

CHAPTER TWO

Leadership Values and
Organizational
Culture

Guiding Questions

- How can campus values support an effort to make the campus ready for students?
- How can campus leaders engage the whole community and governance in this effort?
- How can campus leaders make a case for change based on an urgent, shared, and powerful vision?

Perspective Taking

Let's start with the premise that all campus communities embrace their own core values. Some observers believe that these values or value systems set higher education apart from corporate culture (Kezar & Lester, 2009). We might conclude that while all campus values are significant, some carry more potential to do well than others. In this chapter we invite you to consider your perspective on leadership and to pay attention to your values and the values held by your campus community. We hope that you will do two things. First, we suggest you take a close look at your own values in the context of your campus's values. Then we hope you will experiment with some perspective taking on your position as a campus leader. What might happen if you were to use the concept of the student-ready campus as a source of values you can hold

and serve? What if, as a result, you upended or reversed your thinking about whatever job you do on your campus? How might that help you to do things that contribute to the value system held by your campus and to the way values are enacted within campus governance?

A Casual Conversation with a Community College President from the Mid-Atlantic Region, Summer 2015

“A book on making colleges ready for students? That’s a great idea. We are doing that sort of work in so many ways. We consider everybody who works on the campus to be an educator. We say it in our convocations, and we mean it! Everyone carries that responsibility because we care as a community about our students. We even have advising guidelines for staff to help them make the most of opportunities to be mentors.”

“That’s excellent. Are those guidelines available publicly?
I would love to cite them.”

“I’m not certain. We’ll have to look.”

Observation: The will is there, and leaders are just beginning to find the way.

To begin: an exercise in perspective taking can be illuminating. Ask any seasoned composition instructor what she does to help students who have trouble writing unlock their creativity and bust through writer’s block. You will hear, time and again, that the way to unlock and unblock is to alter perspective. The same basic advice serves for student-ready leadership. One can find a new vantage point on leadership for a student-ready campus and find renewal and creativity in leadership that serves the values of that vision. You as an individual leader may hold this value, but what in fact can you point to as having been done to achieve it? Being ready for students has to be more than aspirational. You have to share the vision.

New Directions for Leadership

- What would it mean for you to be a student-ready leader?
- What would you do that is different?

We invite you to consider a new perspective as you reflect on and explore essential responsibilities, structures, and

recommendations for leadership for a student-ready campus. The recommendations of this chapter flow from the belief in students that animates this book. We have introduced the concept of a belief in students in the opening chapter and will explore that belief more fully in chapter five, “Demonstrating Belief in Students.” This chapter addresses values held by a community of educators and the structures and functions of campus governance—specifically shared governance—in relation to campus values. We are taking a principled position that just as all students have the capacity to learn, all people who work on campus have the capacity to be effective educators and leaders. Similarly, the shared governance structures we build, creaky and problematic as they may sometimes be, actually can accomplish a great deal of good. We have the capacity collectively in higher education in the United States to work more effectively with the students we have and the students we will have.

In some respects, the beliefs and matters of principle presented in this chapter are commonsensical and noncontroversial. But from some angles, as we will see, they might be provocative. As we develop further in chapters three and four, we are taking a holistic approach to the campus as an ecosystem and working with principles and concepts of distributed and developmental leadership for a healthy and flourishing organizational culture. We are looking for something closer to what Kucia and Gravett (2014) call “leaders in balance” rather than “leaders in control” (Kezar, 2015, p. 21; Schroeder, 2010).

A Short Clipping
from the *Chronicle of
Higher Education*,
March 9, 2015

*Leading Beyond the
Hierarchy*

In *Leadership in Balance: New Habits of the Mind* (2014), John F. Kucia and Linda S. Gravett argue that “leaders in balance” can often be more effective than “leaders in control.” That’s especially true for today’s higher-education environment, in which thinking beyond the hierarchy is increasingly prized as a technique for fostering creativity, says Mr. Kucia, administrative vice president at Xavier University.

A leader in balance, the authors say, embodies these traits:

- Approaches leadership as a relationship, not a position.
- Understands that the leader embodies the promise of the brand.

- Is motivated by a higher purpose; believes that mission drives the numbers.
- Acknowledges that collaboration must have a business purpose.
- Thinks “outside the pyramid” in order to share power and to spread leadership, authority, and responsibility.
- Believes that teaching and leadership have much in common.
- Understands that a personal comfort with diversity is at the center of collaboration.

More, however, than issuing an invitation to practice shared and distributed leadership, we intend to illustrate an intentional top-down and bottom-up, inside-out and outside-in approach to leadership that is specifically inclusive of all campus constituencies. Emphasizing the roles and responsibilities of administrators, faculty, and staff, we want to address educators’ roles and rewards and community stewardship. The changing nature of faculty work and the changing characteristics of educators figure into this inclusive approach. To create a student-ready campus, the campus community will need to embrace a vision of student-ready leadership and then act on that vision. It will need to imagine and support action in service of this vision—and do this work in a highly intentional and inclusive way. Starting now. Starting where people are right now, wherever that may be. While few campuses have made changes to leadership as comprehensive as envisioned here, many campuses have been moving in this direction. It is

possible to point to key practices and actions that student-ready leaders can use, no matter where they are beginning.

We have written this chapter with senior administrators in mind, but we hope that our recommendations will be useful to any educator on a campus. An ecological and distributed model of leadership acknowledges traditional hierarchies of responsibility and authority while being open and welcoming to all. We believe in working with the people and structures we have, recognizing that they can change through more purposeful collaboration. We are taking a searching look at orthodoxies, or closely held beliefs, related to leadership and envisioning how they may be flipped or reversed (Nagji and Walters, 2011, pp. 60–65) to help us change perspective.

A holistic plan for student-ready leadership will need to proceed from a new mindset or set of attitudes. To make your campus ready for students, you will need to work with principles—likely new principles—that are aligned with the mission and values of the campus and shared among campus community members. We urge you to consider multifaceted leadership activity as a resource to be used intentionally across the institution. This kind of leadership is open and welcoming to all educators, for the benefit of all students. Accordingly, we offer two approaches to leadership, each addressing a key principle.

Changing Perspective on Educators

Principle One: All people who work on campus have the capacity to be effective educators.

- How can a student-ready campus empower leadership where it may not yet exist?

- Is it possible to take a holistic approach based on a belief that everyone who works on the campus can be an educator and a leader?
- What would it mean to take such a principle seriously?
- What would then have to change?

As we have just suggested, we invite you to think and act as if the campus as a whole has a stake in leadership, with the senior administration standing firmly in support of this model. In management literature, distributed leadership practices, for example, often take a whole system approach. We recommend such approaches to leaders who want to find new means and models for collaboration. A wealth of good guidance is also available in Adrianna Kezar and Jaime Lester's *Organizing Higher Education for Collaboration: A Guide for Campus Leaders* (2009). Especially valuable are their observations on social networking and power dynamics:

Perhaps the greatest challenge is for campuses that do not have any values similar to student centeredness, innovation, egalitarianism, capacity building, or efficiency that appeal to collaboration. This is a very real challenge; manifesting new values on a campus is a very complex process that often takes years to develop. (p. 96)

Does Collaboration Serve a Greater Good or Is It an End in Itself?

Sometimes the change literature of higher education puts collaboration forward as an end in itself. We believe that in order to produce ideal conditions for collaboration, a greater good, a higher value needs to guide the choices that leaders make. The

process of becoming a student-ready campus is value-laden in that way. That is why we are stressing values formation or clarification as a leadership process and recommending a democratic and horizontal approach. If a gathering consensus on campus supports the process of becoming student-ready, then collaboration should follow more smoothly than it would in the absence of that vision and set of values.

Senior leaders sometimes forget that their place in the hierarchy can silence other people. If senior leaders open meetings to more participants and don't consciously address power dynamics, they may stifle expression, creativity, and collaboration (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 120). Consider what would happen if you—whatever your position—open your meetings on student-readiness and empower people who might not otherwise speak to make contributions.

A positive regard for all employees as educators and leaders can become an aspect of the character or ethos and value system of the campus. Values-based leadership can become a natural practice for people who find a new place for themselves in the community or the ecosystem of the campus—and of the campus within its broader communities. Not everyone will find such a place, but as the examples that follow illustrate, some campuses are opening doors to leadership to people who might not otherwise have thought of their position in that way. While it is not our intent to recapitulate the management literature on distributed leadership models, we do recommend that senior administrators consider such advice as Robert Kegan and Lisa Laskow Lahey offer in *Immunity to Change: How to Overcome It and Unlock the Potential in Yourself and Your Organization* (2009). As Kegan and Lahey recommend, individuals in the top tier of authority, with responsibility

for the entire institution, can renew their efforts to distribute responsibility and to encourage shared authority in line with the institutional mission. We would add that as a matter of principle, senior leaders may choose to exercise their power in a productive and cooperative way—creating what one might call productive tension—with the faculty and staff who are working at the grassroots level, from the bottom up.

Collaborative Leadership for Grassroots Empowerment

Research conducted at AAC&U points in this direction. The association's *Peer Review* offers an article titled "Collaborative, Faculty-Led Efforts for Sustainable Change," by senior fellow Ann S. Ferren and AAC&U staff members Rebecca Dolinsky and Heather McCambly. "Because colleges and universities are relatively flat organizations, somewhat fragmented by departmental boundaries, leadership is distributed," they observe (Dolinsky, Ferren, & McCambly, 2015, p. 30). While we would suggest that the degree of flatness may be relative, the general observation is valuable. Distributed leadership carries more potential within institutions of higher education than it does in other organizations. The idea is to make the most of distributed leadership in service of a vision of the campus as a student-ready place. In addition to reviewing the literature on effective leadership, the article recommends

- Collaborative leadership across departments and divisions
- Use of social networks to initiate and diffuse change
- Team-based learning for innovation and action

In addition to envisioning a distributed top-down, bottom-up leadership model, senior administrators can take practical steps to invite all people who work on the campus to regard themselves as educators and leaders. We recognize that this may be a new set of steps to take. But we believe it can make a significant difference to campus culture and allow for the growth of student-ready leadership in a far more democratic, developmental, and distributed way throughout the institution. Because the goal—indeed, often the highest goal—of most institutions is student learning and student success, the status of educator is clearly higher than the status of other roles. Distributing this role and responsibility can be powerful. It can offset the tendency to create a stratified caste system on campus. It can be even more powerful if the effort to share leadership connects explicitly to the diversity and equity goals of the campus.

Every Employee an Educator

All individuals who work on the campus can understand themselves to have leadership and educational roles within the enterprise as a whole. But they need to be invited to regard themselves in this way. Valencia College (2015b), for example, presents its faculty development page in a highly inclusive way—addressing all faculty as “learning leaders” no matter the type of contract they have, and beginning explicitly with adjunct and associate faculty. Among innovations available through the faculty development toolkit of resources are a peer mentoring program called “Learning Partners” and a set of professional development courses, some offering certificates, through the Teaching/Learning Academy (Valencia

College, 2014). These resources are available to any employee. The theoretical platform for this outreach incorporates Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger's influential work on communities of practice and situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Smith, 2003).

Inclusive Professional Development

A campus that intends to become ready for students may begin by reaching out to all faculty. We recommend a serious and concerted effort to improve professional development opportunities, particularly for faculty who work on term or contingent contracts. If your institution has never studied working conditions, types of teaching assignments, and access to professional development across the array of the changing faculty on your campus, now is a good time to start. To make your campus ready for students, you will need to know who is teaching the most vulnerable students on your campus how to read, write, and reason with numbers and who is helping these students to progress intentionally through their programs. You will need to make critical decisions about allocation of resources—but you will not be alone, and you will not be starting from scratch. The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success (2014) offers a principled and practical set of resources and campus examples that can help you get started.

This is what we mean by an intentional top-down, bottom-up strategy. It can be uncomfortable to discuss, but there is a hierarchy on campuses with a bias toward academic affairs and tenure-track faculty and a lower place for people who teach on term contracts or work for the physical plant,

with student affairs typically falling somewhere in between. Yet many of the adults who hold lower-hierarchy positions possess compassion, creativity, and wisdom as educators, and they are especially talented in working with students whose origins might be similar to theirs. In particular, the people who work on the operations side of campus may be more racially and ethnically diverse than the faculty and senior administration and/or may not have attended college. Robert Sternberg's *Wisdom, Intelligence, and Creativity Synthesized* (2003) offers helpful guidance on identifying and applying the many different strengths of all members of the institutional community. If you invite staff colleagues across the institution to join in leadership and make the invitation genuinely to join the community of educators for the sake of student success, for the sake of becoming a student-ready college, you might witness an amazing outpouring of talent. In our work on campuses, we have observed this effect in the smiling faces of people welcomed for the first time to think of themselves as educational leaders.

Exemplary Practice: The University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

The University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (UW-W) exemplifies a commitment like that just described. UW-W has begun to realize the untapped potential for teaching and mentoring in the minds and hearts of staff members, especially staff members who may not have gone to college. The university has intentionally invited everyone who works on the campus to be an educator. The campus has its own LEAP

Figure 2.1 University of Wisconsin-Whitewater staff employers help student employees understand the value of their liberal education on the job



Source: Craig Schreiner, UWW photographer, 2015.

initiative, connected to the national work that AAC&U has led through the LEAP initiative since 2005. Key to the work is a student-employment program that is learning centered and that aligns with academic programs (see Figure 2.1). Behind this work is an explicit and mission-driven commitment to educate and empower students—a deep belief in student capacities. Students who are employed through work-study—for example, in the University Center, the student center, and dining hall—are expected to learn a curriculum developed by staff members, emphasizing practical skills such as making change—literally, handling cash transactions—and practicing intercultural communication (Association of American Colleges and Universities [AAC&U], 2012). The

“LEAP HOME” pages of the university website highlight the commitment to engage all employees and welcome them to participate as educators: “Whitewater faculty and staff are passionate about sharing knowledge, fostering engagement in the community, and teaching life skills that help students prepare for the work force and become immersed in our local and global communities” (University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, 2015). For additional resources, see <http://www.uww.edu/leap/faculty-and-staff-resources>.

As we have suggested already, it is worth considering that the new majority of students, especially first-generation students, may have more in common with the multicultural, multigenerational people who work on buildings and grounds and in food services than with the faculty. Yet do these employees consider themselves educators? Chances are that they do not. Would they enjoy being invited to be educators? We believe so.

Exemplary Practice: California State University, Fullerton

California State University, Fullerton has taken this kind of thinking to heart. CSUF stands out for its commitment to student learning and for equitable achievement of learning outcomes across its diverse populations, as well as for community responsibility and commitment to meet these goals. The institutional mission statement begins with this sentence: “Learning is preeminent at California State University, Fullerton” (California State University, Fullerton, n.d.b). The

current strategic plan, 2013–2018 lays out key objectives that begin with the academic and professional success of the diverse student body. The university presents its own diversity as a resource and openly discusses achievement gaps among student populations. Goal 2 of the strategic plan goes to the heart of the matter: “Improve student persistence, increase graduation rates University-wide, and narrow the achievement gap for underrepresented students” (California State University, Fullerton, n.d.a, p. 9). To reduce the gap, the university is intentionally using high-impact practices to promote student engagement and improve success.

With the leadership of President Mildred Garcia, CSUF has opened a series of town hall events keyed to the strategic plan. The spring 2015 Town Hall convened university faculty, staff, and students to engage in a conversation about the plan, about high-impact educational practices (HIPs) for all students, and about other university priorities. Describing the event, Vijay Pendakur, associate vice president of the Division of Student Affairs, writes, “We’re serious about HIPs. At our last university-wide Town Hall Gathering, high-impact practices were a key item on the agenda. When I looked out at the audience of over 500 faculty, staff, and students, I remember seeing people from buildings and grounds crews seated in the front row of tables” (personal e-mail, June 30, 2015).

Positive Vision of Educators

This example suggests something we have seen every time we have a chance to address a mixed group of faculty, administration, and staff employees. It’s refreshing and inspiring to see

highly positive responses coming from staff who are typically not invited to consider themselves as educators. It helps to consider how staff members, including those who may not have attended college, may be thinking about education and social mobility, about the opportunities the institution can offer. It follows that student employment and mentoring programs are a viable and practical place to begin a broader collaboration with staff members who truly are committed to student success. Working tirelessly to strengthen relations between academic affairs and student affairs is an excellent strategy for many campuses, as has long been maintained by AAC&U and other organizations such as NASPA—Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. We would suggest opening even more doors to staff. We know of a number of institutions that are carrying out projects of this kind. The College Enrichment Day at Prince George's Community College, Maryland, invites all employees to attend and to discover and develop their capacities as educators (Colter, 2013). Brookdale Community College, the County College of Monmouth, New Jersey, makes a stated commitment to the principle we are exploring in this chapter. In Brookdale's vision and mission statement, one finds a set of principles. Student success comes first, followed by this pledge: "One Brookdale: Brookdale values our employees and the philosophy of One Brookdale. One Brookdale represents a collective commitment by all employees to demonstrate a consistent, appropriate and comparable level of teaching and service excellence throughout the entire College, across all locations, creating a dynamic synergy of intent and action focused on student success" (Brookdale Community College, 2013, para. 6).

Building Out the Change Effort

Although the literature on higher education reform is not abundant in advice for evidence-based approaches that lead with values and community value formation in relation to governance, help is definitely available. As we have noted, Kezar and Lester (2009) suggest that campus leaders can motivate colleagues to join a change effort if the work is centered on students and seeks to build the capacity of the institution to do a better job of helping students to learn. A willingness to innovate, a commitment to egalitarianism, a genuine interest in efficiency or in making things work better in the community will also move people to action (p. 96). Lave and Wenger's (1991) work in cognitive anthropology, mentioned earlier, opens up other avenues for collaborative thinking that can be beneficial. It is rooted in American pragmatism and the pioneering efforts of Charles Sanders Peirce and John Dewey. Dewey's work has also served for a century to guide AAC&U in practices of engaged learning and liberal education. The intellectual heritage of the ideas that can be applied to the process of becoming a student-ready college, in other words, is robust and accessible, and particularly resonant to educators.

On most campuses, an inquiry into communities of practice within the campus itself might be led by social science or philosophy departments, perhaps with the help of student researchers. These are resources that administrative leaders may have overlooked. An array of ideas for campus practice that might likewise be attractive to both departments and service units is available in David M. Callejo Perez and

Joshua Ode's edited collection titled *The Stewardship of Higher Education: Re-imagining the Role of Education and Wellness on Community Impact* (2013). The collection explores stewardship for campus and community as a convergence of work for health and education, addressing leadership, campus governance, and applied scholarship. In chapter four we will explore these dimensions of community engagement within the broader communities in which the campus is situated.

Considering Whole-Person Educators

A rich heritage of thought and leadership for the student as a whole person and the concept of formation may also be drawn from lessons learned by faith-based institutions. We would suggest, such lessons can help secular institutions that want to become ready for highly diverse students. Larry A. Braskamp, Lois Calian Trautvetter, and Kelly Ward's *Putting Students First: How Colleges Develop Students Purposefully* (2006) lays out challenges and tensions that emerge when campus leaders and faculty "create campus environments that foster holistic student development" (p. xix). The book includes valuable recommendations for community enrichment and growth, with practical guidance for open conversations on difficult topics. "Service," it observes, "without reflection can perpetuate stereotypes" (p. 188). The book frames questions to guide frank and civil disputes that can have a bearing on resolution of difficult issues concerning administrative practices and governance. "What contributions are expected of faculty?" the authors ask. "Does your institution reward faculty for fulfilling

these expectations such as participation in governance and involvement in the community?” (p. 190). Shared governance involves “all members of the community in deciding on its priorities—[and] includes all members of the campus community in decision-making and in creating community” (188). Similarly, since 1999 the organization called *Imagining America* (n.d.) has been exploring the reward structure of institutions, particularly related to tenure and promotion based on public scholarship and community engagement in the arts and humanities.

Student-Ready Mentoring

Finally, a recent guidebook for leadership in practice is *Transformative Conversations: A Guide to Mentoring Communities Among Colleagues in Higher Education* (Felten, Bauman, Kheriaty, Taylor, & Palmer, 2013). The book offers powerful and moving prompts for discussion related to the values that individual educators hold. It provides guidance to find a wellspring of energy through conversation and mentorship. We think that conversations about a student-ready campus should be transformative and should address the formation of the whole person—the formation of the student and the formation of the educator within a community. Intentional community building needs to address matters of both heart and head in ways that are inviting and safe enough to help people to take risks. Such innovative projects as *Designing the Future(s) of the University at Georgetown University* (Georgetown, n.d.)

are intentionally exploring the education of the whole person and extending the inquiry into the digital realm.

The Will to Apply and Practice What Works

As these examples demonstrate, it's not that we lack ideas and recommendations. What campuses need is the will to apply and practice what works. We believe that the will to work creatively within the campus community depends on an inspiring vision that dares to address people's values and their commitments. Change for the sake of change, collaboration for the sake of collaboration—these are not inspiring and inspiring concepts. Change for the sake of accountability is even less so. But a new vision of the campus as a place ready for the students we have and the students we will have can address deeper motivations within educators, drawing on the hopes and aspirations that made them want to work on a campus in the first place.

The idea and the ideal of the student-ready campus can serve, we would argue, specifically and powerfully to crystallize a bright vision of a more just society and motivate people to invest the effort in building capacity. This understanding of the motivation for change arising internally within the individual and supported externally within the community is what we mean by an effort to lead from the inside out and from the outside in.

Guiding Questions for All Leaders

- Does the mission statement address campus readiness for students? How? How might it be altered to make this outcome explicit rather than implicit? Could you envision an exercise with a mixed group of employees—educators, administrators, faculty both tenurable and term appointed, and staff—to experiment with changes to the mission statement, as a first step?
- Does the campus ethos include an articulated regard for the campus community as a whole, as an ecosystem, both independently and in the context of its broader communities local, state, and national? Are you confident enough in your own leadership, whatever it is that you do, that you could raise this question with others in your unit or with the person to whom you report?
- Does the president offer visible and heartfelt support for distributed leadership?
- Does the campus community embrace the idea that everyone can be a leader?
- Does the senior leadership create opportunities to discuss leadership and push the boundaries of received notions of

leadership? Do employees on the operations side of campus feel welcome in discussions of leadership development for all?

- What key responsibilities, structures, and practices will need to change in order to foster, support, and reward the kind of leadership envisioned here?
- Has the campus community discussed our racialized moment in history in the United States, the implications of local and national demographic trends, the local and national disparities in wealth that have a bearing on the campus community? How might you lead your campus community to see these questions as leadership challenges and opportunities in which everyone has a stake?

Student-Ready Practice of Governance

Principle Two: Shared governance can accomplish a great deal of good.

Having made your way to this point in the chapter, you will almost certainly have devoted a thought or two to institutional shared governance. You may well be thinking how all good inspirations go to languish and die in the shadow of campus bureaucracy, in the dim light of things as they are, in the zone where administration and faculty convene to govern the institution, in whatever way they do that. Having asked mixed groups of educators and administrators on many occasions—through consulting, through campus-based projects, at workshops and

institutes of various kinds—what they think of the institutionalized structures of shared governance, we recognize there is some disagreement about shared governance. While some people think shared governance works, we often hear that it does not.

The higher education change literature of the past two decades has laid out the challenges to campus practices involving faculty and administrators in excruciating detail. In “Why Does the Faculty Resist Change?” John Tagg (2012) describes a tendency for administrative leaders to lay blame for failure to change at the feet of faculty. Tagg is writing generally of change related to student learning. Interestingly, he concludes by flipping an orthodoxy in a way that connects to our argument here:

The key to designing and executing productive institutional change is not simply to build a better academic mousetrap. Faculty will not beat a path to the doors of those with the best arguments. We need to not only design change for our institutions but redesign our institutions for change. At base, we must recognize that we can't change without changing. We cannot create a better future unless we are willing to embrace a future that is different from the past. (p. 15)

There is, Tagg recognizes, no magic bullet or simple fix, no single management strategy that will suffice to bring comprehensive institutional change. Tagg argues that the key is to address rewards, or what he calls “endowments”: practices of hiring, promotion, retention, tenure; the philosophy of individualism, which undercuts collaboration; the dominance of research agendas within departments and across the

institution. He concludes that we need to “create structures through which large numbers of faculty can design the change” (p. 15). By this he means to shape or create the “endowments” of the future.

Exemplary Practice: Alverno College

One exemplar Tagg chooses is Alverno College (as cited in Mentkowski, 2000). For more than a century, Alverno College has cultivated a community-wide belief in the capacities of women. Alverno has also stood the test of time as a model institution centered on learning, on demonstration of student learning outcomes and student abilities—beginning with a celebrated paradigm shift they made in the 1970s (Alverno College, 1994; 2001, p. 2). Over the past four decades, the college has earned a highly respected record of success in educating women of color in particular, with 40 percent of students so identifying. On the strength of its mission and achievement over the years, Alverno can claim to reflect the diversity of Milwaukee and its region better than any other institution (Alverno, n.d.a).

Critically important to the ethos of the college is the fact that its mission expresses a commitment to the individual learner. Alverno presents itself directly as an institution ready for students. The college tells the prospective student consistently and clearly, in public documents and on the institutional website, that she has talents and that she can learn, inviting her to imagine herself as valuable and successful and helping her to see that she will become part of a social community in which she can

grow. The ethos of respect for the individual and her learning coalesces within the relationships of the community and its values. As that ethos has flourished, so the community has grown, its flourishing reflected in the diversity of the graduates.

Alverno is also an institution that has succeeded in getting faculty involved through an institutional design for change including curriculum and governance as they moved to pioneer development of a student experience directed to achievement of learning outcomes.

Outcomes for the major provide a goal for the curriculum but do not, by themselves, provide coherence. When faculty sit down as a department, we do more than establish exit outcomes for the graduate. We also work to articulate the developmental nature of the abilities. We teach toward the exit outcomes and assess students' ability to demonstrate them in developmentally appropriate ways at each stage of the curriculum, from the very first general education course to the senior seminar directly preceding graduation Ultimately, however, coherence depends as much on our practice of having every faculty member in the department teach courses at every stage as it does on the curriculum planning itself. Because each of us knows the entire curriculum, we can assist students to apply what they have learned previously.

(Alverno College, 1994; 2001, p. 3)

The change Alverno made in creating an ability-based curriculum specifically addressed faculty shared responsibilities

as well as governance and rewards, including promotion and tenure (Engelmann, 2007; Mentkowski, 2000, pp. 359–405). And as this example also implies, the motivation for change was explicit and contextualized. Alverno has made an explicit commitment to be ready for the students they have and will have. Their institutional designs for learning and student success have been highly innovative, decades ahead of the curve. They have understood how to make structural changes to endowments with these goals and in this context—and how to collaborate programmatically throughout the curriculum as they share responsibility.

As the success of the learning outcomes and assessment movement in higher education has grown, practices similar to Alverno's are being developed across all types of institutions. As AAC&U's 2015 Member Survey has discovered, 85 percent of member institutions report that they have a common set of intended learning goals or learning outcomes that apply to all undergraduate students (up from 78 percent in 2008) (Hart Research Associates, 2015). The example of California State University—Monterey Bay (CSUMB), which follows, illustrates the way that the learning outcomes and assessment movement has influenced institutional practice at the program level. As in the example of Alverno College, all departments at CSUMB take responsibility for supporting the defined learning outcome for all students. This kind of design exemplifies a structural and programmatic activity supported by administration and governance that addresses a need to make the college ready for all students.

Collaboration in Practice: Institution-Wide Learning Outcomes Strategy

California State University—Monterey Bay has adopted an institution-wide graduation requirement for service learning addressing critical civic literacy. “Distinct from a traditional civics approach, critical civic literacy emphasizes the role of power in facilitating or inhibiting meaningful participation in decision making and civic life. As all departments at CSUMB have to develop service-learning courses, critical civic literacy is integrated into the core knowledge base of each of the degree programs. The departments themselves have had to wrestle with issues of diversity and social justice in new ways as they have developed their service-learning courses” (Calderón & Pollack, 2015, p. 17).

Beyond Change as a Motivator in Itself

As the examples of Alverno College and CSUMB also suggest, change as a motivator—in and of itself—is not sufficient to trigger change. The change needs to serve a meaningful vision.

Much anxiety drives higher education toward change in our era. But a generalized sense that business as usual must change is unlikely to motivate educators. Even if one puts first as a goal the achievement of student learning outcomes, the concept of change, and especially change to endowments, remains amorphous, self-directed, or circular—hardly inspirational. As the example of Alverno suggests, the motivation for change needs to speak to people, to address the actual people at the center of attention—the students—and the people who will have to take responsibility for enacting change—the faculty and staff. The motivation needs to flow from heartfelt commitment to the human, humane, faith-based, or civic responsibility of the institution.

In short, people on your campus have to care about making change. Beyond a generalized desire for reform, assuming that the intended change should improve student learning outcomes, what are the higher motives? Change in the service of what? It's worth considering what a vision of the context for change itself might be and how that vision might guide action for serious modification to endowments, shared governance, and related administrative practices where you work and lead. This approach to change and reform may be sensitive and responsive to context, may be situated, and may be visionary. It may likewise respect the ecology or ecosystem of the campus within its communities.

Here is what we recommend. The motivation for change has to be something articulated and clear, something that people can envision and embrace. The concept of "student learning" on its own is simply not powerful enough. Neither is the concept of change as a vague preparation for an uncertain future. What can be far more powerful is a new vision of students and

a new vision of educators, including those faculty who work on term contracts and staff educators with the least status who are likely to be working with the most vulnerable students. Meeting people where they are right now and moving forward collaboratively with the vision of the student-ready campus is a powerful way to begin. Then, we believe, the “endowments” can begin to fall into place. Change can appear in service of a robust vision. As the urgencies and crises of our times—especially intergroup strife and the yawning socioeconomic gap—are telling us, we need brave and hopeful leaders to get started right now. There is no waiting for a perfect time. We doubt a perfect time will ever arrive, and there is far too much at stake. You might want to think in terms of educational leadership as a movement for civil rights and social mobility.

We know of no campus on which shared governance is completely dysfunctional, where no shred of potential exists to move in the direction we suggest here. If you want your institution to evolve, to be ready for the students you have and will have, you can begin to address the processes you use to govern yourselves, particularly the processes that rest in whole or in part in the hands of faculty and staff right now. The vision of a student-ready campus can guide you to address cultural change.

A Pragmatic Approach to Shared Governance

To become a student-ready campus, a campus community may find it helpful to approach shared governance in a pragmatic way and to be mindful of community members’ beliefs and

attitudes. Consider that people's views of shared governance are both ideologically and historically formed. Orthodoxies inflect viewpoint. You may accept widely held views that shared governance on your campus is not shared at all but a slough of despond, uselessly bogged down in politics. On the other hand, you may work at a place with robust shared governance, in which ideas and actions are subject to productive debate and action. If you begin by understanding where your campus is situated developmentally, so to speak, you can lay out and investigate a set of orthodoxies related to shared governance appropriate for your context. That approach will give you a place to begin. Changing shared governance is cultural change. You need to identify the guiding beliefs that surround the institution of shared governance on your campus and the state of well-being generally of your campus before you make a plan to alter those beliefs in a generative way to be ready for students. Context matters.

You may, for example, conclude that faculty and administration inhabit different planets and cannot communicate and that the pattern of miscommunication has become an orthodoxy in itself. It is just the way things are. But you might consider what happens when people contemplate the orthodoxy from a different angle. Imagine that the college's readiness for students, and for the thriving of a highly diverse student body, is the highest good. What happens to that good when communication among educators is thwarted at every turn? Everyone is harmed. Students are particularly vulnerable when faculty and administration don't communicate. Yet what if cooperation between faculty and administration became a new orthodoxy, something that you can say openly you want to

achieve? Energy, ideas, and resources could multiply through work undertaken together. Rich and spirited communication actually could model highly functional community behavior for students.

We have recommended an intentional top-down and bottom-up, inside-out and outside-in approach to leadership that is specifically inclusive of all campus constituencies. To offer advice on your campus on the roles and responsibilities of administrators, faculty, and staff through shared governance, you will definitely need to take into account the array of endowments within your context: educators' roles and rewards, the changing nature of faculty work, and the changing characteristics of educators. You will need to be particularly aware of the dynamics of change from the inside out. Once the campus leadership has committed to becoming ready for students and recognized the potential of everyone who works on a campus to contribute as a leader, a vista of complexity will no doubt appear. That result is inevitable and necessary. But if you talk with leaders on other campuses, you will find that you are in no way alone. A positive outlook on the campus as a functioning administrative entity can be practical and helpful. Governance and policy can change, and sometimes quite dramatically.

A Vision of a Place Ready for Students

Let's assume your campus community has embraced a vision of itself as a place ready for students. Let's further assume the community accepts the idea of starting where the campus is right now and collaborating with other campuses, guided by a vision of a greater good. Every willing campus doubtless will take a

different plan and pathway to make itself ready for students. Every plan worth its salt will be multifaceted. But there needs to be a coherent vision aligned with the institutional mission and a commitment to wrestle with and discuss campus values.

Having identified your orthodoxies and assessed the well-being of your campus, you should consider coming together to talk about the values you share as a community. Discussion of mission can serve this purpose. We have discovered that the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes offered for discussion in light of the campus mission can jumpstart serious discussion. The LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes are:

Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World

- Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts

Focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

Intellectual and Practical Skills, including

- Inquiry and analysis
- Critical and creative thinking
- Written and oral communication
- Quantitative literacy
- Information literacy
- Teamwork and problem solving

Practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

Personal and Social Responsibility, including

- Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
- Intercultural knowledge and competence
- Ethical reasoning and action
- Foundations and skills for lifelong learning

Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

Integrative and Applied Learning, including

- Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

Demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems. (Association of American Colleges and Universities, n.d.a, para. 2)

The essential learning outcomes (ELOs) were themselves developed through a process like the one we are recommending here, in conversations on hundreds of campuses across the country over more than a decade (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007). If you have never tried to find common ground on student learning outcomes through your shared governance bodies, such as faculty or staff senates, now is a good time to start. It is likely to be helpful, critically so, to position the ELOs in service of making the campus ready for students. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln did something very similar when it used the ELOs thoughtfully and strategically to coalesce the will on campus to change general education. In the process, they made valuable discoveries about diversity and inclusion in practice and took steps that seemed

revolutionary. This strategy and process might be adaptable to your own campus (Kean, Mitchell, & Wilson, 2008).

Consider the value of assembling a cross-functional and intentionally diverse leadership group that can lay out the process of discussing student learning outcomes as key to a more just and democratic pluralistic society. Think seriously about creating learning communities of educators or communities of practice that are committed to the vision of the student-ready campus as a civic responsibility (Kezar, 2015, pp. 2, 19). Learning communities and communities of practice may be powerful when guided by a vision of well-being for diverse students and educators.

Leaders who seriously want to make change should be bold enough to ask probing and meaningful questions and to launch activities that serve the broader vision to make the campus ready for students. Next, we suggest some key planning questions that these leaders may use to guide their efforts. These questions are not new; they frequently appear in the literature on change leadership on campus. See, for example, Paul L. Gaston and Jerry G. Gaff's *Revising General Education—and Avoiding the Potholes* (2009). Particularly instructive is the list of fifty potholes, into which you do not want to fall, and a list of associated pothole patches. A few examples convey the sage humor of the book: "Pothole 3: Expect a holistic change Patch 3: Consider the advantages of evolutionary change" (pp. 8, 31). "Pothole 46: Ignore the reward structure Patch 46: Endeavor to align the reward structure with the priorities of general education" (pp. 27, 33). What's different is that we invite you to ask these planning questions in service of an explicit vision of a more just society in which diverse groups of students can thrive and diverse educators can likewise flourish.

Guiding Questions for All Leaders

- Does the campus have a cross-functional and diverse team that can address campus readiness for students in the searching way that we are recommending?
- Are members of the planning team highly respected by the various sectors of the community? If they are not highly respected, the work of the team will not be held in esteem.
- Is the team relatively independent and unencumbered by the conservative tendencies of standing committees to keep the status quo? Is it charged to function as a respected ad hoc body?
- Does the team have a workable timeline, reasonable resources, and unambiguous support from the top?
- Is senior leadership committed to taking the time needed, given the overall state of the campus, to support this work?
- Is the senior leadership ready to strike a balance, sometimes standing up to speak and act and sometimes sitting on the sidelines so that others are empowered?

We don't intend to make a comprehensive list of planning questions. But we do intend to illustrate a planning process that

ought to seem familiar. Importantly, such a planning process begins at the very outset to open the doors of governance with respect for the processes of the institution. Altering the culture of a campus toward student readiness requires nothing less. Sooner or later, campus governing bodies such as the senate(s) will need to be engaged; campus policies will need to change. The sooner campus leadership gets moving with governance and administrative functions, the better and wiser that leadership will be.

We would like to suggest some ways in which leadership to make the campus ready for students may open up unexpected administrative and governance functions and processes. While no one campus is likely to take up the full set of questions below, cultural change will require serious consideration of several of these questions. Over time, campus leaders may need to develop answers and plans for addressing each one.

1. Has the institution, including administrators and key governance bodies, taken a close and searching look at who is teaching undergraduate students? If leaders do not know, for example, who is teaching students to write, who is teaching general education courses, who is teaching developmental courses, it may be difficult to bring about meaningful change. If graduate students or faculty working on part-time contracts are teaching most of these courses, the institution will have trouble becoming student ready. The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success has developed many resources to help campuses answer critical questions about support of faculty who teach on term contracts, especially part-time assignments.

Taking the time to collect and disaggregate data on who is teaching what to whom can be a crucial strategy. Taking the time to begin working through policy and governance to change the way teaching assignments are being allocated is essential. If leaders don't take the time to figure out who is teaching the most vulnerable students, the plan for student readiness is not going to work.

2. Has leadership connected the intended change in the direction of readiness for students to the reward structures of the institution? As Kezar (2015) has observed, it is essential to "align role changes with evaluations and rewards." *Achieving Systemic Change: A Sourcebook for Advancing and Funding Undergraduate STEM Education* (Fry, 2014) builds robust support for changing faculty and institutional reward structures in order to produce an impact on student learning, especially in light of the "alarming" loss of student talent in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields (p. 3).
3. Have personnel practices for retention, reappointment, promotion, and tenure been aligned with or connected to institutional goals for student learning outcomes and to student achievement of those outcomes? Have you reviewed these documents with readiness for students in mind? Personnel policies and practices are often handled separately and apart within administration and governance. How might they be brought together with mission, vision, and programmatic practices? Can the connection be strengthened? How and where are teaching and learning considered within retention, tenure, and promotion documents? How do policies concerning the

scholarship of teaching and learning embrace the values associated with the student-ready campus?

4. How can rewards of other kinds—teaching awards and activities sponsored by centers for teaching and learning—be redesigned to address the values and goals of a student-ready campus? Excellent resources are available through the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network (POD, 2007–2015).
5. Is it feasible to engage faculty and staff senates or bargaining units in a discussion of rewards, including merit pay? Are rewards available to faculty on term or contingent contracts? Is discussion of rewards open to faculty and educators of all kinds, including those who work on term or contingent contracts?
6. Have you opened discussions of roles and rewards at the department level? A new publication by the New American Colleges and Universities, titled *Redefining the Paradigm: Faculty Models to Support Student Learning* contains excellent advice, readily applied within the context of a student-ready campus. The book offers chapters devoted to holistic departmental planning focused on student learning and to new approaches to faculty evaluation (Hensel, Hunnicutt, & Salomon, 2015).
7. Have you made revisions to the faculty handbook to reflect the values you place on being ready for students? The Centre College Faculty Handbook (Centre College, 2014) offers useful language, for example, on effective teaching:

“Effective teaching involves caring for students as persons; stimulating interest in the Faculty member’s

subject; promoting students' mastery of the facts, theories, and methods of the Faculty member's subject; encouraging students to learn independently; helping students improve skills in thinking, writing, and speaking; assisting students in identifying and clarifying the values that infuse learning; and encouraging students to become creative, responsible members of society" (Section III, pp. 1–2).

8. Can you find ways to address academic freedom in the context of a student-ready campus? Some thoughtful and readily adapted recommendations appear in *The Future of the Professoriate: Academic Freedom, Peer Review, and Shared Governance*, by Neil W. Hamilton and Jerry G. Gaff (2009). The book suggests enhancements to academic freedom that are grounded in student success. It recommends that we seek strong mechanisms for linking academic freedom to faculty responsibility. We can "root [academic freedom] in the transcendent value of educating students for a complex society as well as in the scholarly and research activities of faculty" (p. 28). We can "extend academic freedom to all who teach students to think critically about controversial and contested topics" (p. 28). Certainly the student-ready campus offers challenging prompts for seeking these connections.
9. Have you looked for opportunities voiced in the current institutional strategic plan? For example, Rochester Institute of Technology's plan offers a set of criteria for change of "silo culture" and rewards.

Difference Maker v.2

RIT will reduce academic and administrative silos and diminish the lingering negative effects of a silo culture.

Objective V.2.1

Reward collaboration within and across colleges with regard to curricula, teaching, research, and the student-faculty-staff culture. (Rochester Institute of Technology, n.d., p. 30)

Conclusion: A Vision to Guide Collaboration

Many higher education planning guides extol the value of collaboration. We do indeed endorse collaboration. But as an end in and of itself, collaboration is insufficient to motivate people to make change, especially the kind of structural change under discussion in this chapter. When the desire and impetus to collaborate emerges from shared values and a commitment to begin a process of change in service of a vision, then people will work together on the toughest challenges, especially those related to the governance of an institution. Collaboration for its own sake is unlikely to move hearts and minds. It will not inspire people to care. But collaboration *for something that people value* is attractive and generative. A strong and resonant vision provides social and emotional support to the community that shares it and gives them strength to keep on trying. On the

student-ready campus, that vision can imagine an environment in which equity moves to the center of attention, and social justice and upward mobility can be ideas that people can voice. That kind of vision can move change. The more robust the values of the work, the bolder the idea, the more it will stir the passions of educators.