

Promoting leadership in Australian universities

Andrew P Bradley, Tim Grice & Neil Paulsen

University of Queensland

In this paper we review current practices for developing and promoting academic leadership in universities. We consider the forms of leadership that are appropriate for academic organisations, while exploring the types of leadership favoured by recruitment and promotion committees. Using the Australian higher education context as a case study, we critique the current situation as promoting a restricted form of leadership focused on technical leadership within an academic discipline, rather than the broader array of leadership skills necessary for effective academic leadership. We go on to consider a number of ways in which this broad range of leadership skills can be fostered and developed within academe.

Keywords: Leadership, leadership development, mentoring, public service management, universities

Introduction

In the last four decades, the Australian higher education system has undergone considerable change. Fuelled by a confluence of social, economic and demographic pressures, successive governments have introduced educational policies in Australia that have encouraged greater participation rates in post-secondary education and training, including higher education. As more and more students attend universities, there has been an expectation of increased accountability to government funders (Jones, 2011; Yelder & Codling, 2004), with a broad, but often ill-defined, dictum that universities contribute to the economic and social goals of society (see Fearn, 2010). Since universities receive public funds, their employees, including academic staff, are often seen to be 'public servants' who must acquiesce to the expectations and reporting processes put in place by government (Jones, 2011). The litany of quantitative performance metrics is one visible sign of these increased expectations of accountability in academe (see for instance Van Noorden, 2010).

Yet perhaps a more fundamental and pervasive manifestation of this increased scrutiny has been the move to corporatised governance structures and management approaches to administer the 'business' of academic institutions (Blackmore & Sachs, 2000; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Gosling, Bolden & Petrov, 2009; Jones *et al.*, 2012; Kligyte & Barrie, 2014). Universities are expected to be models of efficiency and cost effectiveness, to be flexible in their course offerings, and increasingly responsive to student needs and expectations. The relatively recent innovation and commercialisation zeitgeist—whereby research value is defined in terms of its more immediate 'real-world' outcomes—has served to reinforce this more corporatised model of academic research and teaching (e.g., Suresh, 2015). These changes have resulted in an epochal shift in the academic landscape that has influenced the balance of teaching and research, and even the type of research undertaken (Abbott *et al.*, 2010). Further, the insistence upon the relevance of universities for the economic flourishing of society may have, somewhat ironically, resulted in the pursuit of increasingly 'ivory tower' behaviours (Jones, 2011).

Some commentators have also noted that these developments have resulted in a crisis of leadership and identity in the university sector (Bryman, 2007; Drew, 2006; Jones *et al.*, 2012; Jones, 2011; Kligyte & Barrie, 2014; Lumby, 2012; Winter, 2009; Yelder & Codling, 2004). Although universities undoubtedly share many features with corporations—such as the requirements for good governance, strategy formulation and execution—the corporate ideal of leadership has contested applicability to academe (Bolden *et al.*, 2015; Kligyte & Barrie, 2014; Lumby, 2012). While academics value and desire an enabling form of leadership, many currently believe that they are constrained by overly bureaucratic administrators and managers who lack the necessary interpersonal and strategic analysis skills to lead their academic colleagues (Ball, 2007; Drew *et al.*, 2008; Lumby, 2012).

Within this changing landscape, we explore the forms of leadership that are appropriate to the particular context of academia, and whether (and in what form) leadership is considered by academic recruitment and promotion committees. We discuss whether current practices promote purely technical leadership within an academic discipline, or take into consideration the broader array of leadership skills necessary for effective academic leadership (Bryman, 2007; Goffee & Jones, 2005; Walumbwa *et al.*, 2008). Finally, we consider a number of ways in which a broad array of leadership skills can be fostered and promoted within universities. In line with current scholarship that critiques our 'obsession... with individual leaders' (Bolden *et al.*, 2015, p. 12. See also Day, 2001; Day *et al.*, 2014), we focus less upon 'intrapersonal' leader development, and more upon the 'interpersonal' enhancement of leadership capacity. Throughout our analysis we draw from our experience in Australian universities and focus on academic leadership more so than leadership of professional staff within universities.

Towards a definition of Academic Leadership

Empirical inquiry into organisational leadership has established that effective leadership results in positive outcomes for employees and organisations alike, including improved employee performance (Carter *et al.*, 2013), organisational commitment (Hulpia *et al.*, 2012), job satisfaction (Gunnarsdóttir, 2014) and employee retention (Burke *et al.*, 2006; Caproni, 2012; Katzenbach & Smith, 2005). However, there is also recognition that what constitutes 'effective' leadership may vary in different kinds of organisations, or even among different

departments within the same organisation (Kligyte & Barrie, 2014; Langland, 2012). For instance, Bolden *et al.* (2015) highlight some of the problems with assuming a corporate leadership model in academic institutions, observing that 'the move towards a more corporate approach is associated with an intensification of formal management processes... and the potential fragmentation and erosion of informal academic and self-leadership'. This then causes a loss of 'a coherent sense of academic values, identity and purpose that, in turn, are key to the production of high-quality academic work' (p.11). Top-down leadership, with connotations of 'power-over' and inequality, is also problematic for academics who value academic independence above all else (Bolden *et al.*, 2015).

Despite such objections to the wholesale adoption of the 'corporate approach' to leadership in academe, there is limited consensus on what constitutes effective 'academic leadership'. In universities, senior executives administer resources and determine policies, while senior academics define the university's intellectual authority (Jones, 2011; Karmel, 1990; Kligyte & Barrie, 2014). Clearly, without intellectual authority universities undermine their 'brand' and market position. However, most universities are large and complex organisations that require professional managers to set direction, coordinate efforts, oversee day-to-day operations, and control finances. The challenge, therefore, is to work with both academic and non-academic staff to get the balance right between the administration of resources on one hand, and the enhancement of intellectual authority through the promotion of scholarly pursuits on the other (Karmel, 1990; Kligyte & Barrie, 2014).

To this end, there is evidence that shared or distributed leadership may be an appropriate model for academic institutions (Bolden *et al.*, 2015; Jones, 2011), with administrative tasks delegated to non-faculty staff, while academic leaders, such as department heads and leaders in research and teaching streams, focus on advancing academic values and goals. This perspective of distributed leadership posits a 'filtering out' of bureaucratic demands so that academics are better able to pursue teaching and research, while also developing the requisite skills to enable strategic leadership and operational effectiveness (Drew *et al.*, 2008). For instance, Bryman (2009) argues that university leaders need to 'create an environment or context for academics and others to fulfil their potential and interest in their work' (p.66), noting the need for leaders to 'consult; to respect existing values; to take actions in support of collegiality; to promote the interests

of those for whom the leader is responsible; to be involved in the life of the department/institution; to encourage autonomy; and not to allow the department/institution to drift' (p.68). Such leadership has more in common with management by objective than management by control (Larson & Gray, 2011). This notion of leadership that is both formal and informal, and also dispersed (Ball, 2007, Bolden *et al.*, 2015; Ladyshevsky & Flavell, 2011), has a number of similarities to the distributed leadership in primary and secondary schools described by Lumby (2012):

'If heroic top-down leadership is at one end of a theoretical spectrum and organised anarchy is at the other, distributed leadership sits in between. It acknowledges the presence and necessity for individual, hierarchical leadership by the few and also accounts for its inadequacy in both theory and practice to capture the multifaceted, simultaneously intentional and emergent phenomenon of organisational leadership by the many' (p. 9).

In a recent review, Denis *et al.* (2012) outlined a range of perspectives that address the notion of 'leadership in the plural', including those approaches that explore the spread of leadership across levels and over time. Jones and colleagues (2012) outlined a framework for taking action under a distributed leadership approach in universities, and Fraser and Harvey (2008) report on a project designed to develop multi-level academic leadership across the institution through a distributed leadership and participatory action research model. Bolden and colleagues (2015) also note that leadership is a 'group quality... a set of functions which must be carried out by the group' (p. 17). From this perspective, distributed leadership is a way to connect the multifaceted roles required within a university to deliver teaching and research programs. However, despite its apparent suitability to the sector, distributed or shared leadership is not common in academic institutions (Lumby, 2012). Moreover, there is significant divergence between rhetoric and reality among higher education institutions that espouse a distributed leadership approach (Gosling *et al.*, 2009). Instead, universities tend to adopt a 'blended' view of university leadership, within which it is difficult to distinguish between leadership and management roles (Lumby, 2012). As a consequence, academic leaders appear to be primarily focused on organisational management, as reinforced via hierarchical (top-down) management structures. In other cases, academic leaders are required to manage 'up' and 'down', leading some to comment that they feel like they are in a 'sandwich' (Scott *et al.*, 2008).

The prevalence of this 'blended' model of leadership and management is emphasised by recent research, which suggests that, whether by choice or circumstance, those who currently occupy formal university leadership roles tend to engage in institutional management roles rather than exercise broader forms of leadership (Lumby, 2012; Kligyte & Barrie, 2014). As a result, many heads of departments and other senior academics do not have sufficient time, resources, or authority to engage with and influence academic work (Bolden, Gosling & O'Brien, 2012), and often find that they are 'so busy complying with bureaucratic and reporting procedures... (and) dealing with complaints... that they have little time left to lead or to think and operate strategically' (Scott *et al.*, 2008, p. xiv). Confounding this issue, or perhaps caused by it, is the fact that leaders in the middle of the university hierarchy are sometimes reluctant leaders (Floyd, 2012; Jones, 2011; Ladyshevsky & Flavell, 2011). Indeed, there are indications that many academics think that the pressures associated with being head of school outweigh the perceived rewards and benefits of the position (Williams *et al.*, 2010; Scott *et al.*, 2008). Furthermore, 'the presence of formal research leaders does not necessarily mean that the leadership of academics in research will occur' (Ball, 2007, p.74). Another issue is that department headship is often rotated through senior academic staff, and therefore not much time is devoted to gaining leadership skills that may only be used temporarily (Ladyshevsky & Flavell, 2011).

The current situation of 'managing-not-leading' brings to the fore the questions of what academics expect or desire from their leaders. In part, such expectations may relate to each individual's perceptions of their identity and intellectual authority as an academic. Generally, it seems that academics 'identify leadership in relation to values and identity, not in the allocation of tasks' (Bolden *et al.*, 2012, p. 14), which indicates that transformational and authentic theories of leadership may also be applicable to academic departments (Drew *et al.*, 2008; Goffee & Jones, 2005; Pounder, 2001; Walumbwa *et al.*, 2008). The notion of intellectual authority reinforces the idea that academics are typically highly individualistic and desire, or perhaps require, academic freedom to function autonomously (Karmel, 1990). There is also the problem that, again due to the individualistic nature of many academics, 'leadership' implies 'followership'—the latter being a role that many academics see as anathema (Bolden *et al.*, 2015). This level of academic autonomy has been referred to as 'self-leadership' and defines not only an academic's ability to determine their own objectives and how to achieve them, but also their ability to influence junior

academics and their peers (Ball, 2007; Lumby, 2012). The concept of self-leadership is important as it implies self-insight, which is a prerequisite for understanding others and a foundation for the development of authentic leadership (Goffee & Jones, 2005; Katzenbach & Smith, 2005). Therefore, ideally university leaders should balance bureaucratic requirements with the need to create a climate that encourages the intellectual authority and self-leadership skills of their colleagues. From this transformational approach (Ball, 2007; Drew *et al.*, 2008; Floyd, 2012), leadership is attentive to allowing and respecting independence and enabling others to act, while modelling best practice in research and teaching (Bolden *et al.*, 2015, Jones, 2011).

A complication of increased scope and freedom is that academics may have their own personal objectives that may, or may not, relate to the objectives of the university. In situations where personal objectives conflict with the objectives of the university, the identity claims that arise from the competing values of 'traditional' academics and 'contemporary' managerial academics, may give rise to unproductive intergroup behaviour (Winter, 2009). For instance, where department heads are seen as overly bureaucratic, many researchers create their own informal research networks, including people 'both within and beyond their own institution' (Bolden *et al.*, 2015, p. 6). In such situations, academics tend to become increasingly disaffected with university leadership, resulting in a feeling of being 'disengaged and demotivated' (Bolden *et al.*, 2015, p. 6). This loss of collegiality within universities has profound effects on morale and also strikes at the heart of academic culture (Kligyte & Barrie, 2014). If, as Kligyte and Barrie (2014) observe, collegiality is the 'behavioural norm that...shapes the culture of the organisation' (p.162), then the role of a leader is to foster a shared identity and sense of collegiality, whether inter- or intra-departmental. This shared identity assists in maintaining the culture, values, vision, and goals of the university's 'strategic vision' (Jones, 2011, p. 281), while still allowing intellectual freedom and connection to individual disciplines (Ball, 2007).

Therefore, for the purposes of this paper, academic leadership is defined as 'the distributed practice of carrying out the institution's strategic vision while supporting the development of intellectual authority and a shared identity that fosters collegiality'. This definition of academic leadership can be thought of in contrast to 'management', which is concerned with the efficient use of resources to plan (Jones 2011; Langland, 2012; Lumby 2012). Previously, much of the research on academic leadership in the university environment is based upon

the perceived effectiveness of leaders (Lumby, 2012), or on the ways in which academic leadership differs from leadership in other organisations (Kligyte & Barrie, 2014; Scott *et al.*, 2008). In our analysis below, we discuss the more applied considerations of whether recruitment and promotion practices select for leadership in its broadest sense and what forms of leadership development are best suited to academic institutions.

Promoting Academic Leadership

Promotion in universities rewards academic staff for the quality, quantity and impact of their work by advancing that person's position (level) within the organisation. Given the diverse political, cultural and economic forces that influence university governance and policy globally, it is perhaps not surprising that even within one country, such as Australia, distinctive and diverse promotion and performance management systems have developed (Morris, 2011; Scott *et al.*, 2008). Nevertheless, promotions are still typically decided by a combination of staff and/or central committees based upon a written application, referee reports, and interviews. Universities provide information and guidelines for both applicants and promotion committees that are intended to clarify expectations about performance without forcing inappropriate rigidity. The interview with the promotion committee supplements the written application and provides an opportunity for the applicant to present their case for promotion, answer questions from the committee and clarify any procedural matters. Promotion to a leadership position, such as full professor, head of department or head of program, requires evidence to support the applicant's international reputation in academic leadership in their discipline. In addition, an applicant must demonstrate a contribution to the governance and collegial life of the university, to continuing education, and to research.

Universities have a clear expectation that academics will take on greater responsibilities throughout their tenure (Vardi & Quin, 2011), typically focusing on some aspect of teaching, research, or service (Winchester *et al.*, 2006). Leadership in these academic domains may be demonstrated to promotion committees in a range of different ways. For instance, one person may demonstrate leadership through activities that have broad influence on practices, policies, programs and their profession; another may provide evidence of effective leadership, management and development of the staff who teach within their unit (Vardi & Quin, 2011). Recruitment and promotion decisions are also influenced by staff strengths

and requirements, as well as the overall objectives of the university. For instance, if an academic is fulfilling a perceived gap in core expertise in a particular discipline; or if a particular teaching or research program is prioritised within the strategic plan of a university, then promotion and recruitment decisions may be influenced by these strategic considerations. However, in practice universities often have a strong bias towards leadership in discipline-specific research when making decisions about academic recruitment and promotion. The 'publish or perish' trope encapsulates this perceived bias towards research productivity in academic career progression (Hesli *et al.*, 2012), with the amount of publications by an academic, relative to opportunity, considered critical to both recruitment and promotion outcomes (Gardner & Blackstone, 2013). Whether or not research and other publications are a useful proxy for academic leadership is treated as a separate and often unexplored question by recruitment and promotion committees. This is despite the fact that leadership roles in universities require a broad range of knowledge and skills; for instance, knowledge about finance or academic policies, and interpersonal skills such as communication and emotional intelligence (Scott *et al.*, 2008; Yelder & Codling, 2004).

While promotion criteria are well studied, especially in relation to gender equality (Hesli *et al.*, 2012; Winchester *et al.*, 2006) and the scholarship of teaching and learning (Vardi & Quin, 2011), researchers have not directly examined how well recruitment and promotion criteria select for effective leadership, or what those criteria might look like. A review of the promotion policies and procedures for the Group of Eight (Go8), a coalition of comprehensive and research intensive universities in Australia, reveals the following observations:

- All eight specify leadership as a criterion for promotion, either explicitly or as part of the research, teaching, and service criteria. Leadership is most often discussed in relation to the service criteria in an academic's discipline, community, or university.
- Only one, the University of Western Australia, includes a definition of leadership that highlights both hard and soft leadership skills. The definition is based on the Australian Public Service Commission's Integrated Leadership System (ILS) (Australian Public Service Commission, 2004)
- Six of the eight give only limited advice on how best to evidence (soft) leadership skills such as mentoring colleagues, managing staff, or strategic management. Typically this advice is aimed at applicants already in formal leadership roles and consists primarily of self-reflection and/or references from peers.
- All eight request examples of specific outcomes as evidence of leadership skills, e.g., new programs, curricula, policies, or procedures. However, a focus on outcomes reveals little about what type of leadership, if any, was required to achieve these outcomes.
- None explicitly measure leadership as a standard part of the promotion procedure. The University of Western Australia's ILS does have a suite of leadership measures, but these are not part of the promotion procedure.

While the accuracy with which these measures reflect the underlying quality or impact of the academic's work is debatable, they clearly serve as poor surrogates for leadership in its broadest sense.

From this survey, the current situation with promotion appears to reflect Peter Drucker's commonly cited quote, 'what's measured improves.' Research productivity can

be measured via an academic's number of publications, journal impact factors, number of citations, and their h-index. Likewise teaching effectiveness can be measured with teaching evaluations, teaching awards, and commendations (Vardi & Quin, 2011). While the accuracy with which these measures reflect the underlying quality or impact of the academic's work is debatable, they clearly serve as poor surrogates for leadership in its broadest sense. For example, two academics with exactly the same research and teaching outcomes may have achieved these outcomes with very different levels of funding, resources, or collaborative leadership skills; and may differ significantly on leadership potential.

Problematically, guidelines and policies often provide only a limited discussion of 'leadership in' or 'leadership of', and so the form of leadership required, and how it is best evidenced, remain unclear to recruitment and promotion committees. For example, the University of Queensland's 'Guidelines for confirmation and promotions committee members', does not contain any mention of leadership, or any advice as to what leadership might mean, or how it should be demonstrated. One explanation for this might be that committee members know what leadership is and how it can be appropriately evidenced. However, it seems unlikely that all committee members would have the same experiences and opinions of leadership – especially given that even the literature on leadership does not

have a universally agreed definition of what constitutes leadership (Allio, 2005; Lumby, 2012). In addition, 'hard' forms of leadership, such as technical leadership, measured by innovation, impact, and reputation, are much easier to evidence than 'soft' forms of leadership, such as people skills and emotional intelligence (Parrish, 2011). Moreover, there is little evidence to suggest that selection and recruitment processes incorporate any formal assessments of whether new staff will have the ability to move into leadership roles (Buckley *et al.*, 2010). In some cases, the terminology of recruitment advertisements has changed to reflect the need to recruit 'leaders' (see for instance The Association of American Medical Colleges in Buckley *et al.*, 2010). Although these guidelines emphasise the need to recruit those with leadership qualities, there is little guidance or criteria as to what these leadership qualities might entail, or how they should be assessed (Buckley *et al.*, 2010).

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that an applicant's leadership experience, as evaluated in the current recruitment and promotion processes, is likely to reflect 'hard' leadership: that is, technical or discipline leadership. While technical leadership is undoubtedly important in universities, as it is the prime source of intellectual authority, it may be of little practical use when a senior academic becomes the leader of an organisational unit. In such roles, softer leadership skills, which are harder to teach and measure (Lovasz *et al.*, 2012; Walumbwa *et al.*, 2008), are perhaps more directly relevant. Despite this, the existing guidelines and criteria for selection and promotion committees in universities seem to provide little or no emphasis on the types of 'soft' leadership skills that would promote effective academic leadership.

Developing Academic Leadership

Traditionally, universities nurture and develop leaders in one of two ways, or a combination of both: formal training, and experiential learning methods such as learning from others, learning on-the-job, and learning from critical incidents (Berman, 2015; Drew *et al.*, 2008; Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004). Perhaps not surprisingly, those in academic leadership positions tend to express a desire for leadership 'classes' taught in much the same way as other university courses (Scott *et al.*, 2008). Despite this, formal leadership development programs in academe are the exception not the norm, with most academic leaders tending to learn on-the-job (Drew *et al.*, 2008; Inman, 2011).

However, there are a few examples of academic leadership programs which illustrate the potential

benefits of formal leadership training. For instance, the University of Wollongong recently developed a formal leadership 'Program for Preparing Early Leaders' (PROPEL; Lovasz *et al.*, 2012). This program highlighted two distinct sets of attributes that were considered important for an effective academic leader: those that can be readily taught (e.g., understanding the university context, rules, management of risk, feedback) and those that are difficult to teach (e.g., passion for their discipline, personal values, emotional intelligence, interest in staff, resilience). The university identifies 'career-track managers' who are at a formative point in their career and score well in the 'difficult to teach' attributes. This group of future leaders then undertakes a formal program of leadership development that targets six interrelated components: mentoring, networking, big-picture, leadership skills, active leadership, and reflective leadership (Lovasz *et al.*, 2012). The program discusses multiple models of leadership, giving participants the opportunity to reflect on a range of leadership styles that may be of interest or suited to their personality and desired future position. The program also provides support for participants in the form of teaching relief and an opportunity to interact with and learn from senior leaders in their organisation. A review of the PROPEL program by Lovasz and colleagues (2012) concluded that leadership development programs can enable both succession planning and effective leadership skill development.

Outside of the Australian context, the Samuel Merritt University in Oakland offered a leadership development program to prepare interested academics for future leadership positions (Berman, 2015). The program arose out of the experiences of academics that were 'thrust into' leadership positions, and has an emphasis on administrative and managerial skills. As such, the program was focused more on academic 'management' rather than 'leadership' as defined in this paper. Berman describes the program components, reports on participant experiences, and evaluates the effectiveness of the program. The most appreciated aspect of the program was having a peer cohort to learn with and from (Berman, 2015). The consensus of the participants was that they better understood, and felt better equipped to deal with, the challenges that leadership would bring. In Australia, similar results were reported from an academic leadership program at Curtin University in Perth (Ladyshevsky & Flavell, 2011). In this case, the need to build collegiality was built into the program, along with components that addressed the demands of each participating department. The delivery consisted of both experiential and classroom

(seminar) components, and, as with the program at Samuel Merritt University, participants expressed their particular appreciation of the peer-learning aspect (Ladyshewsky & Flavell, 2011).

Experiential learning is typically more focused on the organic growth of leadership skills via mentoring, on-the-job training and the sharing of lessons learnt. Ladyshewsky and Flavell (2011) suggest that leadership development should include 'the opportunity to learn through experience in a supportive culture that allows for growth and change' (p.129) within programs developed specifically for the particular circumstances of academia. This process of experiential learning supports distributed models of academic leadership as it fosters delegation, ownership and responsibility within organisational units. The process of experiential learning with colleagues has the added benefit of developing mutual trust within an academic unit (Hurley, 2006). Mentoring can also assist with the process of informal leadership development, through the socialisation of new staff members into the role and culture of the organisation (Drew *et al.*, 2008; Inman, 2011), as well as the development of emotional intelligence through a cyclic approach that focuses on reflection on what does and does not work (Parrish, 2011; Petriglieri *et al.*, 2011). Critically, some form of support and mentoring for new leaders is essential. Just as new academics often feel alienated and unsupported in their work, so do new leaders (Drew *et al.*, 2008). Therefore, in addition to formal leadership development training, universities can usefully invest in more informal leadership development initiatives that are designed to prepare and develop both future and existing leaders (Parrish, 2011). Moreover, because learning about leadership is a gradual and ongoing process, it is important that academic institutions nurture those in leadership roles from day one, and expose them to different types of experiences (Inman, 2011).

These few case studies of formal and experiential leadership development demonstrate that, just as no consensus exists as to what constitutes effective leadership in academia, no consensus has been reached regarding the best way to develop leaders (Drew *et al.*, 2008). What we do know is that leadership development is simultaneously multilevel and longitudinal, involving multiple formal and informal initiatives (Day *et al.*, 2014). Critically, though, it is unlikely that universities can apply a 'one size fits all' approach to leadership development as discipline cultures, even within the same university, vary considerably (Floyd, 2012). With this in mind, universities need to tailor leadership development programs, blending

both formal programs and experiential learning as appropriate to the culture of the university and discipline area, as well as to the individual developmental needs of the leader.

Conclusions

Defining 'effective' academic leadership is complicated by the peculiarities of the academic context. It does seem clear though that current university recruitment and promotion procedures have not yet found a way to adequately select for leadership experience and potential. Current practice still tends to prioritise and reward technical achievements within an individual's discipline, based on their research and teaching outcomes, as a surrogate for leadership. The implication of this is that academic leaders are usually recruited and promoted without a full assessment of their interpersonal skills and strategic and operational competence. This must surely exacerbate the current situation where academics believe they are being over-managed and under-led, potentially resulting in under-performance and dissatisfaction within many organisational units. Moreover, the focus on technical performance in teaching and research does not promote the broader forms of academic leadership advocated in this paper, namely the practice of carrying out the institution's strategic vision while supporting the development of intellectual authority and a shared identity that fosters collegiality.

In the short term, this situation can be ameliorated with on-the-job leadership training and mentoring. In the longer term, universities need to develop a much stronger emphasis on leadership development; one that takes account of the need to facilitate the development of leadership capability across levels and over time. Universities should have explicit processes to acknowledge and reward effective leaders through their recruitment and promotion procedures, without sacrificing the special qualities that differentiate academic environments from other sectors. The desired outcome is to promote university leaders who are seen to be leading more than they manage, constructing supportive environments in which their autonomous staff produce desirable, high quality outcomes, and in which intellectual authority and collegiality are preserved. In short, 'learning to lead is a lifetime responsibility' (Drew *et al.*, 2008, p. 15) for both universities and academics and it is only by properly promoting and developing academic leadership that universities can effectively realise their vision for the future.

Andrew P Bradley is an ARC Future Fellow and Professor of Biomedical Engineering at The University of Queensland, Australia. He is a Senior member of the IEEE and a Chartered Professional Engineer, Engineering Executive.
Contact:bradley@itee.uq.edu.au

Tim Grice is an Honorary Senior Fellow at The University of Queensland's Sustainable Minerals Institute and the Founding Director of Leapfrog International.

Neil Paulsen is based in the Business School at the University of Queensland, Australia. His work focuses on leadership, team and organisational processes.

References

- Allio, R.J. (2005). Leadership development: Teaching versus learning. *Management Decision*, 43, 1071-1077.
- Australian Public Service Commission. (2004). *Guide to the Integrated Leadership System*. Retrieved from <http://www.apsc.gov.au/learn/frameworks-and-guidelines/ils/guide-to-the-integrated-leadership-system> (accessed 4 October 2014).
- Ball, S. (2007). Leadership of academics in research. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35 (4), 449-477.
- Berman, A. (2015). Academic leadership development: A case study. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 31(4), 298-304.
- Blackmore, J. & Sachs, J. (2000). Paradoxes of leadership and management in higher education in times of change: some Australian reflections. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 3, 1-16.
- Bolden, R., Gosling, J., & O'Brien, A. (2012). *Academic leadership: Changing conceptions, identities and experiences in UK higher education*. Review Paper Series. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Bolden, R., Jones, S., Davis, H., & Gentle, P. (2015). *Developing and sustaining shared leadership in higher education*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32, 693-710.
- Bryman, A. (2009). *Effective leadership in higher education. Final report. Review paper Series*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Buckley, P., Dauphinais, D., Miller, D.D., Rawson, J.V., Young, G., & Curd, N. (2010). Academic leadership searches: Evolving best practices. *Journal of Healthcare Leadership*, 10 (2), 61-67.
- Burke, C.S., Stagl, K.C., & Klein, C. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 288-307.
- Carter, M. Armenakis, A. Feild, H., & Mossholder, K. (2013). Transformational leadership, relationship quality, and employee performance during continuous incremental organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol.34(7), pp.942-958.
- Caproni, P. (2012). *Management skills for everyday life: The practical coach*. Boston: Prentice Hall.
- Day, D.V. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 581-613.
- Day, D.V., Fleenor, J.W., & Atwater, L.E. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 63-82.
- Deem, R. & Brehony, K.J. (2005). Management as ideology: the case of 'new managerialism' in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31, 217-235.
- Denis, J.L., Langley, A. & Sergi, V. (2012). Leadership in the plural. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 6, 211-283.
- Drew, G.M. (2006). Balancing academic advancement with business effectiveness? The dual role for senior university leaders. *International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, 6, 117-125.
- Drew, G.M., Ehrlich, L.C. & Hansford, B.C. (2008). An exploration of university leaders' perceptions of learning about leadership. *Leading and Managing*, 14, 1-18.
- Fearn, H. (2010). The colour of money. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*. June 10, 2010, Issue 1951, p.43.
- Floyd, A. (2012). 'Turning points': The personal and professional circumstances that lead academics to become middle managers. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40, 272-284.
- Fraser, S., & Harvey, M. (2008). *Leadership and assessment: Strengthening the nexus: Final report*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Gardner, S.K., & Blackstone, A. (2013). 'Putting in your time': Faculty experiences in the process of promotion to professor. *Innovative Higher Education*, 38, 411-425.
- Goffee, R., & Jones, G. (2005). Managing authenticity. *Harvard Business Review*, 83, 85-94.
- Gosling, J., Bolden, R., & Petrov, G. (2009). Distributed leadership in higher education: What does it accomplish? *Leadership*, 5, 299-310.
- Gunnarsdóttir, S. (2014). Servant leadership and job satisfaction in the University of Iceland. *Stjórnmal & Stjórnysla, Autumn 2014*, 10(2), 499-522.
- Hernez-Broome, G. & Hughes, R.L. (2004). Leadership development: Past, present, and future. *Human Resource Planning*, 27, 24-32.
- Hesli, V.L., Lee, J.M., & Mitchell, S.M. (2012). Predicting rank attainment in political science: What else besides publications affects promotion? *Political Science & Politics*, 45, 475-492.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., Rosseel, Y. Vlerick, P. (2012). Dimensions of Distributed Leadership and the Impact on Teachers' Organizational Commitment: A Study in Secondary Education. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(7),1745-1784.
- Hurley, R.F. (2006). The decision to trust. *Harvard Business Review*, 84, 55-62.
- Inman, M. (2011). The journey to leadership for leader academics in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 39, 228-241.
- Jones, G. (2011). Academic leadership and departmental headship in turbulent times. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 17(4), 279-288.
- Jones, S., Lefoe, G., & Harvey, M. (2012). Distributed leadership: A collaborative framework for academics, executives and professionals in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34, 67-78.
- Karmel, P. (1990). Higher education: Tensions and balance. *Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration*, 12, 329-337.
- Katzenbach, J.R. & Smith, D.K. (2005). The discipline of teams. *Harvard Business Review*, 83, 162-171.
- Kligyte, G., & Barrie, S. (2014). Collegiality: leading us into fantasy –the paradoxical resilience of collegiality in academic leadership. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33 (1), 157-169.
- Ladshewsky, R.K., & Flavell, H. (2011). Transfer of training in an academic leadership development program for program coordinators. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(1), 127-147.
- Langland, E. (2012). Cultural narratives of academic leadership at the dawn

- of the 21st century. *Forum on Public Policy* 2012(2). Retrieved from <http://forumonpublicpolicy.com/vol2012.no2/womenleadership2012no2.html>
- Larson, E.W., & Gray, C.F. (2011). *Project management: The managerial process*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lovasz, K., Dolnicar, S., & Vialle, W. (2012). *The PROPEL Project. Succession planning at universities: Program for preparing early leaders (PROPEL). Final Report*. Wollongong: University of Wollongong.
- Lumby, J. (2012). *What do we know about leadership in higher education?* Review Paper Series. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Morris, L. (2011). *From collegial engagement to performance management: The changing academic landscape in Australia*. PhD Thesis, Victoria University, Australia.
- Parrish, D.R. (2011). *Leadership in higher education: The interrelationships, influence and relevance of emotional intelligence*. PhD Thesis, University of Wollongong, Australia.
- Petriglieri, G., Wood, J.D., & Petriglieri, J.L. (2011). Up close and personal: building foundations for leaders' development through the personalization of management learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10, 430-450.
- Pounder, J.S. (2001). 'New leadership' and university organisational effectiveness: Exploring the relationship. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22, 281-290.
- Scott, G., Coates, H., & Anderson, M. (2008). *Learning leaders in times of change: Academic leadership capabilities for Australian higher education*. Sydney: University of Western Sydney and Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Suresh, S. (2015). Research universities, innovation, and growth: IRI Medal Address. *Research-Technology Management*, 58 (6), 19(5).
- Vardi, I. & Quin, R. (2011). Promotion and the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30, 39-49.
- Van Noorden, R. (2010). A profusion of measures: scientific performance indicators are proliferating—leading researchers to ask afresh what they are measuring and why. *Nature*, 465 (7300), 864 (3).
- Walumbwa, F.O., Avolio, B.J., & Gardner, W.L. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, 89-126.
- Williams, J., Blackwell, C., & Bailey, L. (2010). The conceptualization and investment of leadership development by department heads in colleges of agriculture at land grant universities. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 51, 81-89.
- Winchester, H., Lorenzo, S., Browning, L., et al. (2006). Academic women's promotions in Australian universities. *Employee Relations*, 28, 505-522.
- Winter, R. (2009). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 31, 121-131.
- Yielder, J. & Codling, A. (2004). Management and leadership in the contemporary university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 26 (1), 315-328.