadership development and succession planning best practices. *Journal of Management Development* 26 no. 3: 239-260.

Hatch, J. Amos. 2002. *Doing qualitative research in education settings.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hill, Gregory C. 2005. The effects of managerial succession on organizational performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15: 585-597.

Hornsby, Eunice. 2012. Leadership development for faculty women at The Ohio State University: The president and provost's leadership*. Advances in Developing Human Resources* 14 no. 1: 96-112.

International City/County Management Association. 2012. *Successional Planning in Government Why It Is Still Relevant.* Accessed November 1, 2012. https://icma.org/sites/default/files/308469_Succession%20Planning%20in%20Government_KN%20ICMA%20%281%29.pdf.

Isaac, Carol A., S. Behar-Horenstein, and Mirka Koro-Ljungberg. 2009. Women deans: Leadership becoming. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. 12 no. 2 (April/June): 135-153.

Jarrell, Karen M. and Kyle Coby Pewitt. 2007. Succession planning in government: Case study of a medium-sized city. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 27 no. 3 (September): 297-309.

Jones, Jeffrey M. 2018. Confidence in higher education down since 2015. *Gallup*. <https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/242441/confidence-higher-education-down-2015.aspx> (accessed October 9, 2018).

Kaplan, E. 1982. Intervention in a loosely organized system: An encounter with non-being. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 18 no. 4: 415-432.

Kee, James Edwin and Kathryn E. Newcomer. 2008. *Transforming public and nonprofit organizations: Stewardship for leading change*. Vienna: Management Concepts.

Keller, Kristina. 2018. Building the case for succession planning in higher education: A study of succession planning pilots within the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities System.

Kerr, Clark. 2001. *The uses of the university.* 5th ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ketter, Paula. 2010. Editor's note: who's next? *T&D*. (September): 10.

Kiel, L. Douglas. 1989. Nonequilibrium theory and its implications for public administration. *Public Administration Review* 49 no. 6 (Nov-Dec): 544-551.

King, Serenity. 2014. Unpublished. Succession Planning and Leadership Development Survey Results.

Kiyonaga, Nancy B. 2004. Today is the tomorrow you worried about yesterday: Meeting the challenges of a changing workforce. *Public Personnel Management* 33 no. 4: 357-361.

Kondra, Alex Z. and C.R. Hinings. 1998. Organizational diversity and change in institutional theory. *Organization Studies* 19 no. 5: 743-767.

Kotter, John P. 2012. *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kouzes, James M. and Barry Z. Posner. 2002. *Leadership: the challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leaf, Murray J. 2019. *An anthropology of academic governance and institutional democracy: the community of scholars in America.* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lederman, Doug and Scott Jaschick. 2013. *Survey of college and university chief academic officers*. Washington, D.C.: Inside Higher Ed.

Lederman, Doug and Scott Jaschick. 2019. *Survey of college and university presidents.* Washington, D.C.: Inside Higher Ed.

Lee, Mary Y. and Regina Corrao. 2011. Creating a community of leadership: Lessons learned from managing an academic leadership development program. *University Business.* <http://dev-new.universitybusiness.com:8080/article/creating-community-leadership> (accessed September 1, 2011)

Levin, John S. 1996. *Presidential succession and organizational change in the community college.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Memphis: October 31-November 3.

Lewicki, Roy J., David M. Saunders, and Bruce Berry. 2010. *Negotiation: Readings, exercises and cases.* 6th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lewin, Kurt. 1947. Frontiers in group dynamics: Concepts, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations* 1 no. 5: 5-41.

Lipman-Blumen, Jean. 2006. *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians – and how we can survive them.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Longman, Karen and Patricia Anderson. 2011. Gender trends in senior-level leadership: A 12-year analysis of the CCCU U.S. member institutions. *Christian Higher Education* 10 no. 5: 422-443.

Lumby, Jacky. 2012. What do we know about leadership in higher education? The leadership foundation for higher education's research. Review Paper Series: Leadership Foundation For Higher Education. London. < http://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/research-resources/ publications/index.cfm/RP%20-%2001>. (accessed February 4, 2013).

Luna, Gaye. 2010. Succession planning: A doctoral program partnership for emerging community college leaders. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 34 no. 12: 977-990.

Luthans, Fred, Carolyn M. Youssef, and Bruce J. Avolio. 2007. *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Luzebetak, Angela Kaysen. 2010. Community college succession planning: Preparing the next generation of women for leadership roles. Order No. 3403861, National-Louis University. In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/375502451?accountid=7120>. (accessed June 9, 2013).

Lynn, Dahlia Bradshaw. 2001. Succession management strategies in public sector organizations: Building leadership capital. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 21 no. 2 (Summer): 114-132.

Mangiamele, Deborah. 2010. Succession planning: Key to corporate longevity. *OfficePRO* (October): 8-10.

Marken, Stephanie. 2019. A crisis in confidence in higher ed. *Gallup*. < https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/248492/crisis-confidence-higher.aspx> (accessed April 12, 2019).

Martin, Kevin. 2007. *The looming leadership void: Identifying, developing, and retaining your top talent*. Aberdeen Group: A Harte-Hanks Company. <http://www.aberdeen.com/ Research/Research-Library.aspx?search=looming%20leadership.>. (accessed October 8, 2011).

McGuire, Rissa. 2018. "Texas Women in Higher Education: Public University Women CEO's Reach Milestone in 2017." Accessed May 24, 2019. http://www.twhe.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/TWHESpring2018.01.pdf.

Meinert, Dori. 2014. leadership development spending is up. *HR Magazine* August: 14.

Mercer, Christopher B. 2009. A multi-site case study of informal leadership succession planning in three higher education institutions. Order No. NR54494, University of Calgary (Canada). In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304846190?accountid=7120>. (accessed June 9, 2013).

Merriam, Sharan B. 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mind Garden, Inc. 2011. <http://www.mindgarden.com/titles.htm> Accessed 9 November 2011.

Minton-Eversole, Theresa. 2010. Most companies unprepared for succession at the top. *HR Magazine.* (October): 22.

Moore, K. 1982. *What to do until the mentor arrives? Professional advancement kit.* National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors. Presented in Washington, D.C. ED 234296.

Morgan et al. 2018. *Emotional intelligence: Influence and persuasion.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Morrobel-Sosa, Anny. 2009. Communicate clearly with faculty to promote goals. *Dean & Provost* 10 no. 8: 3.

Multi-Health Systems Inc. 2011. EQ-i 2.0. *Workplace report.* North Tonawanda.

Newell, Terry, Grant Reeher, and Peter Ronayne. 2008. *The trusted leader: Building the relationships that make government work.* Washington: CQ Press.

Newton, Jethro. 2000. *Strategic management of quality and the challenge of the new millennium: Prospects for managing the tension between accountability and improvement in further and higher education*. Proceedings of the Technological Education and National Development Conference. April. Abu Dhabi.

Noumair, Debra A., Barbara B. Winderman, and W. Warner Burke. 2010. Transforming the A. K. Rice Institute: From club to organization. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 46 no. 4: 473-499.

Ohio Department of Administrative Services, Learning and Development, Project Management Program. 2011. *Ohio's talent for tomorrow and beyond: The right person, in the right place, in the right position, at the right time.*

Oliver, Christine. 1991. Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review* 16 no. 1: 145-179.

Parkman, Anna and Roxanne Beard. 2008. Succession planning and the imposter phenomenon in higher education. *CUPA-HR Journal* (Fall/Winter): 29-36.

Parks, Sharon. 2005. *Leadership can be taught: A bold approach for a complex world.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Pasquerella, Lynn and Caroline S. Clauss-Ehlers. 2017. Glass cliffs, queen bees, and the snow-woman effect: Persistent barriers to women's leadership in the academy. *Liberal Education* 103 no. 2: 6-13.

Paton, H.J. 2002. *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pearce, C.L. 2002. *Quantitative and qualitative approaches to the study of shared leadership. Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership.* Presented at the annual conference of the Academy of Management. August. Denver: Colorado.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 2015. *Leadership BS: Fixing workplaces and careers one truth at a time.* 1st ed. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey and Robert I. Sutton. 2000. *The knowing doing gap: How smart companies turn knowledge into action.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Popovich, Mark G. 1998. *Creating high-performance government organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pynes, Joan E. 2004. The implementation of workforce and succession planning in the public sector. *Public Personnel Management* 33 no. 4: 389-401.

Richards, Cheryl L. 2009. A new paradigm: Strategies for succession planning in higher education. Order No. 3366286, Capella University. In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305164828?accountid=7120>. (accessed June 9, 2013).

Robertson, Peter and Sonal Seneviratne. 1995. Outcomes of planned organizational change in the public sector: A meta-analytic comparison to the private sector. *Public Administration Review* 55 no. 6: 547-558.

Rothwell, William J. and Stan Poduch. 2004. Introducing technical (not managerial) succession planning. *Public Personnel Management* 33 no. 4 (Winter): 405-419.

Rothwell, William J., Robert D. Jackson, Shaun C. Knight, and John E. Lindholm. 2005. *Career planning and succession management: Developing your organization's talent—for today and tomorrow*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Rothwell, William J. 2005. *Effective succession planning: Ensuring leadership continuity and building talent from within*. 3rd ed. New York: American Management Association.

Ruscio, Kenneth P. 2008. *The leadership dilemma in modern democracy.* Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.

Ryan, Michelle K. and S. Alexander Haslam. 2005. The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of Management* 16: 81-90.

Sabharwal, Meghna. 2015. From glass ceiling to glass cliff: Women in senior executive service. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25 no. 2: 399-426.

Salipante, Paul F. and Karen Golden-Biddle. 1995. Managing traditionality and strategic change in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 6 no. 1 (Fall) 3-20.

Sanaghan, Patrick, and Jillian Lohndorf. 2018. *How higher-ed leaders derail: A survival guide for leaders.* Denver: Academic Impressions.

Schall, Ellen. 1997. Public-sector succession: A strategic approach to sustaining innovation. *Public Administration Review* 57 no. 1 (January-February): 4-10.

Scott, Richard W. 2010. Reflections: The past and future of research on institutions and institutional change. *Journal of Change Management* 10 no. 1 (March): 5-21.

Sczesny, Sabine, et al. 2004. Gender stereotypes and the attribution of leadership traits: A cross-cultural comparison. *Sex Roles* 51 no. 11/12 (December): 631-645.

Seidle, Brett, Sergio Fernandez, and James L. Perry. 2016. Do leadership training and development make a difference in the public sector? A panel study. *Public Administration Review* 76 no. 4: 603-613.

Selznick, Philip. 1949. *TVA and the grass roots; A study in the sociology of formal organization.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Shafritz, Jay M., Albert C. Hyde, and Sandra J. Parkes. 2004. *Classics of public administration.* 5th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Sherman, Harvey. 1968. *It all depends: A pragmatic approach to organization.* 3rd ed. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Sherman, Whitney H., Danna M. Beaty, Karen S. Crum, and April Peters. 2010. Unwritten: Young women faculty in educational leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration* 48 no. 6: 741-754.

Siddle, Clint. 2019. Academic Impressions. “Emotional Intelligence Workshop for Higher Ed Leaders.” Conference packet. Denver, CO. March 2019.

Skaggs, Sheryl. 2018. Interview by Cindy Folefack. *UTD Mercury*, April 19. Accessed May 19, 2019. https://utdmercury.com/faculty-gender-pay-gap-increases/.

Skaggs, Sheryl, Kevin Stainback, and Phyllis Duncan. 2012. Shaking things up or business as usual? The influence of female corporate executives and board of directors on women’s managerial representation. *Social Science Research* 41, no. 4: 936-948.

Smith, Evangeline Ferguson. 2011. Community college leadership crisis: Identifying and preparing future leaders through succession planning in selected north carolina community colleges. Order No. 3487235, Capella University. In ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Full Text. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/ 912856211?accountid=7120.>. (accessed June 9, 2013).

Stake, Robert E. 1995. *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Stevens, Paul. 2001. *Bottom-up succession planning works better*. Sydney: Centre for Worklife Counselling. ERIC, ED 461062.

Storberg-Walker, Julia and Richard Torraco. 2004. “Change and Higher Education: A Multidisciplinary Approach.” Paper presented at the Academy of Human Resource Development International Conference, Austin, March 3.

Strikwerda, Carl J. 2017. Encouraging both deans and provosts to become college presidents. *Inside Higher Ed.* <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2017/02/02/encouraging-both-deans-and-provosts-become-college-presidents-essay> (accessed February 2, 2017).

Svara, James H. 2009. *The facilitative leader in city hall: Reexamining the scope and contributions.* Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Tang, Joyce. 2011. Educators and founders: How leadership evolved. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*. Fall 2011. 46-53.

Terry, Larry D. 2003. *Leadership of public bureaucracies: The administrator as conservator.* 2nd ed. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Tessens, Lucienne, Kate White, and Claire Webb. 2011. Senior women in higher education institutions: Perceived development needs and support. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 33 no. 6 (December): 653-665.

Texas Council of Chief Academic Officers. 2018. "Texas Academic Leadership Academy." Accessed February 1, 2019. https://www.shsu.edu/tala/.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. 2013. *Closing the gaps: Progress report*. <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/reports/DocFetch.cfm?DocID=3114&Format=PDF>. Accessed 21 July 2013.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. 2015. *Texas higher education strategic plan: 2015-2030.*

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. 2016. *Closing the gaps final progress report.*

Texas Legislative Budget Board. 2012. *General appropriations act for the 2012-13 biennium: Text of the conference committee report*. <http://www.lbb.state.tx.us/GAA/General_Appropriations_Act.pdf#HigherEdFund>. (accessed June 15, 2013).

Texas Legislature Online. 2013. Eighty-third legislature. < http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/>. (accessed July 3, 2013).

The Aspen Institute and Achieving the Dream. 2013. *Crisis and opportunity: Aligning the community college presidency with student success.* Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute.

The Aspen Institute Task Force on the Future of the College Presidency. 2017. *Renewal and progress: Strengthening higher education leadership in a time of rapid change.* Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute.

The Council of State Government. 2009. "Who's in Charge? Succession Planning Before the Crisis." Accessed November 13, 2009. www.csg.org/events/annualmeeting/policy_sessions_am09/wkshp_successionagenda.aspx.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. 2018. *Managing a crisis: What every college leader needs to know.* Washington, D.C.: The Chronicle of Higher Education.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. 2019. *Starter kit: New to the Provost's Role.* Washington, D.C.: The Chronicle of Higher Education.

The University of Alabama. 2019. "Leadership U at The University of Alabama." Accessed May 24, 2019. https://training.ua.edu/leadershipu/index.php.

The University of Texas System. 2013. *Legislative summaries: Regular session and first, second and third sessions of the 83rd session*. < http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/docs/legislative/83LegSum.PDF>. (accessed August 14, 2013).

The University of Texas System. 2015. *Legislative summary: Regular session of the 84th session*. < http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/docs/legislative/84LegSum.PDF>. (accessed September 1, 2015).

The University of Texas System. 2019. Accessed May 24, 2019. "Fast Facts September 2018." https://www.utsystem.edu/sites/default/files/documents/publication/2018/fast-facts-september-2018/fast-facts-09-2018.pdf.

Toppo, Greg. 2018. New findings case net more broadly on 'nontraditional' college presidents. *Inside Higher Ed.* https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/05/30/new-findings-cast-net-more-broadly-nontraditional-college-presidents (accessed May 30, 2018).

Tourangeau, Roger and Thomas J. Plewes. National Research Council. 2013. Nonresponse in social science surveys: A research agenda. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Trochim, William M.K. and James P. Donnelly. 2008. *The research methods knowledge base.* 3rd ed. Mason: Atomic Dog.

United States Government Accountability Office. 2005. *Human capital: Selected agencies have opportunities to enhance existing succession planning and management efforts*. Report to Congressional Requesters. June.

United States Office of Inspector General. *Evaluation of the FDIC's Succession Planning Efforts.* Report No. EVAL-07-001, 2007, March.

United States Office of Personnel Management. 2019. "Center for Leadership Development About Us." https://www.opm.gov/services-for-agencies/center-for-leadership-development/about-us/.

University of California Santa Cruz. 2019. “2019 Leadership Academy.” Accessed May 16, 2019. https://academicaffairs.ucsc.edu/leadership-academy/index.html.

University of California Santa Cruz. 2019. Academic Impressions: How will you use your membership? https://shr.ucsc.edu/training/academic-impressions.html. (accessed May 1, 2019).

University of North Texas System. 2019. “Talent Management Leadership Development Program.” Accessed May 24, 2019. https://www.untsystem.edu/hr-it-business-services/human-resources/talent-management-leadership-development-program.

Van Loon, Richard. 2001. Organizational change: A case study. *Innovative Higher Education* 25 no. 4 (Summer): 285-301.

Van Wart, Montgomery. 2013. Lessons from leadership theory and the contemporary challenges of leaders. *Public Administration Review* 73 no. 4: 553-565.

Van Wart, Montgomery. 2011. *Dynamics of leadership in public service: Theory and practice*. 2nd ed. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Vedpuriswar, A. V. 2001. Strategic issues in succession planning. *Effective Executive* (November): 25-29.

Waldo, Dwight. 2001. *The enterprise of public administration.* 6th ed. Novato: Chandler and Sharp Publishers, Inc.

Wallin, Desna, Don W. Cameron, and Kent Sharples. 2005. Succession planning and targeted leadership development. *Community College Journal* 76 no. 1: 24-28.

Ward, Ralph D. 2000. *Improving corporate boards: The boardroom insider guidebook*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Weber, Max. 1946. "The sociology of charismatic authority." In From *Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by Max Weber, Hans Gerth, and C. Wright Mills, 245-252. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weick, Karl E. and Robert E. Quinn. 1999. Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology.* 50: 361-386.

White, Leonard. 1926. Introduction to the study of public administration. In *Classics of Public Administration* 5^{th} ed, ed. Jay J. Shafritz, Albert C. Hyde, and Sandra J. Parkes, 2004. 56-63. Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Willinik, Jocko and Leif Babin. 2018. *The dichotomy of leadership.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Witt/Kieffer. 2008. Succession planning takes holder in higher education: Witt/Kieffer Survey of Presidents/Trustees. < http://www.wittkieffer.com/file/thought-leadership/practice/Education%20Succession%20Planning.pdf>. (accessed November 11, 2010).

Wolfe, Rebecca Luhn. 1996. *Systematic succession planning: Building leadership from within*. Menlo Park: Crisp Publications.

Woodhouse, Kellie. 2012. Aging workforce: University of Michigan expects nearly one-fifth of employees to retire in next five years. < http://www.annarbor.com/news/the-university-of-michigan-may/>. Published July 1. (accessed July 20, 2013).

Yin, Robert K. 2009. *Case study research: Design and methods*. 4^{th} ed. Applied Social Research Methods Series 5. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Serenity Rose King was born in Memphis, Texas and lived in the small Texas Panhandle town of Pampa, Texas. A former five-sport athlete, Serenity opted in 1996 to follow her high school volleyball coach to Wayland Baptist University (WBU), where she received numerous individual awards, including twice being named an NAIA All-American Scholar-Athlete. In 2017, Serenity was inducted into WBU's Athletic Hall of Honor, only the second-ever volleyball player to receive such an honor. A first-generation student who is an at-large member of the Chickasaw Nation, Serenity received her Bachelor of Arts with a major in English and minor in psychology in 2000. She has worked at three institutions of higher education, joining her current one, The University of Texas at Dallas, in March 2004, the same month her brother Devin returned from his tour of duty in Iraq. In June 2006, Serenity transferred into the UT Dallas Provost's Office, first working under the close mentorship of then-Associate Provost Robert S. Nelsen. She received her Master of Arts in Arts and Humanities-Aesthetic Studies in August 2006 and later enrolled part-time as a doctoral student in Public Affairs in Fall 2009. Serenity, who is currently the Associate Provost for Policy and Program Coordination, has expanded her portfolio of job responsibilities in the Provost's Office to include the university-wide leadership role for regional accreditation.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Serenity Rose King
Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Academic Affairs
The University of Texas at Dallas

EDUCATION

Doctoral Candidate, Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas
Dissertation: *Succession Planning and Leadership Development in Texas Public Universities*
Chaired by Dr. L. Douglas (Doug) Kiel, Professor of Public Affairs and Administration

Master of Arts in Aesthetic Studies, August 2006
The University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas

Bachelor of Arts in English, *cum laude,* May 2000
Wayland Baptist University, Plainview, Texas

CURRENT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

The University of Texas at Dallas, Office of the Provost
Associate Provost for Policy and Program Coordination, 2018 to present
Includes responsibilities retained from tenure as Assistant Provost from 2008-2018

- Oversee the Office of Programs, Accreditation, and Assessment, which includes a subunit, the Office of Assessment; supervise seven full-time employees and three part-time employees
- Serve as Academic Affairs liaison between UT Dallas and Texas Higher Coordinating Board (THECB) and The University of Texas System (UT System)
- Coordinate and prepare the UT Board of Regents agenda items with Academic Affairs university stakeholders and UT System's Office of Academic Affairs
- Communicate with university stakeholders on administrative changes at all levels, for example, leadership changes, renaming of academic programs, consolidation of academic programs, changes to program SCH, and CIP code reclassification
- Collaborate with various committees, including but not limited to the Academic Senate, Academic Council, Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Council of Undergraduate Education (CUE), Graduate Council, Committee on Core Curriculum, and Handbook of Operating Procedures Committee to develop, review, analyze, and revise educational policies
- Coordinate the university's response to policy matters, institutional review of mission statement, degree program reviews, low producing programs, and legislative matters

- Monitor, report, and develop impact analyses of any changes made to policies, Regents' Rules, state regulations, and accreditation principles
- Collaborate with program heads, deans, and faculty to develop new degree program proposals in line with university's strategic plan
- Communicate with university stakeholders on status of degree program proposals, program reviews, and low producing programs
- Maintain website to track new degree program proposal approval process
- Maintain official list of degree and certificate offerings, and listings of program heads, for reporting purposes
- Oversee the Office of Communications' review and editing of marketing materials related to academic programs
- Serve as liaison between institution and Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
    - Served as lead author of the university's Compliance Certification Report for its 2018 Decennial Reaffirmation project
    - Supervise Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) initiatives
    - Oversee management of electronic SACSCOC Reaffirmation Committees' Compliance Certification Reports and workspace system
    - Coordinated narrative teams and editors of the university's Compliance Certification Report
    - Coordinated onsite visit in March 2018
    - Ensure university's compliance with SACSCOC's Substantive Change policy
    - Communicate with university stakeholders on substantive changes at all levels, for example, notifying appropriate entities when academic program offers more than 50% of coursework online, coordinating Cotuelle agreements, joint agreements, and dual degree program agreements
    - Help academic and administrative units across campus monitor continuous improvement of university
    - Served as lead author and editor of university's responses to SACSCOC Monitoring Period due to student complaint, 2013 to 2015
    - Served as lead author and editor of university's SACSCOC Fifth Year Report, 2013 to 2014
- Oversee maintenance of the Academic Templates and Forms, Syllabi Policies and Procedures, and Syllabus Templates websites for accurate and updated information
- Review education abroad and concurrent course requests and resolve any issues with the school faculty and/or dean prior to approval
- Provide biennial legislative analysis for the Vice President for Public Affairs averaging 100 bills per session
- Attend quarterly Texas Council of Chief Academic Officers/Provosts and THECB meetings as institutional representative to discuss policy matters
- Present regularly at Academic Senate and Academic Council meetings

- Serve as Provost’s Office contact for TA/RA/GA appraisals
- Serve as Provost’s Office Liaison to the International Center, 2014 to present
- Collaborate with the International Center and faculty in reviewing dual and joint international agreements, student exchange agreements, study abroad initiatives, and affiliation agreements related to this area
- Partner with Provost’s Technology Group (PTG), Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis (OSPA) on shared initiatives
- Oversee collaboration with Student Affairs, Office of Undergraduate Education, and Office of Graduate Studies, on surveys and data analysis
- Support UT System Quantum Leap Student Success Initiatives
  - Contributed to grant application that secured $1,000,000 from UT System Quantum Leap Student Success funding for Student Engagement through Collaboration, Mentorship and Service Learning
- Supervised the centralized catalog office, a subunit, including the production of the university catalogs, which transitioned to the Registrar’s Office, 2012 to 2013
- Served as liaison between institution and UT System's Office of General Counsel on all policy matters, 2008 to 2012

PREVIOUS PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

The University of Texas at Dallas, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Information Services Coordinator, September 2007 to August 2008

- Collaborated with faculty and deans on responses to UT System and the THECB’s requests for information including proposals for preliminary authority, new degree programs, and new administrative changes; and reviews of table of programs, mission statements, and annual/third-year progress reports for doctoral programs
- Automated degree program proposal process
- Attended university's Committee on Educational Policy meetings
- Attended Texas Chief Academic Officer and THECB quarterly meetings
- Served as lead editor of university's Focused Report and documentation for site visit committee for the SACSCOC reaffirmation process

The University of Texas at Dallas, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Editor, SACSCOC Executive Team, June 2006 to August 2007

- Served as lead editor and partial author of university's print and electronic version of the Compliance Certification Report, which totaled 500 pages of narrative and over 143,000 pages of supporting documentation, for the SACSCOC’s reaffirmation process
- Collaborated with each campus unit to gather information for the compliance report
- Displayed sound judgment to decide which documentation to incorporate into the compliance report
- Used technical knowledge to electronically manage over one thousand shared workspace folders and over two thousand documents
- Provided usability input for co-worker's online SACSCOC project tools

- Assisted with core course and program assessment reports
- Managed early stage of electronic syllabi submission process
- Trained campus constituents on electronic submission processes

OTHER PROFESSIONAL EXPEREINCE

- The University of Texas at Dallas, Eugene McDermott Library
  Reserves Coordinator, September 2005 to June 2006
  Electronic Serials Cataloger, March 2004 to August 2005
- Black Line Group
  Contract Technical Writer, September 2004 to February 2007
- Texas Tech Health Sciences Center Amarillo Campus, Harrington Library
  Interlibrary Loan Specialist, March 2002 to December 2003
- Wayland Baptist University, Learning Resources Center
  Interlibrary Loan and Cataloging Specialist, June 2000 to December 2001

COMMITTEE SERVICE

- Serve on hiring committees for executive leadership positions, e.g. the Dean of Graduate Studies and Associate Provost, Vice President for Communications, etc.
- Chair of the SACSCOC Reaffirmation Leadership Team, overseeing the university's Decennial Reaffirmation Review project, 2015 to 2018
  - Chair of two committees: Steering Committee and Institutional Effectiveness Committee, 2015 to 2017
  - Vice Chair, Mission, Governance, and Administration Committee, 2015 to 2017
  - Member, Programs, Curriculum Instruction Committee, 2015 to 2017
- Graduate Council, ex officio, 2015 to present
- International Education Development Committee (IEDC), voting member, 2014 to present
- Council of Undergraduate Education, ex officio, 2010 to present
- Committee on Core Curriculum, ex officio, 2010 to present
- Handbook of Operating Procedures Committee, voting member, 2008 to present
- Committee on Educational Policy, ex officio, 2007 to present
- Provost's Office Representative on I-20 / International Enrollment Working Group, 2014 to 2017
- Served as UT Dallas Admissions Contact to UT System, designated by president, 2014 to 2016
- Chair of Handbook of Operating Procedures Committee, 2008-2012
- Copyright Committee, 2008-2010
- SACSCOC Executive Team, 2006-2008
- Document Delivery Committee, 2006
- LibQual Committee, 2006
- Recorder, Library Services Strategic Plan Committee, 2006
- Chair of OPAC Usability Focus Group, 2005
- McLemore Awards of Excellence Selection Committee, 2005

HONORS AND OTHER RECOGNITIONS

- Sigma Tau Delta, International English Honor Society, UT Dallas, 2018
- Wayland Baptist University Athletics Hall of Honor (second volleyball player inducted), 2017
- Phi Kappa Phi, National Honor Society, UT Dallas, 2016
- Pi Alpha Alpha, National Honor Society for Public Affairs and Administration, UT Dallas, 2012
- Staff Council Care Award, UT Dallas, 2008
- The Ethel-Ward McLemore Award of Library Excellence, UT Dallas, 2006
- Wayland Baptist University Volleyball Most Valuable Player, 2000
- NAIA All-American Scholar Athlete, 1998, 1999
- NAIA Southwest Region Star Award (first recipient), 1999
- NAIA Southwest All-Region Team, 1998 and 1999
- Dean's List, 1996-2000
- Pioneer Scholar, 1996-2000

PUBLICATIONS, RESEARCH, AND RELATED PRESENTATIONS

- Monthly presentations to Academic Senate
- Regular presentations to President's Cabinet
- SACSCOC monthly lunch-n-learn presentations, 2015 to present
- "Expect the Unexpected: Unscheduled Reviews Due to Complaint Inquiries" presented at SACSCOC Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA., 2016
- Assessment Process Workshops 2012 to present
- New Degree Program Proposal Workshops 2008 to present
- "Tackling the Reorganization Giant" co-presented at the North American Serials Interest Group Conference, Denver CO., May 2006
- "Copyright Management in WebCT: Weighing the Four Fair Use Factors" presented to faculty 2006, 2007
- "OPAC Usability Study: Stage One-Findings and Suggestions" presented to OPAC Committee May 2005
- "OPAC Usability Study: Stage Two-Comparison Results" presented to OPAC Committee July 2005
- "Family Members Left Behind: POWs of a Different Sort." Women Write the War: The Voices of Women Behind Operation Iraqi Freedom. Tuscaloosa: St. John's Press, 2004.