

Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.8.10

CSHE | Center for Studies in Higher Education

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

<http://cshe.berkeley.edu/>

LEADERSHIP, DIVERSITY AND SUCCESSION PLANNING IN ACADEMIA^{*}

May 2010

Cristina González
University of California, Davis

Copyright 2010 Transaction Publishers, all rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

Although academia is becoming more like business in many respects--not all of them positive--it has not borrowed one of the best attributes of business culture: its tradition of developing leadership through succession planning. As a result, much talent is underutilized. This includes, most prominently, that of women and minorities, who tend not to be perceived as leadership material. This paper makes a distinction between two levels of academic administrators: deans and above, who are professional administrators, and department chairs and below, who could be characterized as casual administrators, since all faculty members engage in managerial activities as directors of academic programs, principal investigators of grants, committee members or chairs. In Clark Kerr's terminology, casual administrators are members of the guild, while professional administrators are members of the corporation. At present, women and minorities are having considerable trouble moving from the guild to the corporation. This paper proposes that the connection between the guild and the corporation be strengthened and become more of a two-way street. As William J. Rothwell suggests, people should have dual-career ladders and be able to move back and forth between academic and managerial jobs. Such problems as recency bias, the halo or horn effect, the Pygmalion effect, and pigeonholing must be addressed head on. This will require courage, imagination and training.

According to a 2007 report by the American Council on Education, the numbers of women and minorities in presidential positions at colleges and universities have not increased significantly since 1998, and these groups are underrepresented as presidents in relation to their numbers as senior administrators. Similar situations have been observed at other levels. Women and minorities tend to be underutilized at all ranks, from presidential posts to faculty positions. Therefore, we cannot blame all problems on the pipeline.

The ACE report highlights the fact that almost half of all college presidents are age 61 or older, which offers opportunities for renewal. The report recommends considering more women and minorities with non-traditional backgrounds for presidencies, as well as promoting more women and minorities to chief academic officer positions--the most traditional preparation for the presidency. Women of color, in particular, are extremely underrepresented at this level (3% versus 6% for men of color, already a very low figure), reflecting what we know about their situation, which is worse than those of minority males and white females (Moody; Turner & Myers). At doctorate-granting institutions, the situation is even more critical than in academia at large. In fact, some minority groups are almost or totally absent. For example, not a single Hispanic served as chief academic officer at any of the institutions responding to the survey.

^{*} This paper is a preview of a chapter in an upcoming book titled *Clark Kerr's University of California: Leadership, Diversity and Planning in Higher Education*. I thank Transaction Publishers for granting me permission to publish this essay. I also am grateful to C. Judson King and John A. Douglass, who offered helpful comments.

In order to address these deficiencies, Jacqueline E. King and Gigi G. Gómez recommend that institutions of higher learning identify, mentor and promote diverse pools of internal candidates through succession planning, a practice very popular in the business sector where it has received much attention in the past few decades, but most particularly during the last few years. In part, this may be due to the impending retirement of the baby boomers, which will create many voids in a wide variety of organizations. Recent disasters, such as September 11 and Hurricane Katrina, have also exposed managerial weaknesses in this respect (Atwood). Today, the business sector is focusing on succession planning more than ever before, which has led to the publication of numerous books and articles on this subject.

All studies stress that succession planning is not the same as replacement hiring. Succession planning provides an organization with a surplus of talent by helping members realize their potential, which should not be confused with performance. A person performing satisfactorily at one level might not do well at the next, and vice versa (Ong). People who do well at certain tasks, such as open-ended debates or general planning exercises, are not necessarily good potential leaders, although they are often identified as such (Cohen & March). In other words, sounding good is not enough. Potential should not be determined casually.

The most important ingredient for a successful succession plan is probably the attitude of the leadership. Few people can develop their potential without organizational support, and that begins at the top. Highly successful organizations have a critical mass of passionate advocates who understand that succession planning is the key to sustainability. Some organizations do succession planning within units, while others take a more global approach, looking for potential across units, but all successful enterprises are engaged in some sort of talent management, whether they do it openly or in secret. Such concerns realize that people come before jobs and strategies, not the other way around (Ong). Action does not necessarily follow goals, for "human choice behavior is at least as much a process for discovering goals as for acting on them" (Cohen & March, p. 220). So it is important to have creative human beings engaged in this dual process of discovery and action.

According to Mark R. Sobol, Phil Harkins and Terry Conley, the single most important accomplishment by the legendary chairman and CEO Jack Welch at General Electric was building an integrated system of succession planning, since the ability to make wise decisions regarding people is the most crucial source of competitive advantage. Indeed, when many asked why Japanese companies were so successful, Peter F. Drucker observed that "Japanese top management may spend more time thinking about management succession than on anything else" (p. 229). What Welch did was to follow the Japanese model of succession planning.

Successful organizations engage in a considerable amount of teaching, mentoring and coaching to identify, develop and utilize existing talent, including the talent of women and minorities. This should be true of universities as well, but, thus far, it has not been. Although there are valuable nation-wide mentoring programs such as the American Council on Education Leadership Program and the Harvard Institute for Educational Management, there is very little training of executives at the institutional level.

Although academia is becoming more like business in many respects--not all of them positive--it has not borrowed one of the best attributes of business culture: its tradition of hiring chief executive officers from within (Blumenstyk). The best companies groom talented employees for positions of leadership. Indeed, Jim Collins (2001) has shown that the most outstanding businesses have had an insider at the helm. Collins also notes that most of the fallen companies he has studied had outside chief executive officers, stating that "leaders who fail the process of succession set their enterprises on a path to decline" (2009, p. 60). Although some universities, such as Emory University, are beginning to establish training programs for academic leaders (Selingo), most have never considered such a course of action. They should do so, because there are fewer and fewer external candidates of superior quality, and they tend to stay for shorter and shorter periods of time (Mead-Fox).

The 2005 Chronicle of Higher Education Survey of Presidents, which looks at the leaders of four-year colleges,

masters and doctoral/research universities, shows that only 19% of respondents were internal candidates (Blumenstyk). The vast majority of presidents came from other institutions. One reason is that the public sector considers many factors other than performance in choosing and keeping executives, with politics occupying a prominent role. According to William J. Rothwell, in the public sector, the fortunes of executives are usually tied to a particular administration.

A change of administration generally results in the replacement of many or all members of the executive team. As for university presidents, their fates depend on the changing moods of their campuses, their trustees and the public. Presidential searches are highly political. First, because of shared governance, faculty members can, for all intents and purposes, veto candidates, and internal candidates always have some baggage. Second, external candidates bring prestige to the institution, which can increase its status by hiring administrators from more important universities. Finally, external candidates may be more able to effect change, which is a valid reason to hire them.

External hires are appropriate and desirable under certain circumstances. Indeed, for middle management positions, external hires can be particularly important. At the dean level, for example, external hires can be very helpful in two respects. First, they can bring new ideas to all of the departments in the college and, second, they can expand the pool of potential presidential candidates. The experience of serving as dean gives the external administrator an opportunity to become acculturated and prepared for higher-level service. It is easier to move as a dean than as a provost, chancellor or president, positions so far removed from the everyday affairs of an institution that their incumbents have a hard time understanding local issues if they do not have previous knowledge of them. Perhaps that is why most respondents to the Chronicle survey did not feel “very well prepared” for their first presidency. Indeed, the survey found that “insider presidents” served longer, which allowed them to have more of an impact on their institutions.

Some people are beginning to question the conventional wisdom about the importance of national searches (Barden). James J. Duderstadt thinks that governing boards should demand that their institutions engage in succession planning, and Rita Bornstein believes that more of an effort should be made to prepare potential candidates for presidencies through talent development programs and that new presidents should be mentored, as well. One institution that has been doing this is the University of Notre Dame, where administrators are carefully groomed for the presidency (Malloy).

For example, five years before Father Theodore Hesburgh stepped down from the presidency, a number of younger colleagues were invited to take major leadership positions with the understanding that one of them would eventually be selected as his successor. In the end, the candidates had to go through a full interview process and be fully vetted before a decision was made. Without that period of training, however, it would have been difficult to find an appropriate replacement. As a Catholic institution with religious leadership, Notre Dame draws its leaders from a very limited pool.

The Notre Dame case is interesting, not only for that university's success in recruiting good presidents but also for its development of high-level administrators. Those candidates who were groomed for the presidency, but were not appointed to it, became very effective vice-presidents, which might not have happened if they had not been selected from the faculty for presidential grooming to begin with. The example of Notre Dame is intriguing, because it shows that when an institution of higher learning goes looking for talent in the raw, it finds it, which means that much talent is wasted because it is never sought out.

Most research universities do not engage in the kind of search Notre Dame conducts, which is similar to what frequently happens in the business world. But research universities need to plan for the future as much as, or more than, corporations, for, without planning, what we get is a decision-making process based on informal judgments. These are problematic, because they result in such negative outcomes as:

. . . recency bias (performance or potential is assessed with a heavier-than-desirable emphasis on recent and

singular successes or failures); pigeonholing or stereotyping (supervisors develop impressions of individuals that are difficult to change); the halo or horn effect (supervisors are overly influenced in their judgments of individuals by singular events); the Pygmalion effect (supervisors see what they expect to see); and discrimination (treating people differently solely as a function of sex, race, age, or other factors unrelated to job performance). (Rothwell, p. 72)

These informal judgments result in “homosocial reproduction” (Rothwell, p. 19), as they lead to the selection of administrators who are clones of the powerholders.

Some of the best American research universities have had mostly “insider presidents,” which may account, to some extent, for their success. According to Duderstadt, elite research universities, including the Ivy League, Stanford and the University of California, have had more insider presidents than other institutions of higher learning, in part, because they have a stronger “sense of institutional self-confidence” (p. 91). So having “insider presidents” is both a cause and an effect of high academic quality. Almost all of these “insider presidents,” however, have been white males. Whatever grooming of potential candidates may have taken place has not been formal and has obviously not been extended to women and minorities, who continue to be at the margins of power. This is not because these elite universities do not hire administrators internally.

On the contrary, not only have many of their presidents come from within, but numerous high-level administrators have also. One would think that this ability to identify and promote leaders from within would offer a great opportunity for elite universities to develop their own women and minority administrators. Yet the women and minorities in their midst remain largely invisible, their administrative talent untapped, their leadership potential unrealized. Why?

Women and minorities have trouble being perceived as leadership material, even when they have the most traditional administrative credentials and, most particularly, when they do not (Valian; Valverde). The traditional career path is to become a department chair and then dean, provost and president. But the percentage of women and minority deans is quite small. This is because women and minorities have trouble becoming department chairs, a selection controlled by the academic guild, which continues to be largely white and male (Niemeier & González). This means that decision-makers must insure both that women and minorities have access to traditional academic leadership positions and that those who have shown leadership ability in less traditional positions are considered for higher-level administrative posts. The president has an important role to play in this respect. Erroll B. Davis believes that trustees must choose presidents “who understand how to instill leadership throughout the institution” (p. A64). These presidents must create systems that identify and develop leadership much earlier and much better than is presently the case. They must constantly be on the look-out for potential leaders of all backgrounds.

“The president must walk the walk and make sure that the cabinet and senior leadership are diverse. What one does speaks a lot louder than what one says” (Burnim, Digh & Skandera-Trombley p. B49). It is not enough for presidents to have open searches. Presidents have an obligation to take personal action to expand the number of people who are in a position to aspire to the top spots. This can be done by identifying, mentoring and promoting talented women and minorities, as well as white males, in other words, by engaging in succession planning so that some day these people can aspire to the presidency. “The public-sector executive must begin to consider the end right at the beginning” (Rothwell, p. 344).

“While presidents, ultimately, come and go, *how* they come and go has a profound effect on the institution and largely determines the difference between extended periods of failure and success” (Martin, Samuels & Associates, p. 20). Perhaps because academic culture is built on the tenure system, leaders in academia seem to have a hard time facing and accepting their impending loss of power, a step necessary to plan for their own succession. As a result, transitions are not as smooth as they could be. In many cases, there is a mix of “unplanned continuity” and “discontinuity.” “Discontinuity with the achievements of a leader’s immediate predecessor and continuity (or regression to) the more mediocre state of affairs preceding that predecessor” (Hargreaves & Fink, pp. 70-71). In other words, innovative leaders are pulled out before their innovations take root, and their less creative successors

abandon their projects and return to the status quo. In order to break this pattern, leaders should remain for longer periods of time.

In addition, it is important to spread power about. Sustainable leadership is “emergent distributed leadership” (Hargreaves & Fink, p. 122) or broad bottom-up participation. Sustainability, thus, demands diversity. Paradoxically, the women, minorities and other non-traditional leaders who can most contribute to institutional diversity have shown the least degree of personal sustainability. The system has a tendency to reject them and return to traditional leaders, who prolong the status quo with their longer political lives. It behooves us to break this vicious circle and to appoint and retain non-traditional leaders until they have had a chance to make their mark. As Cohen and March say, power is prone to tautology: a person who gets things done has power and a person who has power gets things done. Women and minorities, who are perceived as having less power than white males--and in politics, perception is reality--may simply not be able to get as many things done, unless a special effort is made to empower them through a succession planning exercise that allows them to move from the political outskirts of an institution towards its center of gravity.

One problem is that, unlike business, where there is a simple and clear bottom line, namely profit, higher education focuses on excellence, a concept that is open to interpretation. Bill Readings thinks that excellence is the currency of the transnational university, which he describes as a bureaucratic corporation, as opposed to the nation-state university, which was centered on the concept of culture. Whereas culture is concrete and specific--a body of knowledge that citizens must share in order to operate in the nation-state--excellence is abstract and vague--the best of everything whatever that happens to be. Unfortunately, women and minorities are not considered excellent by nature. No matter how distinguished, they are seldom perceived as “the best.” They generally are not seen as bringing the same kind of prestige to an institution as white males bring. As Judith Glazer-Raymo indicates, at the top of the administrative hierarchy “promotions are more likely to be based on trust than on performance” (p. 154). And women and minorities are simply not trusted the way white males are.

Academia is not an easy place to assess administrative performance. Academic administrators can take any number of paths. There are many options, and it is hard to establish a cause-and-effect relationship between academic policy and prestige enhancement (Cohen & March). There is a considerable time-lag, and oftentimes the results of a given academic policy are not felt until years later, when it is not entirely clear that the change that has taken place is attributable to the policy. People are obsessed about assessment precisely because it is notoriously difficult to assess progress in academia. In the absence of a clear bottom line, administrators’ success is often a matter of perception, and women and minorities are not perceived as high achievers. The state of the economy also affects the perception of success to a great degree.

During good times, academic administrators tend to be seen as doing well, but during bad times, they are often considered failures. Universities are subject to social forces in a way that companies are not. There are faculty, students, parents, trustees, donors, politicians and journalists to please. Academic administrators are often hired to appease one or more of these constituencies rather than to improve the elusive bottom line. Indeed, some people would say that the university, understood as the faculty, takes care of itself, and the administration takes care of the public. In A. Bartlett Giamatti’s terminology, faculty members are the “permanent officers” of the university (p. 43), while administrators are only temporary ones. Administrators come and go, but faculty members stay. While the administration is subject to external pressures, the faculty is quite self-sufficient and keeps the institution going at all times.

Rothwell makes a distinction between technical and managerial staff and advocates succession planning for both groups, as well as dual-career ladders allowing people to move back and forth between technical and managerial jobs. In a business setting, technical staff would include such employees as engineers, lawyers and scientists, that is, workers with expertise in certain areas. In an academic environment, the technical staff is the faculty, which has academic expertise. But all faculty members also are, to some degree, managers, in the sense that they are responsible for budgets and personnel, including students, staff and other faculty members. As directors of

academic programs, principal investigators of grants, committee members or chairs, professors are engaged in numerous managerial activities. Indeed, one could make a distinction between two kinds of academic administrators: deans and above, who are professional administrators, and department chairs and below, who could be characterized as casual administrators. This is the difference between the corporation and the guild, in Kerr's terminology. The casual managers and permanent officers of the guild keep the university running. The professional managers and temporary officers of the corporation act as intermediaries between the university and the public.

In addition to casual and professional administrators, universities have a core of "nonpositional leaders" (Astin & Leland, p. 6), that is, people who exert "leadership from the margin" (Contreras, p. 150). These kinds of leaders do not have power, but they do have influence. Typically, nonpositional leaders have a base of supporters and a limited set of issues to address. Women and minority leaders often are nonpositional, due largely to their being excluded from positions of power. Nonpositional leaders, who usually are strong advocates for the causes they defend, are some times perceived as troublemakers, which precludes them from being considered for administrative jobs. The opposite should be the case. A good succession planning strategy will seek to identify nonpositional leaders with a view to their possible transformation into positional leaders. Developing leadership is a communal task, and it requires a significant collective effort to nurture a good administrator, whether casual or professional.

Some casual administrators become professional administrators when they transition from department chair (the highest post within the guild) to college dean (the lowest post in the corporation). There is a sharp difference between these two positions. Chairs represent the faculty to the administration, while deans represent the administration to the faculty. That is the fault line between the guild and the corporation. Many tensions that develop at that level can be interpreted as clashes between the two cultures. Yet deans are usually chosen from among department chairs and other faculty leaders, a process faculty members jokingly call going over to the dark side. There is an implicit understanding that becoming a dean is crossing a border into a different, and less benign, territory. Indeed, that is where the career ladder changes. Once a faculty member becomes a dean, other professional administrative positions, such as provost and president, open up. So the selection of deans is very important. And since deans tend to be chosen from among those faculty members who have served as department chairs, the selection of these casual administrators should not be casual at all.

Any succession planning effort worth its salt should pay a great deal of attention to the selection of department chairs. Yet, although these crucial academic leadership positions provide the best experience for higher administration, incumbents are not usually chosen according to administrative talent, but rather on the basis of seniority (Hearn). The position of department chair tends to rotate among those senior members of a department who least challenge the status quo. In this context, search committees "operate with a de facto blackball system" (Hearn, p. 169). They eliminate unwanted candidates, leaving only those whom their colleagues find the least offensive. These are not necessarily the best leaders. In addition, since they know that their jobs are temporary, they often are not inclined to effect changes that might upset their colleagues, who can make their lives unpleasant after the end of their tenure as department chairs.

For Hearn, teaching involves leadership, and leadership involves teaching, so there should be a way to prepare faculty members to become academic administrators. Many candidates for high-level administrative positions are functionally qualified, but lack leadership abilities. Perhaps this is because so little effort is spent developing the pool. Academics often become administrators for the wrong reasons, so the administrative track includes a fair number of people who are not very inspiring, while many interesting individuals are excluded from it.

Rather than seeing department chair positions as rotating jobs that any senior faculty member who can get along with his or her colleagues can fill, we should regard them as a prime source of academic leaders and make an effort to groom faculty members for these positions. Identification and mentoring of creative and energetic faculty with leadership qualities, including women and minorities, should be conducted on a regular basis. Although not all faculty members schooled for these positions would get them, the university would always benefit from having a pool of faculty members well-trained in management, particularly since all faculty members are casual administrators of

one kind or another. Young faculty members today often express a desire for managerial training, as they find themselves having to deal with budget and personnel issues in labs and other settings.

Perhaps all new faculty members should receive some such training, which would also serve the purpose of identifying early on those who could eventually become professional administrators. In this way, everyone would receive some benefit, and fewer people would feel excluded from the decision-making process. This would be particularly important for women and minority faculty members, who, as Martin J. Finkelstein, Robert K. Seal and Jack H. Schuster have demonstrated, tend to be less satisfied with the profession than are white males.

If picking true leaders to serve as department chairs is important, the selection of strong deans is crucial. As Frank H.T. Rhodes notes, at American universities, deans have a great deal more power than at institutions of higher learning in other parts of the world. Indeed, in the United States, deans control budgets, and the budget is the policy. Deans also have a great deal to say about the selection of department chairs and faculty members. In addition, they provide general direction for their colleges, which they represent to external constituencies. Working with department chairs, deans run the university on a daily basis. A good dean can inspire a college, while a bad dean can demoralize one. It is, thus, particularly important that deans be visionary. While positions such as department chair, director of an institute or associate dean are the best preparation to become dean, non-positional leaders, that is, people who have shown leadership qualities without holding administrative posts, should be considered for the job as well, provided that they have the personal skills necessary to operate in an executive capacity.

Deans are natural candidates for provost and president positions and should be mentored so that they are able to aspire to these positions in due time. Deans have three career options: up, out or back. Deans can be promoted to higher-level positions, can move laterally to similar positions or can return to the faculty, that is, leave the corporation to go back to the guild. Due to "recency bias," there is a tendency to hire provosts and presidents from the group of current deans. This excludes a great deal of talent, as there are many former deans who are highly qualified but are excluded simply because they have left the corporation and have returned to the guild.

Since such moves are seldom voluntary, it is assumed that there must be something wrong with them, without taking into consideration the highly-political nature of academic administration, where leaders are let go for all kinds of non-competence-related reasons. Since not everyone is able and/or willing to relocate in order to continue in administration, many deans decide to go back to the faculty rather than to move. Some are eager to renew themselves intellectually, finding inspiration in teaching and scholarship. Excluding this important group from the pool of potential provosts and presidents is short-sighted.

Succession planning must involve seeking out former deans and persuading them to consider undertaking other administrative positions. The same should be done with former provosts, chancellors and presidents. The best talent may be found among those who are not currently involved in administration but have the insight afforded not only by their previous experience but also by the time they have had to reflect on it. In parliamentary systems, politicians alternate periods of service with periods of rest. One of the most famous examples of this is Sir Winston Churchill, who, after his so-called "wilderness years," returned to government to do the best job of his life as leader of the United Kingdom during World War II. It was precisely the time that he had to read, write and think in the intervening years that made it possible for him to refine his vision and become one of the most inspiring politicians in recent history.

Academics who follow the pattern of Plato's ideal leader, the "philosopher king," who combines action and reflection, should be considered prime candidates for higher level positions. However, many former presidents, provosts and deans of great knowledge and wisdom are not being tapped for administrative positions, while less competent, original and courageous current administrators are getting jobs simply because they are still inside the administrative machine. This amazing shortcoming of the current system, which discards those who, for whatever reasons, leave the corporation to return to the guild, needs to be addressed. The connection between the guild and the corporation must be a two-way street. In Rothwell's terms, people should have dual-career ladders and be able to move back

and forth between technical and managerial jobs, that is, between the guild and the corporation.

In addition to being an important source of talent to draw upon when looking for academic leaders, former administrators are a natural pool of mentors for the younger generations (Bridges, Eckel, Córdova & White). In fact, former administrators, particularly former presidents, should be tapped for all kinds of positions, including membership on boards of regents, as Duderstadt and Womack have suggested. In terms of mentoring young leaders, virtually all campuses have numerous former administrators on their faculties or as emeriti/ae. Yet their experience and expertise is not being tapped. In fact, former administrators oftentimes are marginalized. The reasons for hiring and firing administrators in academia are largely political, so when people leave these positions, there is a sense that their company might spell trouble with the powers that be. Academics do not usually seek the advice or help of former presidents, chancellors, provosts, or deans, which is a great waste of knowledge and wisdom. Such members of the campus community should be engaged in the identification and training of future leaders. Women and minority mentors should particularly be tapped, for, as Nannerl O. Keohane says, young people from these groups are in great need of "precursors and companions" (p. 78).

At the same time, we must keep in mind that one of the main purposes of mentoring is to confer what Belle Rose Ragins has termed "reflected power" (p. 109), so mentors should be influential. For example, people who have white male mentors often do better than those who are mentored by women and minorities, precisely because the former have more power than the latter. Current administrators, who generally have more power than former administrators, should put their influence to good use and become involved in mentoring, as well. Ideally, academics should have a variety of mentors who can provide the advice, encouragement and power they need to make it to the next level, so that more of them are in a position to become presidents some day.

Bringing diversity to the college presidency has never been addressed with sustained energy (Bridges, Eckel, Córdova & White). There is a tendency to have token candidates and to view diversity as a one-time commitment: once some women and minority administrators have been hired, no more are sought. Yet, the challenges facing society are too complex to be addressed by a limited group of leaders. As Daryl G. Smith warns, the lack of sufficient diversity at the top places institutional decision-making at risk. We need all the talent we can get and cannot afford to miss underappreciated ability. So we must address the problems affecting women and minority administrators head on. We know that they are underestimated and overscrutinized and enjoy shorter tenures than white males do (Wenniger & Conroy). This can be very discouraging to them, as Leonard A. Valderde notes:

The feeling of being treated unfairly emerges while in service, but it is accentuated after leaving. The feeling of unjust treatment is highlighted when one views the treatment of the successor, especially if the successor is a white male. It is easy to observe the dual standards being applied (forgiveness to the incumbent, lesser expectations, overlooked omissions, etc.). (p. 152)

We also know that women and minorities are not given enough feedback about their performance and do not have enough sponsors who can vouch for them. We must develop systems to deal with all these problems and do a better job at retaining women and minority leaders.

A particularly difficult issue to address is the fact that women and minority leaders oftentimes do not conform to expectations, because they do not act and look like white males. A great deal of education will be necessary to make people understand that inclusion "is not so much about treating everyone the same as it is about preventing their differences from being an unfair hindrance" (Bridges, Eckel, Córdova & White, p. 5). Accordingly, institutions of higher education need to become more sophisticated so that they can recognize good leadership when they see it. This will require courage, imagination and training. It is easy to find leaders in the usual places. To find leaders in places where they are likely to be overlooked by the casual observer can only be done through a deliberate, thoughtful and sustained process of succession planning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Council on Education (2007). *The American College President*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Center for Policy Analysis.
- Astin, Helen S., & Carole Leland (1991). *Women of Influence, Women of Vision: A Cross-Generational Study of Leaders and Social Change*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Atwood, Christee Gabour (2007). *Succession Planning Basics*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASTD Press.
- Barden, Dennis M. (2010). Where Will You Find Your Future Leaders? The Time Has Come for Colleges and Universities to Get Serious about Succession Planning. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 56, 17, pp. D20-D21.
- Blumenstyk, Goldie (2005). Outside Chance for Insiders. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52, 11, pp. A28-A29.
- Bornstein, Rita (2005). The Nature and Nurture of Presidents. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52, 11, pp. B10-B11.
- Bridges, Brian K., Peter D. Eckel, Diana I. Córdova, & Byron P. White (2008). *Broadening the Leadership Spectrum: Advancing Diversity in the American College Presidency*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Burnim, Mickey L., Patricia Digh, & Laura Skandera-Trombley (2007). What Can Be Done to Diversify Executive Suites? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54, 5, pp. B48-B53.
- Cohen, Michael D., & James G. March (1974). *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. A General Report Prepared for The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Collins, Jim (2001). *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap...and Others Don't*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Collins, Jim (2009). *How the Mighty Fall: And Why Some Companies Never Give In*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Contreras, A. Reynaldo (1998). Leading from the Margins of the Ivory Tower. *The Multicultural Campus: Strategies for Transforming Higher Education*. Ed. Leonard A. Valverde & Louis A. Castenell, Jr. Walnut Creek, London & New Delhi: Altamira Press, pp. 136-161.
- Davis, Erroll B. (2008). Colleges Need to Offer Clear Paths to Leadership. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54, 45, p. A64.
- Drucker, Peter F. (1980). *Managing in Turbulent Times*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Duderstadt, James J. (2007). *The View from the Helm: Leading the American University During an Era of Change*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Duderstadt, James J., & Farris W. Womack (2003). *The Future of the Public University in America: Beyond the Crossroads*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Finkelstein, Martin J., Robert K. Seal, & Jack H. Schuster (1998). *The New Academic Generation: A Profession in Transformation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Giamatti, A. Bartlett (1990). *A Free and Ordered Space: The Real World of the University*. New York & London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Glazer-Raymo, Judith (1999). *Shattering the Myths: Women in Academia*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hargreaves, Andy, & Dean Fink (2006). *Sustainable Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hearn, Thomas K., Jr. (2006). Leadership and Teaching in the American University. *University Presidents as Moral Leaders*. Ed. David G. Brown. Westport, Connecticut: American Council on Education & Praeger Series on Higher Education, pp. 159-176.
- Keohane, Nannerl O. (2007). Crossing the Bridge: Reflections on Women and Leadership. *Women and Leadership: The State of Play and Strategies for Change*. Ed. Barbara Kellerman & Deborah L. Rhode. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kerr, Clark (2001). *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, England: Harvard University Press.
- King, Jacqueline E., & Gigi G. Gómez (2008). *On the Pathway to the Presidency: Characteristics of Higher Education's Senior Leadership*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Malloy, Edward S. (2006). Succeeding a Legend at the University of Notre Dame. *University Presidents as Moral Leaders*. Ed. David G. Brown. Westport, Connecticut: American Council on Education & Praeger Series on Higher Education, pp. 87-101.
- Martin, James, James E. Samels, & Associates, Eds. (2004). *Presidential Transition in Higher Education: Managing Leadership Change*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mead-Fox, David (2010). It's Getting Harder to Find Superior Leaders: To Compete for the Best Talent, Colleges Must Rethink how they Recruit Executives Externally and Internally. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 56, 17, pp. D25-D26.

- Moody, Ann (2004). *Faculty Diversity: Problems and Solutions*. New York & London: Routledge Falmer.
- Niemeier, Debbie, & Cristina González (2004). Breaking Into the Guildmasters Club: What We Know About Women Science and Engineering Department Chairs at AAU Universities, *National Women's Studies Association Journal*, 16, 1, pp. 157-171.
- Ong, Sze Ann (1989). *Succession Planning-Concepts, Issues and Implementation*. Master of Business Administration Thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
- Ragins, Belle Rose (1995). Diversity, Power, and Mentorship in Organizations: A Cultural, Structural, and Behavioral Perspective. *Diversity in Organizations: New Perspective for a Changing Workplace*. Ed. Martin M. Chemers, Stuart Oskamp & Mark A. Costanzo. Thousand Oaks, London & New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 91-132.
- Readings, Bill (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Rhodes, Frank H.T. (2001). *The Creation of the Future: The Role of the American University*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Rothwell, William J. (2005). *Effective Succession Planning: Ensuring Leadership Continuity and Building Talent from Within*. New York: American Management Corporation.
- Selingo, Jeffrey (2009). Emory U. Trains Its Own Leaders. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55, 41, pp. B3-B4.
- Smith, Daryl G. (1995). Organizational Implications of Diversity in Higher Education. *Diversity in Organizations: New Perspective for a Changing Workplace*. Ed. Martin M. Chemers, Stuart Oskamp & Mark A. Costanzo. Thousand Oaks, London & New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 220-244.
- Sobol, Mark R., Phil Harkins, & Terry Conley, Eds. (2007). *Linkage Inc.'s Best Practices for Succession Planning*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes, & Samuel L. Myers, Jr. (2000). *Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success*. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Valian, Virginia (2000). *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, England: The MIT Press.
- Valverde, Leonard A. (2003). *Leaders of Color in Higher Education: Unrecognized Triumphs in Harsh Institutions*. Walnut Creek, Lanham, New York, Toronto & Oxford: Altamira Press.
- Wenniger, Mary Dee, & Mary Helen Conroy, Eds. (2001). *Gender Equity or Bust! On the Road to Campus Leadership with Women in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.