

As chair, you can show the reality in comparing each faculty member's time, space, and responsibilities. Sometimes you can help the envious faculty member see how he or she can acquire more of the status or the abilities of the envied professor. Try to identify that which makes the person envious, and help him or her to acquire the skills that will make the person feel more secure.

Envy is aligned with covetousness, which leads to the sin of **greed**. Few go into teaching for the material wealth. However, there are those who succeed in getting large grants or in writing *the* definitive text in the field, and thereby become wealthy. Greed is about more than money. The opposite of greed is generosity, letting others get the credit or praise, giving without having expectations. But the greedy faculty member wants his or her share . . . and more.

How often do people in your department share the glory? How often do they want to be the only one in the spotlight? The lack of community within an academic department, and the presence of only silos of stars, may be because of greed. As chair, you need to develop that generosity of spirit. How can you get the faculty in your department to work together? Can they collaborate on a grant? Can you create a departmental newsletter that features everyone? Can you get the university to do a feature not just on one faculty member, but on the department as a whole? Greed is lessened in true community.

With all of these active sins, sometimes the sin of **sloth** seems least important. But this sin means that all of the talents of the slothful professor are going to waste. We often call these professors "deadwood." They last published more than a decade ago; as soon as they got tenure, they quit producing. They teach poorly, using outdated references; they have no idea how to use a computer for classroom enhancement, and even seem to not care about enhancing anything. But the sin of sloth often hides a deadened spirit. The slothful

professor may feel that he or she is not needed anymore or not valued as much as the new faculty in the department.

A chair must pay special attention to this professor. Finding out what the professor cares about, what might energize the professor, may only take a few conversations. Sometimes just asking about the good old days when the professor was productive and active will lead you to some fruitful information. Often the slothful professor needs attention and needs the chair to spend

some time working to return him or her to a productive and positive member of the department.

The seven deadly sins may be two thousand years old, but they are actively identifiable in the department. The chair must be aware of and work with each of those sins to keep the soul of the department intact and to foster collaboration and community among faculty. ▲

Susan A Holton is professor of communication studies at Bridgewater State College.
Email: sholton@bridgew.edu

Planning for Success

by Abour Cherif, Sherril Hoel, Karen Murkar, and Lin Stefurak

Many large colleges and universities with significant numbers of chairs and/or deans often encounter problems of realizing maximum benefits and outcomes from annual meetings. In this article we will share our practical experience of planning for the national annual meeting of Deans of Academic Affairs (DAA) of DeVry University. We believe that our experience in developing and conducting DAA meetings will be applicable to colleges and universities that have a large number of department chairs and/or deans, as well as universities with multiple campuses such as national universities. The ultimate goal of our national meeting is to achieve a number of concrete outcomes that can be implemented without the need to obtain additional consensus.

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools regionally accredits DeVry University. Through a system of 67 DeVry University locations, including 24 university campuses, 43 university centers, and online delivery, the university offers career oriented undergraduate and graduate programs in technology, busi-

ness, management, and biomedical technology to more than 52,000 students (approximately 8,500 graduate and 44,000 undergraduate students). The university also employs 20 DAAs, approximately 24 campus presidents, and 60 directors of graduate centers who act as the chief academic persons at their campuses and/or graduate centers.

Phase One: Creation of the Annual National DAA Meeting Planning Committee

In creating a planning committee for the annual meeting of DAAs, we first identify five or six representatives to be part of the committee. We consider the following goals when selecting individual committee members.

- Creating a balance between new campus and mature campus representation.
- Maintaining an awareness of gender balance within the planning committee membership.
- Inclusion of diverse points of view and personality types, keeping in mind the goal of striking a balance between those academic leaders who are usually critical of the actions and decisions taken by the university's top leadership

and those who are generally supportive of new ideas and initiatives proposed to the university system (i.e., those who often implement new initiatives and those who more often take the wait-and-see approach).

- Representation from DAAs overseeing campuses with both large and small numbers of students and faculty.
- Viewpoints of those locations with mature, commuting, and night (adult learning) students as the majority versus those dominated by younger, full-time day students.
- The desire for diversity with regard to DAAs overseeing graduate and undergraduate programs and those with only undergraduate courses on their campuses.

Achieving these goals can be challenging; thus, we spend a great deal of time debating and discussing to arrive at the most effective formula (combination of individuals) to form the planning committee.

Once the individual DAAs from the university system that best meet the selection criteria are identified, a letter is sent to the appropriate president or other individual to whom these persons report. In this letter we ask for approval for those DAAs identified to participate on the planning committee. Once approval is received, a communication is forwarded to each prospective participant to invite him or her to serve, knowing that approval has been received from the president or regional vice president. Generally, the process is straightforward and the presidents and regional vice presidents are very helpful and supportive. In fact, they are quite pleased to have representation on the planning committee.

Phase Two: Establishing Strategies for Collecting Information Necessary to Develop a National Meeting Agenda

The following strategies have been useful for establishing an effective and practical agenda for the annual national DAA meeting.

- Selection of one representative from the planning committee to communicate with fellow DAAs, requesting input and suggestions for issues to be included in the national meeting agenda.

- Identification of one committee member to communicate with the presidents of the campuses to solicit their input and suggestions for items to be covered at the national meeting.

- Selection of another committee member to communicate with various university departments, including student services, recruiting and admissions, and human resources, to gather input and suggestions for items that might be included.

- Naming one DAA to chair and/or to coordinate the efforts of the members of the planning committee.

Each committee representative outlined above gathers, analyzes, and organizes the information he or she has received. Eventually each idea or suggestion is placed within a group of categories identified by the planning committee membership as potential meeting topics/agenda items. Prior to preparing their individual summary reports of the information gathered, committee members often make additional telephone calls to clarify ideas and suggestions submitted.

Phase Three: Getting the Big Picture

Often times, a dinner meeting is arranged for the members of the planning committee so that each will have the opportunity to meet with the university leaders: executive vice president, vice president of academic affairs, vice president of operations, dean of faculty and administration, dean of curriculum, and dean of graduate school. During this meeting members of the DAA planning committee share and discuss findings from their communications with campus presidents, fellow DAAs, and admissions, recruiting, and student services staff. Before the dinner meeting concludes the university leaders discuss with committee members the present

status of their respective areas of the university and their future visions. They also relay their suggestions of the items that might be included in the national meeting agenda.

Phase Four: Crafting the Agenda

The day following the dinner meeting the members of the planning committee spend the entire day (approximately eight hours) as a group. They discuss and debate the issues thus far identified as most important for the DAA annual meeting, using the input from fellow DAAs, campus presidents, and the university admissions, recruiting, and student services staff, as well as the university's academic leaders, including the vice presidents and deans who participated in the previous day's dinner meeting. All the necessary equipment, refreshments, and so on are provided to the members of the committee during the daylong meeting. In addition, the university leaders are available and on call if they are needed by the members of the committee.

Prior to the conclusion of the meeting the members of the planning committee craft a draft agenda for the annual national meeting. The draft agenda contains topic details, time schedules, and potential presenters' names, as well as the entertainment (evening) component of the meeting. The agreed-upon draft of the agenda is sent to all the DAAs in the system, the vice president of academic affairs, dean of curriculum, and the dean of faculty and administration. It is also posted on a DAA resource web site for two weeks for feedback.

Phase Five: Finalizing the Agenda

The members of the planning committee collect all the feedback from their fellow DAAs, discuss the feedback, and make the necessary changes and adjustments to the agenda. The new, modified agenda is then posted again for one week on the DAA resource web site for comment. Further adjustments are made, if necessary, and the final agenda is sent to all DAAs and university leaders. The

final agenda is also posted on the DAA resource web site.

Phase Six: Preparing for the National Annual Meeting

The members of the planning committee work together with the staff of the dean of faculty and administration, as well as the director of faculty and academic leader development, director of academic quality assurance, and the coordinator of faculty and academic leader training, to prepare for the national annual meeting. They also work with the persons identified as presenters, guest speakers, workshop conductors, and so forth.

Summary and Conclusion

In *Getting It Done: How to Lead When You Are Not In Charge*, Roger Fisher and Alan Sharp (1998) have argued for collaborative planning. Collaborative planning is an effective process for achieving positive results in a diverse system. The practical approach we provide is for developing and planning for an effective meeting. It is a highly useful, structured, no-nonsense approach for getting things done by transforming our thinking into desirable outcomes in an efficient way.

This approach helps to inspire those who are involved in the process with the power of clear thinking, and the tools to pull off a successful, sustainable collaboration without formal authority.

In order to follow this process however, egos must be left behind. Participants need to adopt an attitude for taking on a challenge that requires the best minds, ideas, and approaches within the system to come together. In addition, support from top administration is essential and a key component to the success of this planning process.

The conceptual framework and practical strategies that we have developed and used enable us to harness the power of thinking and optimism among our DAAs. We believe that participation as a planning committee member helps them to become more effective academic leaders and to achieve higher levels of performance in meeting the university's mission and goals. ▲

Abour Cherif is director of faculty and academic leader development and acting director of curriculum for science, Sherril Hoel is dean of faculty and administration, Karen Murkar is coordinator of faculty and academic leader training, and Lin Stefurak is director of academic quality, all of DeVry University. Email: acherif@devry.edu, shoel@devry.edu, kmurkar.devryu@rogers.com, lstefurak@devry.edu

Our dean thought that I possessed the leadership skills to quell the instability in the department as well as handle the issues related to our other locations. I was not so sure of that. The only endeavor I had undertaken in higher education that might qualify for leadership was directing grants. In my academic career, I had never supervised anyone. What I had done was to establish myself as an independent thinker with a personal and professional vision, and as someone willing to take tremendous risks. That was all that I brought to the administrative table. The dean saw more. His only request was that I commit to do the job for more than one year.

As part of my preparation for assuming the position, the dean sponsored my participation in a conference that prepared new chairs for their roles and responsibilities. I attended the conference, conducted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Information gained in the meetings was valuable. The most poignant piece of information gathered was that as a new chair, I should have a standing weekly appointment with the dean. This meeting would serve as a source of professional development for me as I became an administrator. It would also keep my dean informed about my concerns as I embarked on a new and challenging adventure. Upon return from the conference, I told my dean what I had learned and asked about the possibility of our meeting weekly as had been suggested. He agreed.

For the past three years, we have met almost every week. Our meetings have varied in length, depending on our agenda. What follows is a reflective work on how those meetings have benefited me in my role as department chair and helped to build leadership collaboratively for my department.

Conversation Peace

The meetings opened lines of communication. As a new chair, I was not sure how I would communicate with the dean. We had always had open discussions about

Conversation Peace: Building Leadership Collaboratively

by Veda McClain

I accepted the position as department chair as an untenured assistant professor. I made the decision to enter administration at the end of my fourth year in a tenure-track position. I cancelled the job interviews I had scheduled at Research I institutions and decided to stay at a regional state university. My friends all told me that I was making an unwise decision and was taking a major gamble with my career. What if I was not promoted or did not gain tenure?

I decided to take a chance and try my hand at becoming an administrator in the largest department on campus, teacher education. I was the fourth department chair in five years so some stability was needed. We offered academic programs at five different locations with 35 full-time faculty members and several adjunct faculty members. Student enrollment hovered around 900, and our relations at the off-campus locations were not good.

The Department Chair

Summer 2004

Vol. 15

No. 1

A RESOURCE FOR ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

Inside

- Managing Your Way
Through a Crisis: A Case Study
by Robert P. Hamill p. 3
- Engaging the Department:
Community-Based Approaches to
Support Academic Unit Coherence
by Kevin Kecskes p. 7
- Infusing a Culture of Collaborative
Faculty Development and Vitality
Within a Department
by Scott Gordon, Charles Harrington,
and Timothy Schibik p. 9
- Program Manager, People
Motivator: Delineating Your
Role as Department Chair
by Kina S. Mallard p. 12
- Adding Ideas, Subtracting
Criticism, Dividing Work, and Other
Ways to Count on Advisory Groups
by Laura J. Janski and
N. Douglas Lees p. 13
- How to Interview Candidates
for Administrative Positions
by Jeffrey L. Buller p. 15
- The Parallel Chair Move
by Gene C. Fant, Jr. p. 18
- Laptops: Why, Why Not?
by Barbara Weaver and
Linda Nilson p. 19
- Managing the Seven Deadly Sins
in the Department
by Susan A. Holton p. 23
- Planning for Success
by Abour Cherif, Sherril Hoel,
Karen Murkar, and Lin Stefurak p. 24
- Conversation Peace: Building
Leadership Collaboratively
by Veda McClain p. 26
- Reviews p. 29

Tough Financial Times for Higher Education: What It Means for Leadership

by Steven W. Graham, Suzette Heiman, and Rob Williams

Presenting the results of a recent national survey on how department chairs are responding to higher education's tight financial conditions, the first article in this two-part series (Spring 2004 issue) discussed the specific actions chairs have taken to deal with budget cuts. Part two of this series details information from this same survey, focusing here on leadership expectations and offering useful advice to chairs facing similar budgetary situations.

There's no doubt about it: Funding for higher education has taken, and promises to take, major hits. According to state budget figures from across the country, spending for higher education fell for the first time in over a decade during the 2003–2004 fiscal year. Colleges and universities will continue to face lean times in the next few years, and most state budget projections show a slow recovery and adjustment to tight fiscal conditions. Higher education is particularly vulnerable to these economic downturns because their funding is often considered “discretionary” within state budgets. As a result, lawmakers are asking higher education institutions to be more cost effective and rely less on state appropriations without raising tuition costs for students (Arnone, 2004).

The impact of these budget cuts on the leadership within higher education remains somewhat ambiguous, especially at the department level. Department chairs may not have the budget-

ary flexibility and scope to sway the course of educational economics, but they are the ones who most often interact with the students, staff, and faculty affected by the cuts. During tough fiscal times it is hard for chairs to balance the various demands for research, teaching, and service when they are facing open faculty positions, reduced resources for travel and supplies, and little administrative support.

Advice From Chairs to Chairs

We conducted a study that provides an inside look at what happens where the rubber meets the road. This research surveyed almost 100 department chairs at public and private institutions across the nation about their strategies for managing budget cuts. Academic departments chairs who experienced significant budget reductions provided information about the extent of their budget cuts through an online survey. They reported on the strategies used on their campuses, the advice they would offer to other chairs facing similar conditions, and what they wanted most from their campus-wide leaders. Embedded in their responses were admonitions to their colleagues on how to address tough budget times.

The chairs surveyed reported on the most significant challenges they faced during tough fiscal conditions. While their comments represented a wide variety of problems, they could be organized into a subset of overarching