

# **President's Emerging Leaders Program**

**2004 - 2005**

## **HUMAN RESOURCES LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

### **Sponsors:**

Carol Carrier, Vice President for Human Resources

Tim Delmont, Director, Center for Human Resources Development, Office of Human Resources

### **Team Advisors:**

Dee Anne Bonebright, Director, Supervisory Training, Office of Human Resources

Mike McGlynn, Organizational Development Consultant, Office of Human Resources

### **Team Members:**

Etty DeVeaux Westergaard, The Graduate School

Dave Dorman, Boynton Health Service

Ruthann Manlet, Facilities Management

Steven Pearthree, Department of Family Social Science

Kate Stuckert, Office of the President

**June 21, 2005**

## Contents

I. Executive Summary .....	page 3
II. Introduction .....	page 5
III. Charge .....	page 5
IV. Methodology .....	page 5
V. Report Structure .....	page 6
VI. Rational For Leadership Development.....	page 6
VII. Recommendation #1 Adopt A Competency-Based Model for Leadership Development.....	page 7
VIII. Recommendation #2 Employ A Systems Approach to Leadership Development.....	page 8
University Culture .....	page 9
Performance Management .....	page 10
Talent Management and Succession Planning .....	page 11
Career Training and Development .....	page 13
Position and Selection Criteria .....	page 14
IX. Recommendation #3 Charge a Task Force to Address Challenges in Preparing Faculty Researchers and Teachers for Administrative Leadership Positions .....	page 15
X. Recommendation #4 Convene a task force of experts to Validate and Refine Recommendations .....	page 16
XI. Conclusion.....	page 17

### **Attachments:**

a. Interviewees .....	page 18
b. Interview Questions .....	page 19
c. Selected Interview Quotes .....	page 21
d. Interview Key Themes.....	page 23
e. Core Competencies (full version) .....	page 26
f. Research I Institutions' Human Resources Websites.....	page 30
g. Literature Review .....	page 31

# **HUMAN RESOURCE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

## **Executive Summary**

Last fall, our President's Emerging Leaders (PEL) team was charged with proposing core competencies for leadership effectiveness and developing a strategic vision to support development projects across the University of Minnesota (University). The President and Board of Regents (Regents) later confirmed employee development as a strategic priority. From that point, we viewed this project as setting the context in which a strategic employee development initiative must be framed and implemented to ensure success.

While the recommendations in this report are based on *all* of the data we collected – interviews with internal University stakeholders and Minnesota business leaders, University reports on leadership effectiveness and employee satisfaction, literature on leadership effectiveness and core competencies, human resources practices at higher education institutions – they are *primarily* reflective of the major themes identified in our interviews with the University community, particularly those themes that were consistent across employee groups. Our recommendations address specific obstacles that may hinder the University's ability to achieve a culture of excellence in employee and leadership development: a lack of consistently articulated messaging about the values and expectations of the institution; an absence of defined and articulated core competencies expected of University employees; a lack of accountability and consistency in the University's performance management system; and a culture in which employees are responsible for advancing their own development. Based on our analysis, we recommend the University:

**1. Adopt a competency-based model for leadership development at the University, including:**

- using the Len Sperry model, as amended to fit the University context and direction, we propose this amended model as the foundation of core competencies for the University as a whole, and on which to establish context/area-specific competencies;
- integrating core competencies throughout human resources systems and strategies to form the foundation for all performance measurement, management, and development, with increasingly higher levels of complexity as employees develop throughout their tenure; and
- enlisting the Office of Human Resources (OHR) to serve as partner and vital resource in educating the University community about applying, embedding, and tailoring leadership competencies to the unit level.

**2. Employ a systems approach to leadership development, including:**

**A. Establishing a University culture in which the President and his executive officers:**

- own the initiative, partner with OHR to ensure the highest level of commitment and visibility, take responsibility for serving as role models and mentors to the next generation of leaders, and support and expect continuous improvement opportunities for direct reports and all levels of employees throughout the organization;
- provide incentives for all employees to engage in this initiative, particularly supervisors who excel at developing members of their team; and
- launch a comprehensive communication plan to convey the expectations for leadership development and its value to employees, and to the organization.

**B. Improving accountability in the performance management system by:**

- conducting a comprehensive assessment, or inventory, of each University employee within a defined period to establish a baseline for measuring performance and development, based on the proposed core competencies;
- adding a 360-degree feedback component to employee performance reviews to provide a more comprehensive assessment of leaders, and allowing employees the opportunity to provide evaluative feedback on the effectiveness of their supervisors;

- emphasizing both evaluative and developmental components to performance appraisals that assess supervisor effectiveness in developing employees and themselves, and providing high quality and timely performance reviews to their direct reports; and
- enhancing supervisory training and support in managing difficult or underperforming employees as well as developing and supporting employees.

**C. Building the University’s bench strength of leadership effectiveness by:**

- employing a formal, systemic process of talent management that includes succession planning – beyond the unit level – to forecast, identify, and leverage the development and deployment of employees;
- incorporating talent management and succession planning in supervisor performance expectations and assessment; and
- establishing and communicating incentives for supervisors to become effective in developing and deploying University employees.

**D. Enhancing the structure and effectiveness of leadership programming by:**

- developing a tangible management and leadership development track, a “continuum” of leadership development such as a series of development programming from emerging leaders to mid-level leaders to executive leaders, to support leadership development for all levels of University employees;
- incorporating a fully blended model of learning (i.e., 360-degree feedback, classroom instruction, action learning, coaching) at each level of development to leverage the University’s strength as demonstrated in the President’s Emerging Leaders Program (which we learned in our interviews is highly regarded throughout the University community); and
- formalizing and expanding mentoring and coaching opportunities through a programmatic and administrative framework, such as expanding or restructuring the mentoring/coaching component of PEL to go beyond the one year period, identifying coaching and mentoring as a core competence of performance when evaluating for promotion, and establishing of a clear set of incentives for mentoring at all levels of the University.

**E. Improve alignment in University recruitment and retention by:**

- integrating the proposed core competencies into position and selection criteria; and
- using the proposed core competencies to guide development of additional recruitment and selection tools and materials, such as hiring guides, interview process, and screening strategies.

**3. Charge a task force to address challenges in preparing faculty researchers and teachers for administrative leadership positions.**

**4. Convene experts to refine and validate recommendations, necessary to secure buy-in from the Community and validate our work as academically sound.**

We are recommending a culture change at the University, and high-level commitment, consistent messaging, system alignment, and employee engagement must support that change. This level of culture change takes time, but if approached with the long-term vitality of the institution in mind, we believe these recommendations will effectively mobilize all employees in greater support of the University mission.

It is the full and faithful engagement of the University human capital that will ultimately create and sustain its competitive advantage.

## HUMAN RESOURCE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

*“Strategic positioning priorities will require a coherent institutional focus and a fundamental transformation of administrative operations and cultural expectations across all University campuses and operations.”* – March 30, 2005, Administrative Strategic Planning Task Force Report

### Introduction

The President and Board of Regents (Regents) of the University of Minnesota (University) have identified employee development as a strategic priority. A number of barriers have prevented, and if left unresolved will *continue* to prevent, the University from achieving a culture of excellence in employee development. The strategic planning goals of the institution can not be accomplished without a fully engaged workforce. Specific to leadership effectiveness, some of the major obstacles to achieving the University’s mission include a lack of consistent messaging about the values of the institution; a lack of defined and articulated core competencies expected of employees; a lack of accountability in performance management; and a culture in which employees are responsible for advancing their own development. While our President’s Emerging Leaders (PEL) Human Resources Development Team recognizes significant challenges in designing and deploying leadership development strategies for effective administrative operations in an institution of this size, complexity, and structure, we offer this report in hope that it will help set the context in which a strategic leadership development initiative must be framed, communicated, and implemented to ensure the University’s success.

### Charge

Last fall, our PEL team assumed responsibility for the human resources leadership development project. Our charge was to: 1) propose a set of core competencies to guide leadership effectiveness and focus and guide performance expectations; and 2) develop a strategic vision in support of a wide variety of management development projects, including a communication framework to ensure that units across the University are working toward the same goal. The goal was to strengthen and transform the University’s leadership development culture and ensure alignment with its vision for the future.

The team recognizes the distinct difference as well as interrelatedness in how leadership and management are defined. We also recognize that the control and execution of planning, organizing, and directing the human, financial, and material resources and operations of the institution are a fundamental skill for effective leaders. We chose to focus this report on *leadership development* and on core behavioral competencies required to lead people effectively.

### Methodology

Our methodology included:

1. interviewing a cross-section of nearly 50 internal stakeholders, including the President, executive officers, deans, faculty leaders, professional and administrative (P&A) and civil service employees, and student leaders to:
  - a) gain a deeper understanding of the current and desired culture for leadership development, and
  - b) identify specific competencies valued by the University community;

2. analyzing interview data;
3. reviewing recent University reports on leadership effectiveness and employee satisfaction;
4. examining literature on leadership and core competencies;
5. exploring over 20 human resources websites of Research I Institutions; and
6. interviewing leaders in Minnesota businesses recognized for leadership effectiveness and successful transformational leadership development initiatives.

Complete lists of interviewees (Attachment A), interview questions (Attachment B), selected quotes by people interviewed (Attachment C), and key themes (Attachment D) are attached.

## **Report Structure**

Although our recommendations are based on *all* of the collected and analyzed data, they are primarily reflective of the major themes identified throughout our interviews, particularly themes that were consistent across University employee groups. Our intentional focus is on impediments to achieving an effective mission driven leadership development culture that encourages engagement and results. The specific structure of the report follows a model that describes the current state at the University, lists our recommendations for achieving the envisioned leadership development state, provides a snapshot of the culture change that needs to happen to achieve the vision, and outlines the resulting benefits to both the organization and employees.

## **Rationale for Leadership Development**

Effective leaders understand the value of nurturing and developing internal talent as vital to building and sustaining a high performing organization. The value of leadership development is also evidenced and supported in best practices in the field of human resources; management practices employed by successful private companies to achieve business results; areas of improvement identified in our interviews; and in *The Pulse Survey* results, composite University exit interview data, and Work-Life Initiative recommendations. The timing of President Bruininks' agenda "to maximize opportunities for the people of the University to grow, develop, and contribute, and to achieve a culture that is committed to excellence," recently endorsed by the Regents as a strategy to meet the University's goal to be one of the top three public universities in the world within a decade, is no coincidence.

Creating an organizational culture that actively supports leadership development of its employees is one of the best investments the University can make for its future, with positive returns in employee satisfaction, recruitment, and retention, as well as organizational effectiveness, performance, and dexterity. We urge the University to seize this unique window of opportunity to boost the University's competitive advantage by implementing these recommendations in their entirety. We anticipate that this report will serve as a road map for Dr. Carol Carrier, Vice President for Human Resources and executive owner of the President's employee development agenda, whose vision to enhance leadership development at the University was demonstrated last summer in her identification of this project for the PEL Program.

Based on our analysis, we recommend the University:

1. adopt a **competency-based model** for leadership development;
2. employ a **comprehensive systems approach** to leadership development;
3. charge a task force to address challenges in **recruiting and preparing faculty for administrative leadership positions**; and
4. convene a task force of internal and external experts in leadership development to **validate and refine** the recommendations.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **RECOMMENDATION #1: Adopt a Competency-Based Model for Leadership Development**

There is not a consistent set of core competencies to inform and guide performance measurement, management, and accountability at the University. Analysis of our interviews revealed a set of institutional values and behavioral expectations such as integrity, accountability, excellence, and collaboration which closely aligned with the set of core values identified in the University's strategic plan. However, there is no formal identification, communication, or integration of University values and competencies to provide clear expectations and performance standards to all employees, or to improve overall organizational alignment and effectiveness.

Core competencies are important for all employees of an organization, irrespective of position. We recommend the University:

- implement a competency-based framework to guide leadership development;
- integrate the proposed core competencies throughout the University's human resources systems and strategies, from formation of position descriptions and hiring processes, to training and development programming, through exit interviews; and
- enlist the Office of Human Resources (OHR) to serve as partner and vital resource in educating the University about application of leadership competencies, and building strategies to embed core competencies in all efforts to attract, engage, and retain employees.

We analyzed our research to a) determine what leadership competencies were necessary to advance and sustain the University's competitive advantage, and b) to identify a competency model specific to the University context and direction. We recommend a slightly amended Len Sperry model<sup>1</sup> as the foundation of core leadership competencies for the University as a whole, on which to build context/area specific competencies. A full version of these competencies, including selected examples of highly effective, moderately effective, and minimally effective behaviors, can be found in Attachment E.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sperry, Len (2002) *Effective Leadership: Strategies for Maximizing Executive Productivity and Health*, New York, London: Brunner-Routledge

Using core competencies for leadership will provide clear expectations and standards across all units resulting in improved outcomes for the University. Specifically, a competency-based model will:

- provide an effective means for translating business strategy and vision into employee action;
- inform and drive hiring, training, and compensation decisions;
- standardize competency-based programming across a wide variety of settings;
- embed consistent messaging to align employee behavior and performance with the institution's mission and strategy, from on-boarding through departure;
- establish and maintain benchmarks of performance for the entire institution; and
- assess and hold employees accountable to consistent performance criteria.

### **CORE LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES**

(Based on the Len Sperry Model)

1. Acts with integrity and a sense of balance
2. Frames planning successfully by engaging employees and responding to stakeholder needs
3. Optimizes employee commitment
4. Possesses requisite job capabilities and organizational understanding
5. Engenders organization capability
6. Communicates effectively and encourages knowledge sharing
7. Demonstrates commitment to diversity
8. Builds and sustains effective individual and team working relationships

It is instructive to note here that while managing culture change is not specifically identified in this model, cultural awareness is assumed in the broadest sense when achieving effectiveness in each of the competency areas.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **RECOMMENDATION #2: Employ a systems approach to leadership development**

While many organizations, including the University, make good faith efforts towards developing leadership capacity in employees by offering leadership courses and/or training, many initiatives lack the essential components that create a successful leadership development program and transform the development culture.

The University needs a more strategic focus for human resources throughout the organization if we are to recruit and retain the best employees and become both an employer of choice and talent magnet for the state. We recommend that the University move beyond incrementalism to create a systems approach to leadership development that is aligned, holistic in its method, and sustainable; an integrated system supported by the interrelationships between individual parts. This transformation will require changes in 1) University culture; 2) performance management; 3) talent management and succession planning; 4) career training and development; and 5) position and selection criteria.



## 1. University Culture

*“Programs will not be the key – culture will be the key with training as a component.” – Dean*

*“Developing a culture is the best way to create change and get things done as a whole.”  
– Executive Officer*

The original proposal for this project clearly defines the need for a culture change:

*“The University is experiencing a wide variety of changes in funding levels, technology, and business practices that affect how our supervisors and managers accomplish their work. In addition, traditional leadership roles are expanding to include individuals who are not formal leaders, but who have significant responsibilities as project managers, team leaders, and lead workers.*

*Several recent initiatives illustrate the importance of creating a culture that values effective people management and systems management skills. As staffing levels are cut and we ask our staff to continue to produce excellent work with fewer – and changing – resources, it’s more critical than ever that our managers are able to effectively motivate and support their employees.*

*This is a critical point for leadership and management development at the University. New technologies, such as learning management systems and online learning, provide us the opportunity to influence the entire system and create culture change on a level that has not been possible in the past.”*

September 10, 2004 project proposal

Our interviews with members of the community support the idea that no strong, system-wide leadership culture with core skills and a common approach to leadership and employee development currently exists at the University. There are pockets of excellence throughout the institution, but there is no central philosophy of what makes an effective leader and/or manager in this context, and development opportunities are dependent upon varied levels of commitment of individual college/department/unit leaders.

When asked what the University’s leadership philosophy is, one executive leader said, “It has been the ‘great person’ philosophy. We are moving to the philosophy that everyone needs to be a leader and contribute. People need to be empowered when making judgments and understand how their contributions make a difference. Excellence by everyone.”

The single largest and most compelling force for change will be a dedicated and focused team of leaders that drive change initiatives to optimize the University’s human, financial, technological, and material resources. This is a critical initiative that cannot be delegated; it must begin at the top. We recommend that the President and his executive officers:

- own this initiative, partner with OHR to ensure the highest level commitment and visibility, take responsibility for serving as role models and mentors to the next generation of leaders, and support and expect continuous improvement opportunities for their direct reports and for all levels of employees throughout the organization;
- provide incentives for all employees to engage in this initiative, particularly supervisors who excel at developing members of their team; and

- launch a comprehensive communication plan to convey the expectations for leadership development, and its value to employees and to the University.

Developing an organizational culture that values, promotes, and develops leadership at all levels of the University will maximize the University’s ability to recruit and retain employees, ensure employee engagement and satisfaction, and will significantly increase the institution’s capacity to achieve its strategic goals. This culture change will require the University to move:

<b>FROM</b>	<b>TO</b>
Human resource functions perceived as isolated programs and single-change initiatives	Human resource functions strategically-aligned with a clearly articulated and actionable agenda that is grounded and owned by the organization and supported by executive officers
Employee learning and development viewed as an <b>optional expenditure</b>	Employee learning and development viewed as a <b>necessary investment</b>
Performance accountability based on positional authority	All employees held to same standards of behavior through modeling and results
Presumption of needs based on looking backwards	Disciplined analysis and forecasting of needs

## **2. Performance Management**

*“There is a sense of apathy at the University due to leadership and management ineffectiveness. There is a desperate need for improvement.” – P&A Employee*

*“A key factor in improving leadership/management will be leading by example and improving the process of doing performance reviews.” – P&A Employee*

There is a lack of accountability in the performance management system of the University. Despite overall effective leadership at the University, there is a small number of positional leaders who simply lack core leadership competencies, and pose a significant risk to the reputation of the institution for effective employee development and performance management. While admittedly in the minority, their impact on the community is profound and takes a significant toll on the University in terms of reduced employee morale, decreased productivity, increased turnover and costs to replace employees, etc. Our interviews with the University community were replete with anecdotal evidence of ineffective employees in formal leadership positions. Recurring themes in the interviews included: an absence of performance reviews in some settings; no to little constructive feedback on performance; avoidance in addressing low performers and/or problem employees; lack of leadership/management skills in positional leaders promoted on their technical strength; and managers who were clearly ineffective and/or inappropriate yet not held accountable for their behavior.

Accountability in the performance management system is essential to the continuous improvement and overall effectiveness of the organization. We recommend the University:

- conduct a comprehensive assessment, or inventory, of each University employee within a defined period to establish a baseline for measuring performance and development, based on the proposed core competencies;
- add a 360-degree component to employee performance reviews to provide a more comprehensive assessment of employees, allowing University employees the opportunity to provide evaluative feedback on the effectiveness of their supervisors;
- emphasize both evaluative and developmental components to performance reviews that not only assess supervisors’ management effectiveness, but also their effectiveness in developing employees and themselves, and providing high quality and timely performance reviews to their direct reports; and
- enhance supervisory training and support in managing difficult or underperforming employees as well as developing and supporting employees.

Enhancing the performance management system will benefit the University by improving open communication and clarifying expectations between supervisors and direct reports while enhancing the overall quality of job performance for both employee groups. A culture change in the performance management system will require the University to move:

<b>FROM</b>		<b>TO</b>
Single, compliance-based annual performance reviews; varying levels of mandatory performance reviews	⇒	Regular feedback on performance; focus on employee development with management efforts to maximize employee engagement and contributions; mandatory performance assessments
Status quo for under-performing leaders and other employees	⇒	Accountability for all under-performing employees
Conflict avoidance due to fear of legal consequences and lack of management support for addressing under-performers or problem employees	⇒	Authentic assessment and appropriate follow-through, with developmental support for supervisors; comprehensive training and support on managing problem employees
Perceived favoritism based on personal relationship between supervisor and employee	⇒	Objective and consistent standards in assessing performance and contributions and rewarding employees

### **3. Talent Management and Succession Planning**

*“I feel strongly that the University needs to do a better job of formally reviewing their talent pool and working with employees on development and preparing them for either more responsibility or other jobs ... most people at the University get into a job and that’s where they retire. When opportunities open up, they are posted for the whole world to apply, and more often than not, someone from the outside comes in to take the position. To me that is a clear indication of failure of the leadership at the University. We need to do better.” – P&A Employee*

*“Resistance for leadership development includes no support from supervisors. How can employees take advantage of what the University has to offer in this area if their supervisors don’t allow them the time to attend, participate, develop?” – P&A Employee*

Becoming a leader at the University results more often than not from individual drive and initiative than planned institutional career pathing and organizational planning. Our interviews revealed in many cases a lack of supervisor support for the development of their employees due to fear that their employees will grow out of and vacate their positions. Such a state is simply not consistent with the values of a learning organization. According to a 2004 summary of exit interviews on the Twin Cities campus, 44.7% of participants expressed some dissatisfaction with opportunities to advance (19.8% were extremely dissatisfied), and participants in this year’s PULSE survey responded less favorably in satisfaction with supervisor support for career development. The February 2003 Work/Life Report and Action Plan includes this recommendation: *“Employees wish to see an expansion of opportunities and services for career development and professional growth. A clear promotion process, with career paths, professional development, and/or continuing education is desired.”* Comments from the community indicate a lack of talent management and succession planning, and calls the University to action.

The University must be more strategic in developing and positioning its human capital in order to build its bench strength. We recommend the University:

- employ a formal, systemic process of talent management that includes succession planning – beyond the unit level – to forecasting, identifying, and leveraging the development and deployment of employees;
- incorporate talent management and succession planning in supervisor performance expectations and assessment; and
- establish and communicate incentives for supervisors who are effective in developing and deploying University employees.

Effective talent management and succession planning will help ensure a ready reservoir of able leaders to prepare for and step into roles that will be vacated by the imminent retirement of a generation of University leaders. Proactive talent management and thoughtful succession planning will better prepare the University to identify and develop potential and high performing leaders early, and get the right people in the right places, at the right time. In addition, we predict a reduction in the number of employees leaving the University. Talent development at all levels, and a culture that promotes from within will result in more motivated employees. Supervisors should be more comfortable and prepared when their employees leave for positions with greater responsibility within the University. A change in mindset on employee movement, planned institutional career pathing, and readying the University’s workforce for diverse leadership roles across the institution will require that the University move:

<b>FROM</b>	<b>TO</b>
Employee movement perceived as <b>loss</b> ;	Employee movement perceived as <b>gain</b> : a positive, development and retention strategy that maintains leadership continuity and best serves the institution
Unit/department loyal employees	University loyal employees
Poor staff choices due to unplanned vacancies and need to quickly fill open positions	Filling open positions in a thoughtful, planned manner with groomed talent ready to move horizontally or vertically, and with a more diverse workforce
<b>Employee dissatisfaction</b> with opportunities for promotional advancement	<b>Full employee engagement</b> ; continuous development; motivated employees focused on achieving the goals of the institution

#### **4. Career Training and Development**

*“It is still a struggle to define my role in a way in which I see myself making a long-term contribution to my program and the University that serves both the institution and my own professional development goals. We have a clear line of development and promotion for faculty members. We understand the skills they need to be successful, and the ways in which we measure their professional progress and success are fairly clear. We even have a good sense of the time line we expect with regard to their progress. We really don’t have a similar system for professional staff in most places at the University.”*  
– PEL Alumni survey

The University offers a wide array of courses to help University employees develop as supervisors, managers, and leaders, but our interviews with the University community revealed that the purpose and progression of development programming is unclear. Too frequently at the University, professional development consists of training and conferences related specifically to one’s job or discipline. In addition, a related and recurring theme evident in our interviews was the lack of, but very strong desire for, mentoring and coaching opportunities.

We recommend the University enhance the structure and effectiveness of leadership programming by:

- developing a tangible management and leadership development track, a “continuum” of leadership development, such as a series of programming to support leadership development for all levels of University employees, from emerging leaders, to mid-level leaders, to executive leaders;
- incorporating a fully blended model of learning (i.e., 360-degree feedback, classroom instruction, action learning, coaching) at each level of programming to leverage the University’s strength. (The PEL Program, which we learned in our interviews is highly regarded throughout the University community, is a good example of a blended learning model); and
- formalizing and expanding mentoring and coaching opportunities through a programmatic and administrative framework; identifying, coaching and mentoring as a core competence of performance when evaluating for promotion, and establishing of a clear set of incentives for mentoring at all levels of the University.

Strategic leadership training and development that goes beyond immediate job-specific needs will help to ensure employees obtain the transferable skills that will allow future job mobility and success. In particular, mentors benefit the organization by nurturing employees in learning new skills, sharpening current skills, and guiding them in development activities and programs. Effective mentoring will result in improved employee performance and satisfaction. A culture change in career training and development thinking will require the University to move:

<b>FROM</b>		<b>TO</b>
Development perceived as fragmented, isolated programs	⇒	Comprehensive and systematic employee development programs based on competencies for all employees
Primary focus on training and courses	⇒	Strategic focus on development through a clear and integrated plan
Unit-specific skills with inconsistent training standards	⇒	Unit-specific skills, and transferable skills
Onus on employees to develop themselves	⇒	Development as a shared responsibility of employee and University

## **5. Position and Selection Criteria**



*“We want top-notch employees in every leadership position at the University and here’s what we’re going to do to meet that goal. We want to hire and retain employees with ‘x’ leadership competencies, we have identified ‘x’ expectations for employees who serve in these leadership roles, here’s how we will hold them accountable for their performance, and here are the resources we are prepared to offer to ensure their success – training, mentoring, coaching, etc.” - P&A Employee*

The University’s values and expectations for its employees are not clearly articulated, or communicated, internally or externally. The University does not create a consistent and positive first impression to all incoming employees.

We recommend the University:

- undertake an initiative to communicate its values and expectations for employees;
- integrate the University’s values and proposed core competencies into position and selection criteria; and
- use the proposed core competencies to guide development of additional recruitment and selection tools and materials, such as hiring guides, interview questions, and screening strategies.

Integrating leadership competencies into the hiring processes will result in better-prepared employees during their first few months on the job and greater synchronicity with the culture and expectations of the University throughout one’s career. Of all of our recommendations, we view this recommendation – which to a great extent consists of developing materials such as hiring guides, interview questions, and screening strategies – as one of the more immediate goals because it can be accomplished rather quickly, with a moderate level of effort; serves as a foundational element for an integrated leadership development system; and achieves short and long term successes. Articulating and embedding the University’s values and expectations throughout the institution will require the University to move:

FROM	TO
University values not widely known or articulated	 University values and expectations for employees widely known, and incorporated into all recruitment and retention systems. We suggest that each position posting and description start with: “The University of Minnesota values integrity, accountability, excellence, and collaboration.”
Inconsistent approach to writing position descriptions, recruitment, and selection materials	 Consistent approach to recruitment and selection using consistent messages regarding, values, and expectations, and core competencies for effective leadership and engagement.

\* \* \* \* \*

**RECOMMENDATION #3: Charge a Task Force to Address Challenges In Preparing Faculty Researchers and Teachers for Administrative Leadership Positions**

*“It’s wrong that so many people are promoted from the academic ranks into an administrative leadership position without receiving adequate managerial or leadership training, and then they are punished when they can’t live up to the responsibilities of the job.” –Faculty*

*“Just because someone is good at being a faculty member does not mean that they will be good administrators, but this is the assumption.” – Director/Educator*

*“I know of several faculty members who have served once as Associate Dean, who will not do so ever again, and in fact there are many faculty who simply refuse to serve at all. Those who are willing to take their turn in leading perhaps are not appropriately recognized in a way which justifies future participation.” –Faculty and Associate Dean*

*“Faculty sometimes don’t want to take on ‘leadership’/administrative roles or don’t want to take critical time from research and teaching. Sometimes this resistance is legitimate.” – Executive Officer*

*“Don’t find the person who hasn’t published in the last 10 years and make that person the Department Chair. The Department Chair position has come to be viewed as punishment.” –Faculty*

We would be remiss if we failed to note one of the more significant challenges the University faces – identifying, recruiting, and training faculty members for administrative leadership positions within departments. While faculty are certainly proficient at the skills of their profession (research, teaching, and outreach), and are recognized and promoted on their strength in these areas, the complex and unique challenge for faculty administrators is that they must also possess management and leadership skills. In some cases, faculty are selected for administrative leadership positions, such as department chairs and heads, based on their effectiveness as researchers and scholars, but lack the requisite skills and experience necessary to perform management and leadership responsibilities effectively. The predicament is that the very skills needed to advance the academic mission of the University are at times in conflict with the skills needed to lead the strategic initiatives of the institution. We note that this issue is not unique to the University, but rather a conundrum throughout higher education institutions in

general. We also note the recent development of programming to address this issue, and recommend an expansion of efforts.

We recommend that the University charge a task force of faculty leaders and administrators, deans, human resource professionals, and other experts to address the challenges in preparing faculty researchers and teachers for administrative leadership positions. At a minimum, by openly acknowledging the faculty administrator conundrum in the spirit of collaborative problem solving, innovative solutions to address the issue may flourish.

\* \* \* \* \*

**RECOMMENDATION #4: Convene Experts to Validate and Refine Recommendations**

We are confident that our recommendations for core competencies and strategies to improve leadership development correlate accurately with the common themes we heard while gathering information from University employees and best practices in the literature, at Minnesota companies, and leadership development initiatives at other higher education institutions. However, we acknowledge our limitations in collecting the empirical data necessary for buy-in from the University community and we are cognizant that our work must be perceived as academically sound. Therefore, we recommend that a strategy team be convened to implement the President’s recommendation to “maximize opportunities for the people of the University to grow, develop, and contribute,” review, augment, and validate the recommendations in this report. Specifically, we propose the following tasks for the strategy teams as they relate to leadership development:

- Assess current state of leadership development and identify/confirm a desired state of leadership and employee development.
- Review and validate proposed leadership core competencies and recommendations in this report.
- Identify the gaps left by our recommendations, and identify and address other organizational barriers to success.
- Propose a strategically coordinated agenda of human resource functions for the University.
- Analyze cost (dollars, human resources, time, and capability/capacity) to achieve outcomes.
- Identify University units, departments, and colleges that have successful leadership development initiatives and successes in employee engagement, performance management and retention, and leverage those successes in developing best practices for the University, and broadly communicate the benefits of such programming.
- Identify the most appropriate organizational placement for the coordination and support of leadership development systems to optimize importance, visibility, and organizational success, with an eye toward the strategic realignment of existing resources where appropriate.
- Develop a comprehensive communications plan, a critical component for success of a leadership development initiative.

The strategy team should include faculty leaders, representatives of OHR, The Carlson School of Management, College of Continuing Education, Office of Service and Continuous Improvement, and University Relations, and should work with individuals and groups at the University concurrently working on these issues.

\* \* \* \* \*



## **Conclusion**

Our interviews with members of the University community revealed that OHR is, in general, meeting most of the current human resource needs of the University. A significant step forward will be the intentional, planned strengthening of programs and systems that provide more effective cooperation and coordination at all levels of the institution. Accomplishing the University's strategic goals requires a realignment of the administrative capacity of the University – a broader and deeper plan for leadership development will help to accomplish that. The integrated and strategic approach we recommend in this report requires an examination of both the supply and demand side of the organization. That is, how do we leverage what we have, and in doing so create a culture that encourages engagement and results, and how do we attract the employees we want and need and get their full commitment and contribution to the University's mission? Bold and substantive efforts must ensure that administrative functions become fully operational in support of leadership development to attract, engage, and retain top-notch employees. To this end, we urge the University to resist the natural inclination to make gains from single initiatives that present seemingly high and immediate impact, and instead build upon the progress already made in the area of leadership development to strengthen and leverage the organization's capacity to meet its strategic goals. This level of culture change will take time, but if approached with the long-term vitality of the institution in mind, will effectively mobilize all employees in greater support of the University mission.

It is the full and faithful engagement of the University's human capital that will ultimately create and sustain its competitive advantage.

**Interviewees (University of Minnesota)**

**John C. Anderson**, Associate Dean, Carlson School of Management

**Melissa S. Anderson**, Associate Professor of Educational Policy and Administration

**Shirley L. Baugher**, Dean, College of Human Ecology; Chair, Twin Cities Dean’s Council

**Terry L. Bock**, Associate Vice President, Academic Health Center

**Mario F. Bognanno**, Professor, Carlson School of Management, Industrial Relations Center

**Kathryn F. Brown**, Vice President and Chief of Staff, Office of the President

**Robert H. Bruininks**, President

**Carol A. Carrier**, Vice President for Human Resources

**Lisa Dau**, Counselor, Employee Assistant Program

**Stephanie D. Dilworth**, Fiscal Officer, College of Human Ecology (PEL Alumni 2001-2002)

**Vicki Fields**, Associate to the Dean, The Graduate School

**Gregory R. Fox**, Vice Chancellor, Duluth Campus-Finance and Operation

**Dorit A. Hafner**, Administrative Professional, Department of Wood and Paper Science and Chair, Civil Service Committee

**Britt E. Johnson**, President of Council of Graduate Students

**Mary Jo Kane**, Professor of Kinesiology and Vice Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

**Linda Kinnear**, Assistant to the Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Duluth Campus

**Ian C. Lasics**, Office of Student Finance

**Vincent R. Magnuson**, Vice Chancellor, Duluth Campus

**Jerome A. Malmquist**, Departmental Director, Facilities Management

**Jeanne D. Markell**, Associate Director, Extension Services

**Marvin L. Marshak**, Professor of Physics and Astronomy and Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

**Scott Martens**, Director, Office of Service and Continuous Improvement

**Judith A. Martin**, Professor of Geography, Former Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

**Kate Martin**, Assistant Director, International Teaching Assistant Program

**B. Jan McCulloch**, Head, Family Social Science

**Meredith M. McQuaid**, Associate Dean, Law School

**Francine M. Morgan**, Human Resources Director, College of Liberal Arts

**Mary L. Nichols**, Dean, College of Continuing Education

**June E. Nobbe**, Director, Leadership Programs

**Kathleen A. O’Brien**, Vice President for University Services

**Brett Opal**, Associate Academic Adviser, Carlson School of Management

**Rich Portnoy**, Associate to the Dean, School of Public Health

**Jennifer Reckner**, Associate Administrator, Department of Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences

**Anita Rios**, Coordinator, Work/Life Initiative

**Steven J. Rosenstone**, Dean, College of Liberal Arts

**Laurie Scheich**, Associate Vice President, Auxiliary Services

**Thomas J. Schumacher**, Director, Office of Compliance

**Samuel Schuman**, Chancellor, Morris Campus

**Wayne Sigler**, Director, Office of Admissions

**Javiar Silva-Biotti**, Human Resources Consultant, Academic Health Center

**E. Thomas Sullivan**, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

**Craig E. Swan**, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

**Julie A. Sweitzer**, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action

**David Taylor**, Dean, General College

**Teri L. Wallace**, Research Associate, Community Integration, Former Chair, Council of Academic Professionals & Administrators

**Nathan R. Wanderman**, Chair- Student Senate

**Amelious N. Whyte, Jr.**, Associate to the Vice President, Office of Student Affairs

**Nan R. Wilhelmson**, Director, Office of Human Resources

**Interviewees (Minnesota Business Leaders)**

**Grace Gorringer**, Leadership Development Director – Medtronic

**Rob Jones**, Leadership Development Consultant – Medtronic

**David Larson**, Vice President – Cargill; Regent, University of Minnesota

**Jennifer Martin**, Human Resources – BestBuy

**Rozanne Webb**, Human Resources – 3M

**Interview Questions (University Community)**

1. How do you define leadership? How do you define management? Is there a difference?
  2. When you see effective leadership in action at the University, what core competencies – and by that we mean behaviors – do you see the leader demonstrating?
  3. How do you develop leaders in your unit? Where do you find resistance and how do you address it?
  4. What leadership philosophy does the University currently follow? What do you see as key leadership focuses that will be needed to drive the University forward into the future?
  5. Should the University develop silo (unit) leaders into enterprise (system) leaders? If so, how?
  6. What leadership group(s) at the University needs additional leadership development?
  7. The University operates in an environment of declining financial resources, increasing demands, and increasing financial challenges. Developing leaders costs. How do you see development of the University’s human capital fitting into its many competing priorities?
  8. As we advance further in our process, how should we present our findings -- similar or dissimilar -- to you?
  9. What do you do to develop yourself as a leader?
  10. Are there other people we should talk to? Other questions we should be asking?
- 

1. What leadership philosophy does the University currently follow?
    - a. What do you see as key leadership focuses that will be needed to drive the University forward into the future?
  2. When you see effective leadership in action at the U, what core competencies – and by that we mean behaviors – do you see the leader demonstrating?
    - a. Can you give me a story that highlights your points?
    - b. What about ineffective leadership? Do you have a story that highlights ineffective leadership at the U?
    - c. What gaps in leadership competencies, if any, do you see at the U?
  3. Should the University develop silo (unit) leaders into enterprise (system) leaders? If so, how?
  4. What, if any, incentives have you seen, or heard of, at the U for leadership development?
  5. Conversely, have you run into resistance for leadership development? Are there disincentives?
  6. What resources at the U have you utilized in developing your leadership skills?
  7. What resources at the U have you utilized in developing your management skills?
  8. What would you like our group to tell our Human Resources Department about how managers manage at the U?
  9. In addition to expanding leadership/management training opportunities, what other elements do you think would be important in creating a culture change at the ‘U’ around the topics of leadership and management?
-

### **Interview Questions (Minnesota Business Leaders)**

1. What leadership development model informs leadership development at your organization? How did you select it?
  2. Does your organization hire people with leadership skill sets, or hire with potential and develop on the job?
  3. Is more emphasis placed on management development or leadership development? Why?
  4. What is your organization targeting as leadership competencies? How does the organization training to it?
  5. How does the organization address potential leaders or leaders who are resistant to leadership development?
  6. What is the breadth of the organization's leadership development program or system, and how is it supported? Identification of leadership potential? Assessment? 360s? Rewards and incentives? Mentoring?
  7. From what you know about the U, what would you put in a leadership development program? Do you see your model working in a higher education setting?
  8. Is leadership development embedded in your management training? If so, how?
  9. Has the organization created a culture of leadership development? If so, how was that accomplished?
-

### Selected Interview Quotes (University Community)

“Leaders are collaborative, trustworthy, empathic, thoughtful, passionate, clear on vision, able to communicate clear expectations and focus on outcomes, they do not micro-manage and they are good role models. They need to love what they do and be able to show and share this.” – *P&A Employee*

“Managing is making sure the trains run on time while leading is determining where the tracks should be placed.”  
– *Said by many*

“If I ‘ran the circus,’ I would require a full day orientation for leaders/managers with a half day devoted to expressing expectations, ‘Enterprise is important – it is bigger than any individual department.’ Right now the culture is: ‘What’s good for me is what’s good.’ The other half would be spent on preventive problem-solving.” – *P&A Employee*

“Do not let people tell you that the University does not have money for leadership development. Senior Management needs to make this a priority and make the right decisions. We need to look into how employees feel about themselves. We need to look at benefits programs and salaries.” – *Executive Officer*

“I am very happy with all of the opportunities the University has offered me. We have the Minnesota ethic of earnestness. What can we do to make it right?” – *Faculty*

“If training and educating our supervisors is something we value as an educational institution invested in developing and retaining top-notch faculty and staff, why is supervisory and leadership training optional?” – *P&A Employee*

“One-time trainings are fine, but then employees are sent back in the U community still feeling unprepared. We need to help leaders APPLY what they’ve learned when they get back in the trenches by providing mentoring, consultants, and coaches. Good leaders model and promote effective leadership to the people who work for them. It would be beneficial for them to also ask for feedback on their own leadership abilities from the people who work for them. This is very rare, if not non-existent. We need to walk the walk.” – *P&A Employee*

“In order to be more interdisciplinary, we need to remove the barriers that don’t allow people to work together. The budgeting process is one of those barriers.” – *Dean*

“The leader’s mindset is that we are good, but we can always get better. Effective leadership is not what you did, but the promise of what you’re going to do.” – *Associate Dean*

“Effective leadership is forward thinking; maps out the terrain without proclaiming a position; sees the possibilities before determining a direction or making a decision; waits to make up his/her mind until hearing the views of others; able to combine choices; not every decision is black and white’ learns to find the synergy between more than one way of thinking. Be ahead of those following you. – *Faculty*

“Ineffective leadership is procrastination and blocking; leader paralysis; afraid of dealing with other people so decisions are put off; not responsive in a timely manner; stuck/paralyzed in their own decision-making; impatient yet unwilling to entertain other perspectives and ideas.” – *Faculty*

“I’ve spent some time around theater designers. The designers give the shops people a few pencil strokes and the craftspeople bring to life those brush strokes. I admire these craftspeople more than the designers. We need more craftspeople here at the U that can take a plan or vision and bring it to life.” – *Executive Officer*

“What kinds of policy changes are needed to provide incentives for leadership development? What barriers are there in our current system that need to be removed?” – *Executive Officer*

“The University’s architects and engineers area was eliminated in the 1990s. When they were hired in the 70s, they were all highly qualified in their field. When they were laid off, they left without the state-of-the-art skill set. The University has the responsibility as an employer to keep the employee skilled.” – *Executive Officer*

“The University’s leadership philosophy has been the “great person” philosophy. We are moving to the philosophy that everyone needs to be a leader and contribute. People need to be empowered when making judgments and understand how their contributions make a difference. Excellence by everyone.” – *Executive Officer*

“Many capable employees are isolated and disconnected by not seeing how their contribution is important to the mission of the ‘U’. In the 1960s a custodian at NASA was asked what his job was and he replied that he was helping put a man on the moon. We need team players like that.” – *Executive Officer*

“Leaders avoid conflict and that’s tied to not being transparent. Many operate as ‘bubbling pots’ until they explode. We are sending mixed messages: performance issues have not been addressed during annual reviews. Reviews show satisfactory performance across the board by the employee, but then the supervisor verbally states unsatisfactory performance by the employee when asked for references.” – *P&A Employee*

“I wasn’t aware that there was a leadership philosophy at the University. That’s not to say that I don’t believe there might be one that key University leaders follow, but I am not aware of it.” – *Associate Dean*

## INTERVIEWS KEY THEMES FROM TIER I

QUESTIONS	CONSISTENT THEMES
<b>Definition of Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision</li> <li>• Big-picture thinker/macro-viewpoint</li> <li>• Empower/engage</li> <li>• Energy/charisma</li> <li>• Integrity/values/credibility</li> <li>• Influence/motivate/persuade</li> <li>• Makes connections</li> </ul>
<b>Definition of Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operations/implementation (how)</li> <li>• Day-to-day management of processes/resources</li> <li>• Maintains status quo</li> <li>• Micro-viewpoint</li> <li>• Results (things)</li> </ul>
<b>Demonstrated Leadership Competencies at the University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication skills/articulate</li> <li>• Engaging/empowering/good listener</li> <li>• Strategic/enterprise-thinker</li> <li>• Transparency/authenticity</li> <li>• Role model/mentor</li> <li>• Inclusive</li> <li>• Persistent</li> <li>• Risk-taker, bold</li> </ul>
<b>Demonstrated Leadership Practices in the Units</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentoring</li> <li>• Stretching assignments</li> <li>• Succession planning</li> <li>• Encourage through reflection (performance evaluation)</li> <li>• Nomination for award or enroll in development programs</li> </ul>
<b>Reasons for Resistance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pressure of daily business (time and workload)</li> <li>• No support for professional development from supervisor</li> <li>• Takes time away from research obligations/interests</li> <li>• Personal fear, not prepared to be developed</li> </ul>
<b>Current University Philosophy</b>	<p>No one philosophy, but some additional comments were —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service-oriented</li> <li>• Decentralized</li> <li>• Consensus building/consultative/inclusive</li> <li>• Mission-driven</li> </ul>
<b>Future Leadership Focuses for the University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accountable (compliance)</li> <li>• Emphasize leadership in strategic planning process</li> <li>• Empower and value/recognize the contributions of all employees</li> <li>• Continuous improvement/efficiency</li> <li>• Decisive</li> </ul>
<b>Development of Silo leaders into enterprise leaders</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is important, but not universal and not easy to do</li> <li>• Balance between being a silo leader and an enterprise leader is important</li> <li>• Need early start in an employee's career by exposure to system learning opportunities</li> </ul>
<b>Who Needs Leadership Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All employees, but especially deans and mid-level managers</li> </ul>
<b>Leadership Development as a Priority</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best investment that saves money in the long-run</li> <li>• Costs more NOT to develop your human capital</li> <li>• Would rather have fewer and excellent than more and mediocre</li> <li>• With 70% of budget going to employees, we have no choice</li> <li>• Question of priorities (human capital vs. unnecessary projects)</li> </ul>

## INTERVIEW KEY THEMES FROM TIER II

QUESTIONS	CONSISTENT THEMES
<b>Current Leadership Philosophy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overwhelmingly, none or ad hoc (situational)</li> </ul>
<b>Future Leadership Focuses for the University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater focus on developing leadership and management skills</li> <li>Collaborative, but decisive</li> <li>High degree of accountability</li> <li>Results-oriented</li> <li>Service-oriented</li> <li>Business-model thinking based on stewardship and bottom line</li> </ul>
<b>Effective Leadership Behaviors at the University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to both articulate strategic vision and action plan</li> <li>Clear/effective communication, especially being good listener</li> <li>Engages, empowers, and inspires others (passionate)</li> <li>Decisive and takes responsibility</li> <li>Leads by example, accountable</li> <li>Risk-taker and change agent</li> <li>Delegates (not micromanages)</li> <li>Leads with collaboration, transparency, flexibility, and integrity</li> <li>Follow-through, resolve, commitment</li> <li>Recognizes the value of others and their contributions</li> </ul>
<b>Ineffective Leadership Behaviors at the University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoids conflict and takes path of least resistance</li> <li>Indecisive</li> <li>Poor communication</li> <li>Does not share information</li> <li>Does not value or show respect for employees</li> <li>Thinks in silos; lack of creativity</li> </ul>
<b>Leadership Gaps at the University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need more leadership and management development</li> <li>Insufficient incentives for taking on these roles</li> <li>Lack of clear career paths, succession planning</li> <li>Conflict resolution and performance management skills</li> <li>Mentoring opportunities (esp. for junior staff w/ seasoned leaders)</li> </ul>
<b>Development of Silo Leaders into Enterprise Leaders</b>	<p>Mixed reaction on importance, but suggestions for “how” include —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employee work plans should include one system-wide commitment</li> <li>Standard evaluation criteria in performance reviews</li> <li>Articulated expectation w/ evaluative and developmental component</li> <li>Graduated program, with a dedicated path for development</li> <li>Rotate job responsibilities to round out skills</li> </ul>
<b>Incentives and Disincentives for Leadership Development at the University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few system incentives, mostly personally/intrinsically motivated</li> </ul> <p>Numerous disincentives, including —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of time, money, and energy (particularly w/ fewer U staff)</li> <li>Lack of supervisor support and subsequent succession planning for fear of losing talented employees</li> <li>No link to performance reviews, expectation not systematic</li> <li>Divided loyalty for faculty between U obligations and their profession</li> <li>Difficult to justify non-essential, transferable skills as a priority</li> <li>Poor (fixed, step) compensation strategy and poor merit component</li> </ul>
<b>U Resources Used</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Observation of good leaders</li> <li>Take opportunity to discuss w/ supervisor in performance review</li> <li>On-the-job training</li> <li>Tuition reimbursement for courses not currently covered by Regents’ Scholarship</li> <li>Informal mentoring or peer counsel</li> <li>Service on University-wide committees (governance system)</li> </ul>



<p><b>What OHR Needs to Know</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a vision to lead the U community</li> <li>• Identify and dedicate a percentage of FTE to leadership development</li> <li>• Mandatory training is not always observed or enforced</li> <li>• High degree of variability re: support for development across the U</li> <li>• We have resources for leadership development, but no intention/plan</li> <li>• Leadership/management ineffectiveness = apathy and low morale</li> <li>• Faculty with no administrative skills become department heads – need consistency in key administrators in department to handle budget/HR</li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendations for Culture Change</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Align individual contributions to the mission of the U</li> <li>• Articulate vision, provide infrastructure, and measure progress/success</li> <li>• Hold people accountable in annual performance reviews</li> <li>• Weave core competencies into award/recognition systems</li> <li>• Succession planning will help supervisors to let go of talented staff</li> <li>• Widespread messaging of where we want to go, why, how we will get there, and what we will look like when we're there</li> <li>• Broad integration of expectation throughout systems across the U</li> <li>• Identify and clearly communicate both the extrinsic and intrinsic benefits of management/leadership to the individual</li> <li>• Establish a reward system for managers when people in their unit are promoted (performance expectation)</li> <li>• Align expectation for leadership and management development with performance review evaluation criteria</li> <li>• Establish a formal/informal mentoring program after classroom training is completed; help people transfer what they learn to practical situations</li> <li>• Integrate expectation through systems as the U, including policy, communication, marketing, hiring criteria, promotion, strategic plan</li> <li>• Reach out to all employee classifications to develop leaders at all levels</li> </ul>

## Core Competencies of Leadership Effectiveness Based on Len Sperry Model

1. **Acts with Integrity and a Sense of Balance.** The leader inspires staff by acting with unparalleled integrity, courage, transparency, and authenticity. Serves as a role model by acting in a consistent and fair manner. Manifests a high degree of self-awareness, and stability and balance among campus, personal, and family needs and demands.

Highly effective:

- Genuinely lives with integrity and courage – that is, consistently listens, responds, and serves others authentically.
- Consistently keeps ego in check; humble about accomplishments; recognizes the efforts of employees and colleagues and the impact of family.
- Leads by example and consistently models fairness, courage, and honesty.
- Effectively maintains a balance among campus, personal, and family values, needs, and demands.

Moderately effective:

- Considered honest; has reasonably good listening and responding skills.
- Viewed as a team player; is somewhat inconsistent in acknowledging the contributions of others.
- Usually models fairness and honesty.
- Reasonably balances campus, personal, and family needs, values, and demands.

Minimally effective:

- Anticipates what others want to hear and emphasizes managing a good impression over responding and acting with honesty and forthrightness.
- Places self-interest over the organizational need and publicly recognizes the contributions of others only when it is expedient.
- Displays and models self-seeking behavior, defensiveness, favoritism, or self-protectiveness.
- Excessively preoccupied with work, family, or personal needs at the expense of the other two.

2. **Frames Planning Successfully by Engaging Staff and Responding to Stakeholders Needs.**

The leader creates and communicates a compelling vision of the future that reflects University values, resources, trends, and opportunities. Acts decisively in establishing and committing to strategies and a course of action that accomplishes the vision.

Highly effective:

- Proactively scans the environment and develops long-term approaches that redefine problems or opportunities in anticipation of changing conditions or environmental trends.
- Envisions the future when developing strategy; anticipates potential obstacles and alternate scenarios; develops contingency plans.
- Fosters internal and external commitment for strategy by involving stakeholders and multiple perspectives.
- Implements strategy through the organization (e.g., college, division, department, unit, or project team) by integrating organizational and individual goal planning, assessment, and rewards into strategy.

Moderately effective:

- Recognizes changing environmental conditions that will impact the organization and its stakeholders; applies established approaches to address this impact and aligns organizational resources to deliver results.
- Anticipates long-term consequences while developing plans and strategies that address current issues.
- Considers how decisions will impact other parts of the University when developing strategies.
- Consistently communicates strategy and creates broad understanding of direction within appropriate stakeholders.

Minimally effective:

- Communicates unclear or conflicting information regarding strategy formulation and implementation.
- Hesitates or fails to incorporate changing conditions into strategies and plans.
- Fails to consider unwarranted assumptions, projections, and the broader impact of issues and opportunities.
- Fails to include others in strategy development or is too dependent on a single person's input.

3. ***Optimizes Staff Commitment.*** The leader inspires and engages individuals to achieve and remain loyal to the organization's strategy, vision, and goals. Develops self and maintains a strong talent pool by continuously developing employee skills, knowledge, and capabilities.

Highly effective:

- Identifies and develops human capital by matching strengths to opportunities and anticipating future needs through succession planning.
- Manages talent by anticipating employee and leadership competencies needed within the organization and actively develops others' competencies to meet those needs.
- Effectively demonstrates how the unit's teaching, research, public service, and services meet students'/stakeholders' needs.
- Employs coaching and mentoring strategies that respond to critical needs of individual team members and prepares them for greater productivity and achievement in the future.
- Enthusiastically and proactively garners employees' commitment to the organization by creating and maintaining a culture of trust and cooperation.

Moderately effective:

- Continually upgrades staff core competencies through selection, training, coaching, or rotational assignments.
- Shares goals, expectations, timelines, and status in order to increase employee understanding of the organization's purpose and direction; builds appropriate cross-functional teams to address challenges.
- Manages expectations and appropriately delegates decision-making authority.
- Considers how structure and culture impacts results.

Minimally effective:

- Neglects some key stakeholders in achieving buy-in for goals, strategies, and direction.
- Displays favoritism or ignores employee issues and concerns.
- Fails to plan for long-term needs of employees and human capital needs of the unit.
- Ignores potential impact of negative information on staff commitment and on developing solutions.

4. ***Possesses Requisite Job Capabilities and Organizational Understanding.*** The leader possesses requisite job capabilities and a keen understanding of field/discipline, student/stakeholder/customer needs, operations and systems management, and emerging issues to accomplish the vision. Makes and accepts decisions based on facts, experience, and warranted assumptions about anticipated changes.

Highly effective:

- Draws broadly on resources, knowledge, and expertise to collaboratively create strategic initiatives.
- Works to achieve an equitable outcome, cognizant of relevant facts and data, as well as of the needs, wants, objectives, and constraints of the involved parties.
- Demonstrates the capacity to make and accept difficult decisions.
- Manages fiscal, capital, and human resources at a high level with the assistance of unit and central experts.

Moderately effective:

- Gathers essential data and consults with appropriate stakeholders before making a strategic or important tactical decision.
- Creates opportunities for staff to share ideas and information within the college/department/unit, etc. and, when appropriate, between University entities.
- Seeks out internal and external resources, expertise, and knowledge when trying to resolve problems.
- Systems are managed at an acceptable level.

Minimally effective:

- Fails to share goals, results, or activities with others or to receive information from others.
- Ignores suggestions for improvement or fails to learn from situations and replicates ineffective or unproven processes.
- Regularly makes decisions based on initial reactions; fails to question, clarify, or confirm information.
- Budgets and physical/human capital issues frequently result in problems for the unit.

5. **Engenders Organization Capability.** The leader sets high goals for organizational and personal performance and commits the organization's resources to achieve these goals. Utilizes performance monitoring to hold self and others accountable for achieving high-quality results.

Highly effective:

- Seeks out opportunities for partnership in setting goals and proactively integrates these goals with appropriate functions within and across units.
- Consistently sets the bar higher and searches for new tactics to improve results.
- Challenges current perceptions that limit effectiveness and results.
- Consistently articulates organizational and team expectations and holds team members accountable.

Moderately effective:

- Persists in pursuit of goals despite obstacles.
- Actively implements new ways to improve old processes and increase productivity.
- Pursues the "spirit," rather than the "letter," of a strategic initiative.
- Establishes performance measures at beginning of project; utilizes these measures to monitor and communicate project accomplishments.

Minimally effective:

- Dictates goals without gaining buy-in of those responsible for delivering results.
- Limits efforts to the success of the leader's own unit while ignoring the potential for benefit to the rest of the organization and the University.
- Develops plans that lack sufficient monitoring and feedback systems.
- Establishes overly optimistic or unrealistic time frames.
- Sets goals that are too conservative.

6. **Communicates Effectively and Encourages Knowledge Sharing.** The leader is influential by creating a culture of open, honest communication and knowledge sharing. Regularly solicits ideas, provides honest feedback, and shares information with employees and others. Practices effective listening and understanding as well as excellent verbal and written communication skills.

Highly effective:

- Encourages and rewards diversity of opinion in discussing issues.
- Redesigns organizational structure and operational systems to support effective communication.
- Seeks, quantifies, and responds to employee input in large and small issues.

Moderately effective:

- Creates multiple processes for two-way communication and information sharing.
- Regularly shares relevant information with entire organization.
- Utilizes technology to facilitate the exchange of best practices and rapid access to knowledge and expertise.
- Seeks and effectively responds to personal feedback.

Minimally effective:

- Insists on functioning as the sole information processor and decision maker.
- Reacts ineffectively to negative information.
- Limits the dissemination of important information.

7. **Demonstrates a Commitment to Diversity.** The leader respects, understands, values, and seeks out individual differences to achieve the vision and mission of the organization. Develops and uses measures and rewards to hold self and others accountable for achieving results that embody the principles of diversity. Leads and manages an inclusive workplace that maximizes the talents of each person to achieve sound results.

Highly effective:

- Infuses diversity as a value in all aspects of organization's work.
- Ensures effective recruitment, retention, and promotion of historically underrepresented constituencies.
- Expects that differences are managed with skill and sensitivity.
- Challenges environments that support a disrespectful work environment.

Moderately effective:

- Provides framework for supporting diversity issues.
- Demonstrates effective recruitment, retention, and promotion of historically underrepresented constituencies.
- Manages differences with skill and sensitivity.
- Fosters an environment that seeks understanding and respect for all.

Minimally effective:

- Diversity initiatives are supported with rhetoric and not action.
- Recruitment, retention, and promotion of historically underrepresented constituencies is ineffective.
- Situations requiring sensitivity are handled awkwardly.
- Staff frequently report some dissatisfaction with issues of respectful interaction.

8. **Builds and Sustains Effective Individual and Team Working Relationships.** The leader inspires, motivates, and guides others toward goal accomplishments. Fosters commitment, team spirit, pride, and trust. Identifies and takes steps to prevent potential conflicts and promptly resolves actual conflicts and disagreements in a positive and constructive manner to minimize negative impact.

Highly effective:

- Builds constructive relationships with others and manages disagreements effectively.
- Establishes a norm of shared responsibility and trust, where team members communicate openly and honestly and where information is readily shared.
- Builds clear and compelling cases for ideas and initiatives and fosters a shared commitment to goal achievement.
- Actively seeks out development opportunities and supports individual and team development.

Moderately Effective:

- Works at building constructive relationships and managing disagreements.
- Discusses overall strategy and priorities with team members .
- Feedback is accepted; problems are generally proactively resolved.
- Education and development are encouraged.

Minimally Effective

- Concentration is on task excellence; teaming initiatives are supported, but not celebrated.
- Communication between the team members is ineffective; there is a general lack of tolerance for differences in communication styles.
- Conflicts are left unresolved.
- Professional development and growth is reserved for favored team members.

**Research I Institutions' Human Resources Websites Reviewed**

Columbia University

Cornell University

Harvard University

Kent State University

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Ohio State University

Penn State University

Tufts University

University of Arizona

University of California, Berkeley

University of Illinois, Chicago

University of Iowa

University of Maryland

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

University of Utah

University of Wisconsin, Madison

Yale University

**Literature Review**

- Brian L. Davis ... [et al.] (2004) *Successful manager's handbook*. Minneapolis: Personnel Decisions International
- Eckel, P.D., & Kezar, A. (2003). *Taking the Reins: Institutional Transformation in Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers
- Exenrod, M. Cisco Systems: Building the Next Generation of Leaders presentation. National Consortium for Continuous Improvement in Higher Education, Washington D.C. October 18, 2004
- Greenleaf, R.K., edited by Spears, L.C. (1998). *The Power of Servant-Leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers
- Hacker, C.A. (1997). *The High Cost of Low Morale ... and what to do about it* Boca Raton, FL: St. Lucie Press
- Nari, P. (2003). *Imperatives for Change in Higher Education: Planning the Future of the American Campus*. Minneapolis, MN: Design Share
- Peters, T., Waterman, R. (1982) *In Search of Excellence*, New York, London: Harper & Row.
- M.V. Peterson, D.D. Dill & Mets and Associates, Eds., (1997) *Planning and Management for a Changing Environment*. (1997). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Shaw, R.B. (1997). *Trust in the Balance: Building Successful Organizations on Results, Integrity, and Concern*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Sperry, Len (2002) *Effective Leadership: Strategies for Maximizing Executive Productivity and Health*, New York, London: Brunner-Routledge
- Stringer, D. *Characteristics Desired By Successful Organizations and Leadership Teams*  
Ford Foundation and Kansas State University Study of Twelve Fortune 500 Companies
- Waterman, R. Jr., Peters, T. and Phillips, J.R. *Structure Is Not Organization*, Business Horizons, 23,3  
June 1980. 14-26.