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Abstract

This purpose of this study was to explore the role of the Ontario colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT) Associate Dean and/or Chair, and specifically focus on an investigation of leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles. The study is situated within the context of changes currently taking place within the Ontario college system.

The study followed a sequential mixed methodology method. Online surveys were used to gather data from Associate Deans and/or Chairs as well as Deans from the 22 English language colleges in the Ontario CAAT system. Follow up interviews were conducted with a purposeful sample of seven Associate Deans and/or Chairs. Finally, institutional documentation was gathered from Human Resources departments across the Ontario CAAT system. Data gathered focused on gaining a deeper understanding of the role and responsibilities of the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair, an exploration of leadership competencies that would help them to be successful, and a review and assessment of leadership development opportunities currently available to them.

Conclusions drawn from the study indicate that change occurring in the Ontario college system is re-defining the role of the Associate Dean/Chair, led primarily by the
proliferation of degrees, and to a lesser extent, the heightened importance placed on research, expansion of flexible delivery, increases in international students, and effects of the Strategic Mandate Agreements. These changes are exacerbated by budget constraints/reduced funding and all contribute to an ever increasing workload for the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair.

The study also concluded that a substantial number of Ontario college Associate Dean/Chairs would benefit from enhancing their leadership competencies in order to help them be successful. Current leadership development opportunities available to Associate Deans/Chairs are not always well received, and are most effective when they focus on real-life application that addresses the uniqueness and importance of their role.

The findings from the study may inform system and institutional policy and practices that would help Ontario college Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful, consequently improving the health of the Ontario CAAT system.
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CHAPTER 1.
Introduction

Rationale for Study

_Clowns to the left of me, jokers to the right, here I am, stuck in the middle with you._
_Egan & Rafferty, 1972_

These lyrics made famous in a 1970s pop song aptly apply to my perceptions of what academic middle managers, Associate Deans and/or Chairs, in the Ontario colleges of applied arts and technology (CAAT) system experience on a daily basis. Associate Deans/Chairs cope with the unenviable sensation of feeling “stuck in the middle“ between the faculty teams that report to them, and senior management to whom they report (Buller, 2012; Boyko, 2009; Edwards, 2006; Gillett-Karam, 2002; Gmelch & Gates, 1995). Seagren, Creswell, and Wheeler (1993) confirm this sentiment claiming that, “the chair must learn to cope readily with the demands of being in the middle, with responsibilities to both faculty and administration” (p. 2). The role of the Associate Dean/Chair, accompanied with their sense of feeling stuck in the middle, present unique challenges that warrants further investigation. These challenges become more acute when examined against the backdrop of unprecedented change that is currently taking place in the Ontario college system.

Research validates that leading from the role of the department Chair is no easy task (Filan & Seagren, 2003; Gillett-Karam, 2002; Sirkis, 2011; Buller, 2012); however, the literature also confirms that they are seldom provided with the leadership training that would help them be successful in their roles (Filan, 1999; Inman, 2009; Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006). Filan (1999) found that historically, leadership training in colleges has been designed for senior administrators including presidents, vice-presidents, and deans while, “few if any opportunities have been available to chairs, who outnumber all other types of administrators combined” (p. 47). The need for leadership development becomes
more critical as the Ontario college system is currently experiencing extraordinary change.

I hold the strong personal belief that colleges should do more to assist Associate Deans and/or Chairs build the necessary leadership competencies required to be successful in their roles. Chairs are the primary link to faculty and students (Edwards, 2006; Filan, 1999; Gillett-Karam, 2002), and as such are essential to providing leadership for their departments and collectively for the college. Filan (1999) claims that academic middle management positions in colleges are usually filled by faculty already working in the institution. They are promoted into the job with little training or explanation regarding what is expected in the role. Wolverton and Ackerman (2006) confirm the lack of preparation faced by new chairs who have been promoted from faculty:

Take your typical academic star faculty in, say, biological anthropology and make them a department chair. What, in their background and training or previous interests, has prepared them for such an important management role? Usually nothing has—thus this call for intentional professional development. (p. 14)

This paper explored the current role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean and/or Chair, and specifically focused on an exploration of the leadership competencies that would help them to be successful as they lead change currently taking place in the system. (For the purpose of this paper, the terms Associate Dean and/or Chair shall be deemed as interchangeable; further explanation to be provided at the end of this chapter.)

**Personal Relevance**

Filan’s (1997) and Wolverton and Ackerman’s (2006) observations are congruent with my own experiences. Prior to January 2011, I enjoyed a middle management position as a Director and then as an Associate Dean at Humber College in Ontario for over 12 years. Early in my career at Humber, I was promoted into a middle-management role as I had been successful in generating additional revenue streams for the college through various ventures. During that time, I experienced minimal training or explanation as to what was expected of me in the position, and there was little meaningful discussion of leadership during my performance reviews, or in reference to my job responsibilities.
During those past performance reviews, there were frank conversations related to increasing business and enhancing revenues, balancing budgets, managing resources, meeting enrolment targets and accomplishing previously stated goals—all necessary responsibilities associated with the role of effectively managing my department. However, I would consider these to be management skills as opposed to leadership competencies. Warren Bennis and John Kotter believe that there are distinctions between the two skill-sets. Bennis states:

There is a profound difference between management and leadership, and both are important. To manage means to bring about, to accomplish, to have charge of or responsibility for, to conduct. Leading is influencing, guiding in a direction, course, action, opinion. The distinction is crucial. (as cited in Coutts, 2000, para. 2)

Kotter International (2015) defines the differences as:

Management:
- Planning
- Budgeting
- Organizing
- Staffing
- Measuring
- Problem solving
- Doing what we know how to do exceptionally well
- Producing reliable dependable results constantly

Leadership:
- Establishing direction
- Aligning people
- Motivating
- Inspiring
- Mobilizing people to achieve astonishing results
- Propelling us into the future

(“Principles,” para. 1)
I agree with Bennis and Kotter International. In my opinion, having strong leadership competencies are equally crucial to the success of the role of Associate Dean/Chair as having strong management skills. This paper, while acknowledging the need for management skills, focused on the leadership competencies that would assist Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles.

In January 2011, I left Humber to assume a Dean’s role at Fanshawe College. In that role, I observed that the Chairs who reported to me sometimes exhibited similar frustrations to those that I experienced at Humber. Some of those frustrations included:

- Responding to the new demands associated with offering degree programming including expectations from Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB) regarding enhanced faculty credentials
- The sensation of feeling “caught in the middle” between the demands of faculty and senior management
- Being asked to wear many hats that distract from the core responsibilities of the role, that is, Health and safety responsibilities, Human Resources (HR) functions, labour issues (sometimes union grievances), budget management
- Dealing with front line student issues with minimum support from senior management
- Constant pressure to enhance enrolments, yet encumbered by barriers to delivering new programming (i.e., Strategic Mandate Agreements [SMA] restrictions)

From my perspective, and it should be noted that I was relatively new in the role, the Chairs who reported to me would have benefited greatly from enhancing the appropriate leadership competencies that would help them be successful in their jobs. The preceding statement begs the questions, what leadership competencies would be appropriate, and how can Associate Deans/Chairs acquire and put those competencies into practice? This will be one of the major themes to be addressed by this paper.

It should be stated that my observations are not a negative reflection of my former employer (Humber College), or my current employer (Fanshawe College). Nor are these observations intended to reflect negatively on any of my former or current direct managers or reports. Humber and Fanshawe are both exceptional educational institutions and I have had the privilege of reporting to extraordinary managers who were committed
to student success, were very supportive of my role, and ironically, exhibited what I would consider extremely positive leadership qualities. My observations are rooted in my personal belief that in order to make these institutions even stronger, the academic managers who lead from the middle, specifically Associate Deans/Chairs, would benefit greatly from enhancing the appropriate leadership competencies to help them to be successful in their roles.

Of note: since beginning this project, I have been promoted at Fanshawe to the position of Senior Vice President, Academic (SVPA). This does not diminish my personal belief that Associate Deans/Chairs hold vital positions within the Ontario CAAT system, and that they would benefit from enhancing the appropriate leadership competencies.

**Backdrop of the Study**

Ontario CAATs are pivotal to the province’s economic success (Colleges Ontario, 2015a). Each year, Ontario colleges serve over 500,000 students and clients, approximately 200,000 of them full-time, through a variety of educational programs including traditional post-secondary education, apprenticeship training, continuing education courses, collaborative programs with universities, and literacy and basic skills programs (Colleges Ontario, 2014). They serve an ever increasing and diverse student population that includes students who have enrolled directly from high school, young people with partial post-secondary or recent workplace experience, recent university graduates, internationally trained individuals, mid-life career changers and people seeking retraining. “Much of Ontario’s economic advantage comes from the extent to which college education is embedded in communities throughout the province. Colleges produce graduates who make a fundamental difference to local economic growth and strong communities” (Colleges Ontario, 2015a, p. 38). Clearly, the success of Ontario’s CAAT system is important to the health of our province, and subsequently, our nation.

This study is situated within the context of the changes that are currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system. These changes have taken what was already a challenging role and added a new layer of complexity to the Associate Deans and/or
Chairs position. Of significance, the changes are re-defining the relationships between Associate Deans/Chairs, and the faculty who report to them. To that end, the focus of the paper focused on a review of current responsibilities associated with the role as well an exploration of leadership competencies that would help Associate Deans/Chairs in Ontario’s CAAT system to be successful as they navigate the changes currently taking place within the system.

Changes in the Ontario System

_The times they are a changing._ (Dylan, 1964)

Dylan’s lyrics were used to describe the tumultuous times of the 1960s; however, their meaning is equally applicable to the profound changes currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system of higher education. The significance of this is that the changes taking place are redefining the relationships between the Associate Dean/Chair and faculty, and consequently affecting the role of the Associate Dean/Chair. Further discussion of this phenomenon will be explored in a later section of the paper.

A significant change is that colleges are now allowed to offer degree programs. This has led to a heightened focus on applied research in colleges, and some institutions differentiating themselves claiming to be Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning (ITAL) while others now recognized as Polytechnic Institutes (Hicks, Weingarten, Jonker, & Liu, 2013). Furthering differentiation, the Ontario Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities (MTCU) recently introduced Ontario’s differentiation policy for postsecondary education (MTCU, 2013a). Under the policy, all Ontario colleges have recently negotiated a Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) with the province clearly outlining areas of existing and future program strength (MTCU, 2015a).

There are also many other changes taking place within the system. Examples include the influx of international students that certain institutions are accepting. Some institutions are experiencing enrollment shortages and have introduced strategic enrollment management initiatives. Others are moving many of their courses to an online format creating a new teaching paradigm. Finally, the Ontario government is experiencing budget shortfalls resulting in a level of unrest and anxiety regarding funding
Looking back: The movement towards degrees in Ontario colleges. The approval for colleges to offer degrees is a primary catalyst currently driving change in the Ontario CAAT system. Ontario colleges have a strong desire to increase their degree offerings into the foreseeable future (Colleges Ontario, 2009). The implication of this bears a short review of how that came to be.

There was relatively little change in the Ontario community college system during the 1970s and 1980s. The 1990s however, led to a shifting of forces in higher education. The neo-liberal reform agenda of the Harris government was a contributing factor. Harris believed in market-driven, free consumer choice for citizens, and that included education. This neo-liberal agenda led to the passage of the Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act (2000) granting Ontario colleges the authorization to deliver degrees. Until that time, degree granting privileges in Ontario were the exclusive rights of universities who enjoyed complete autonomy and were not required to adhere to a fixed set of transfer arrangements with colleges (Clark, Moran, Skolnik, & Trick, 2009). Dianne Cunningham (2002), who at that time was the Minister of MTCU, heralded in the new era of education in Ontario claiming that the new act “positioned the province to provide education choices for students of all ages” (p. 5). Skolnik (2009) saw this as a positive development stating:

Allowing both private postsecondary institutions and the colleges to award the baccalaureate degree was important in breaking the monopoly of the public universities over degree granting and, thus opening the door to greater choice and competition in postsecondary education, and making the postsecondary system more market driven. (p. 146)

The proliferation of degree offerings in Ontario colleges has been substantial. The Ontario college website (Ontario Colleges, 2015c) currently lists 261 degrees offered at by Ontario colleges (at the time of writing). Of note, some of the aforementioned total includes collaborative degrees between colleges and universities, as well as bridging degrees. See Appendix A for a total count of current degree numbers offered by individual institutions.
Colleges in Ontario were granted even further autonomy through the new Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act (2002). In 2003, the MTCU granted certain colleges the right to change their names from Community College of Applied Arts and Technology to ITAL. The implication of the ITAL designation indicates that 15% of the programming offered at the institution could now be at the degree level. Change had indeed come to the Ontario college system.

With the advent of degrees came further changes. As formerly referenced, many colleges are now referring to themselves as Polytechnic Institutes, but what does that term mean? Polytechnics Canada (2015) define themselves as, “the voice of leading research-intensive, publicly funded colleges and institutes of technology. We are dedicated to helping colleges and industry create jobs for tomorrow” (para. 1). A major distinguishing factor between the self-declared polytechnic institutions in Ontario and the other colleges that offer degrees appears to be the importance placed on applied research, although this is shifting. The six Ontario colleges represented at Polytechnics Canada (2015) include Connestoga College, George Brown College, Sheridan College, Seneca College, Algonquin College, and Humber College. The Ontario colleges, who self-identify themselves as Polytechnics, are lobbying both the provincial government for the right to officially use the term polytechnic in their names, and the federal government for additional funds for applied research (Doyle, 2009).

**Advance of research agenda.** All universities and colleges share a directive, that being the provision of education and development opportunities for students (Skolnik, 2009). The crucial difference has historically resided in the research function that is central to the mandate of all Ontario universities. One of the primary functions of universities is the advancement of knowledge through research. University students in Ontario are basically taught by researchers who teach. That is certainly not the case in Ontario CAATs. Colleges focus on applied, employment related education that is often taught by faculty who have subject matter expertise, but do not necessarily hold an advanced degree.
Times are changing, and research is no longer the exclusive privy of universities. Ontario CAATs are now placing far more importance on applied research as confirmed by Hicks et al. (2013) who find, “There is considerable movement across Canada on growing the role of colleges in research, particularly applied research. This is often connected to the growth of degree granting” (p. 8). This is another issue that has many Ontario college faculty members concerned, as many of them have no experience with research on any level. Compounding this issue is that there are no provisions in the current bargaining agreement that allows time for faculty to conduct research (College Employer Council, 2013). Currently, time for faculty research is being allocated by management on an ad hoc basis. Asking faculty to conduct research without providing adequate time or resources is unrealistic and is not sustainable.

**Impact of change on the role of Associate Dean/Chair.** As stated, a most noteworthy change that has recently occurred in the Ontario CAAT system was the introduction of degree offerings. The introduction of degrees concatenates an intensified focus on research and certain colleges seeking a differentiated status. These changes have affected the jobs of many college faculty members, consequently impacting the role of the Associate Dean/Chair. The changes become most significant when examined against the relationships between Associate Deans/Chairs and faculty.

Existing college faculty often do not have the credential required by the PEQAB (2015) to work on the new degree programs. Six colleges here in Ontario, now identify themselves as Polytechnic institutions yet many college employees do not have a clear understanding of what the terms ITAL or Polytechnic even mean. Finally, many faculty members who have been very effective at their jobs for years do not have any experience in applied research. In my former roles as an Associate Dean and then Dean, many faculty members had expressed to me that some of these changes had them feeling excluded and undervalued, particularly in regards to participation in degree related activities. The amount of change currently taking place within the Ontario CAAT system is unprecedented. Bolman and Deal (1997) state that one of the effects of change is that, “it affects individual’s ability to feel effective, valued, and in control” (p. 339). This would validate Bolman and Deal’s assumptions.
The impact of these changes on Associate Deans/Chairs is profound as they are the direct managers of faculty and the front line connection to students. “Department chairs sit squarely in the middle—between faculty and administration—and have daily interaction with students, faculty, administrators, and staff personnel” (Sirkis, 2011, p. 48). There are many studies confirming that Chairs are the primary link between senior management and faculty and students (Filan, 1997; Sirkis, 2011; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011). They are the ones essential for the success of day-to-day campus activity (Filan 1999; Inman, 2009; Lindholm, 1999; Buller, 2012). Their direct relationship to faculty and students necessitates them leading this change; however, they have had little influence in setting the strategic direction of the college system, nor in my opinion, are they being provided with adequate training required to lead change of this magnitude.

A major stressor expressed by faculty as a result of the recent changes is that most are not allowed to participate in the curriculum development process, or teach in any of the new degree programs unless they have what is considered a terminal degree in the relevant field of discipline. The terminal credential is required by 50% of full-time faculty associated with a college degree program and is mandatory in order to meet the approval process of the PEQAB. In addition to defining faculty credential requirements, the PEQAB (2015) Handbook for Ontario Colleges clearly states that there are research expectations associated with college degree programs as defined in the following sections related to capacity to deliver:

12. All faculty teaching in the professional or main field of study and, where appropriate, acting as thesis supervisors and/or members of examining committees:
   a) have, where relevant, professional credentials and related work experience
   b) hold an academic credential at least one degree higher than that offered by the program in the field or in a closely related field/discipline
   c) engage in a level of scholarship, research or creative activity sufficient to ensure their currency in the field

13. At least 50% of the students’ experience in the professional or main field of study is in courses taught by a faculty member holding the terminal academic credential in the field or in a closely related field/discipline
14. All faculty teaching non-core courses
   a) have, where relevant, professional credentials and related work experience
   b) hold an academic credential at least one degree higher than that offered by the program in the field or in a closely related field/discipline
   c) engage in a level of scholarship, research or creative activity sufficient to ensure their currency in the field

15. At least 50% of the students’ experience in the non-core areas is in courses taught by a faculty member holding the terminal academic credential in the field or in a closely related field/discipline

(p. 33)

These provisos eliminate many of the full-time faculty currently teaching in Ontario CAATs from working in the degree programs. The requirement of an advanced credential has not historically been a determining factor in the hiring criteria of a college faculty member. In personal communication with me, many have expressed that they feel they will soon be considered as “lower-class” faculty and that their contributions will no longer be valued by the institution. Colleges are in danger of creating a 2-tier faculty body, not a desired scenario.

The effects of these changes have already negatively affected the morale of certain faculty. It is yet to be determined whether the advancement of degrees will have an adverse impact on teaching or on the learning of students enrolled in what are considered traditional college programs including diplomas, certificates, adult-upgrading programs, bridging programs, continuing education programs, and corporate training. Maintaining faculty morale and ensuring the commitment to excellence in teaching for all college programs will be a challenge impacting the role of Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs.

In a similar fashion, convincing college faculty of the benefits of participating in research and finding them the time and money to be successful are major challenges currently faced by Ontario CAAT Associate Deans and/or Chairs. A barrier for management to overcome regarding this issue is, “how to organize this new research
function and address it in the context of faculty work and reward structures” (Jones & Gopaul, 2006, p. 2).

**Further proof: Expansion of differentiation.** There is further evidence that many Ontario colleges are embracing a new era that includes the offering of degrees, a focus on research, and differentiated statuses between institutions. In the summer of 2012, the (at the time) Minister of MTCU, Glen Murray, undertook a reform of the Ontario postsecondary system. He initiated a province wide series of workshops and forums that resulted in a discussion paper on how to make our university and college system stronger. The paper focused on strengthening the Ontario postsecondary education system through creativity, innovation and knowledge (MTCU, 2013b). The findings implied that colleges were critical the success of Ontario’s future leading the way through an increased emphasis on experiential learning and applied research.

Another result of the Minister Murray’s reform agenda was the new requirement for all Ontario colleges to negotiate SMAs with the Ministry (MTCU, 2013a). The initiative was started in early 2013 when all colleges submitted a draft of their respective SMA’s to MTCU, and was formalized in fall 2013 when the Ministry introduced the new Ontario’s Differentiation Policy Framework for Postsecondary Education (MTCU, 2013a).

A report prepared by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO, 2013) states that the SMA exercise was intended to address at least three desired outcomes:

1. To promote the government’s stated goal of increasing the differentiation of the Ontario postsecondary system by asking each of Ontario’s postsecondary institutions to articulate an institutional mandate statement identifying its distinctive strengths or aspirations and to identify key objectives aligned with that aspiration.

2. To advance and inform the discussion about how the Ontario system could increase its productivity so that it could continue to deliver a quality education to more students within the financial constraints expected in the public sector.

3. To elicit the best thinking from institutions about innovations and reforms that would support higher quality learning and, in its most ambitious
form, transform Ontario’s public postsecondary system. (p. 5)

MTCU (2013a) provides further clarity to the intention of the SMAs within the Differentiation Policy Framework:

Our overriding goals for a differentiated system are to build on and help focus the well-established strengths of institutions, enable them to operate together as complementary parts of a whole, and give students affordable access to the full continuum of vocational and academic educational opportunities that are required to prosper in our contemporary world. (p. 6)

The SMA agenda, from the onset, recognized the new movement towards differentiation, acknowledged the fiscal constraints in the system, and spoke of innovation and reform. In a paper written to inform the differentiation discussion, Hicks at al. (2013) found that “Degree granting emerges as the most important distinguishing feature in contemplating formal differentiation between colleges” (p. 3). Their study also referenced that, “Polytechnics Canada points to degree granting and research activity as twinned defining characteristics that differentiate its members as a distinct type of educational entity” (p. 8).

A brief exploration of the content in the aspirational sections in some of the actual signed SMAs between certain colleges and the MTCU confirms further evidence of the changes taking place within the system:

Sheridan SMA:

• “The Ministry has noted Sheridan’s vision to become Sheridan University” (MTCU, 2015a, Sheridan Mandate Agreement, p. 11).

Humber SMA:

• “The Ministry has noted the College’s aspirations to expand degree-granting activity and this will be examined as part of the Ministry’s policy review of Ontario’s credential options” (MTCU, 2015a, p. 10).

• “The Ministry recognizes that Humber’s Strategic Plan outlines its desire to achieve formal designation from the Province of Ontario as a differentiated provider of postsecondary education and training, outside the existing college/university classifications” (p. 11).
Fanshawe SMA:

- “The Ministry has noted Fanshawe College’s aspirations to expand degree-granting activity and this will be examined as part of the Ministry’s policy review of Ontario’s credential options” (MTCU, 2015a, p. 10).

In addition, Fanshawe’s SMA contains the following Institutional Strategies.

- “Fanshawe has developed a Research and Innovation Strategy that will embed research and innovation into the curriculum of all postsecondary programs within the next five years.
- Fanshawe has set a goal of being among the top colleges in this area by increasing research and innovation activities over the next decade” (p. 4).

Algonquin SMA:

- “The Ministry has noted the College’s aspirations to expand degree-granting activity and this will be examined as part of the Ministry’s policy review of Ontario’s credential options” (MTCU, 2015a, p. 14).
- “The College plans to grow its applied research activities and establish more Research Centres across the College” (p. 14).

A review of the aspirational goals defined in the SMAs confirms many of the change initiatives and challenges already referred to in this paper, that is, the desire to offer more degrees; the movement towards greater differentiation between institutions; and an intensified focus on research. These changes, originated through the Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act (2000), are currently manifesting themselves through Ontario’s Differentiation Policy Framework for Postsecondary Education (MTCU, 2013a). As previously mentioned, these changes directly affect the jobs of faculty, and consequently, the roles of Ontario college Associated Deans/Chairs. Highly developed leadership competencies in change management will be required if Associate Deans/Chairs are to effectively lead this change.

**Additional changes.** Of note is that there are references within the SMAs to other changes currently taking place in the system that were mentioned earlier in this paper. They include: the fiscal challenge faced by the province; the desire of institutions to increase their online course deliveries; and the influx of international students.
The province is currently undergoing serious fiscal challenges, and those challenges are affecting the way Ontario colleges are run. All managers across the CAAT system are being expected to deliver greater results with restricted financial resources. Another impact of the province’s fiscal restraints resulted in Ontario college faculty accepting a wage freeze in the latest round of collective bargaining (College Employer Council, 2013). It would be difficult to assess how a wage freeze has affected the morale of faculty; however, their immediate managers (Associate Deans/Chairs) would be the first to experience any negative implications. These new financial realities add another layer of complexity to the changing landscape in which Ontario Associated Deans/Chairs are expected to lead.

**Online course delivery.** Colleges across the Ontario system (and across North America) are all increasing online course deliveries in a bid to attract and retain students, and this initiative continues to grow (Inside Higher Ed, 2013). “In 2012, over 85 percent of postsecondary institutions offered courses or degree programs online, a 15 percent increase in institutions since 2002” (Hanover Research, 2014, p. 4). A report series originally known as The Sloan Online Survey, tracking online course delivery across the United States, found even more staggering results:

> “The proportion of all students taking at least one online course is at an all-time high of 32.0 percent” (Allen & Seaman, 2013, p. 4)

Many of the Ontario college SMAs previously referenced increasing online course delivery as a priority in their institutions. Of note, Algonquin has declared it will be the provincial leader in this area and become the Ontario Institute for Digital Education (HEQCO, 2013).

The proliferation of online course delivery and the impact on Ontario’s postsecondary system warrants a study onto itself; however, for the purposes of this paper, it serves as yet another dramatic shift currently taking place within the CAAT system. A major challenge associated with online course delivery is that there is no current framework for allocating time to faculty for the development and delivery of these courses, yet Associate Deans/Chairs are expected to increase this activity. The local faculty union at Fanshawe (in personal conversation with me) has stated that they expect
the development and delivery of online courses to be a negotiating topic during the next round of collective bargaining. Once again, this change affects the relationship between Associate Deans/Chairs and faculty. The lack of clarity around time allotment granted to faculty to develop and deliver online courses is a concern that needs to be addressed if change is to be successfully implemented.

**International students.** A final major change currently affecting Ontario CAAT’s is the increasing number of international students. Between 2000 and 2010, the number of international students at Ontario colleges increased five-fold. Colleges Ontario (2015b) found that, “International enrolment in the colleges is continuing to increase year over year. More than 28,000 international students enrolled in colleges in 2014-15” (p. 9). Naturally, new challenges can be expected with change of this scale. The Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance (2010) wrote a policy paper identifying six major themes they felt should be addressed in order to accommodate the influx of international students: tuition; financial aid; international student health care; employment for international students; international student services; and campuses and recruitment.

From personal observation, faculty in the colleges where I work (and have worked) welcome international students. However, there are some unique challenges, particularly around the understanding of plagiarism. Students from certain cultures do not always follow what we (in Ontario postsecondary) consider to be acceptable standards around plagiarism. This has frustrated both international students and faculty. At Fanshawe, where I am currently employed, this issue has led to many grade appeals. There is also the issue of faculty having to adapt to a shifting student culture in the classroom. This is compounded by the fact that although all international students have to test at a certain level of English in order to qualify for admission to an Ontario college (Ontario Colleges, 2015a), faculty complain that many are still challenged in this regard, particularly their oral communication skills. These challenges could be attributed to the fact that in Ontario, “Only a few post-secondary institutions have a formal international strategy to guide international processes at their schools” (College Student Alliance, 2013, p. 2).
As in the case of online course delivery, the impact of international student enrollments in Ontario colleges merits a study of its own. However, for the purposes of this paper, it is evident that the increase of international students in the Ontario college system has once again affected the jobs of faculty, and consequently the role of the Associate Dean/Chair.

**Salary constraints.** There is one further point that bears discussion regarding system implications on the role of the Ontario college Associated Dean/Chair. Most Ontario colleges adhere to a gridded salary schedule in order to determine Associate Dean/Chair salaries (Algonquin College, 2015). The Executive Director of HR from Fanshawe College (J. Low, personal communication, Oct 7, 2015) informed me that most Ontario colleges pay Associate Deans and/or Chairs at either pay band levels 12 or 13. This level of compensation does not make the position attractive from a compensation perspective to many faculty members who might otherwise consider the role. Many faculty members currently make close to these salaries (while sometimes exceeding them) and are entitled to a greater number of vacation days as defined in the Academic Employees Collective Agreement (College Employer Council, 2013). The effects of this are two-fold. The small (if any) difference in salary provides little incentive for faculty to move into administration roles, and give up possible vacation time as well as the protection of the union. There is also potential this could also cause stress for those who do move from faculty to administrative positions as they lose much of the flexibility inherent in the work schedule that faculty enjoy.

**Leadership implications.** The major focus of this section has been a reflection of the changes taking place in the Ontario college system. These changes affect the jobs of faculty as some will now be expected to work on degrees (which will require them to have an advanced credential) and there will be an intensified emphasis for faculty to participate in research. It has been previously stated, but bears repeating that Associate Deans/Chairs are the direct managers of faculty, and as such these changes will impact their relationships with faculty, and consequently their roles.
To that end, the greatest challenge that Associate Deans/Chairs will face in the near future is leading that change. However, as Gmelch and Miskin (1993) accurately convey, “Change is inevitable but the critical question is, how well chairs and departments prepare for it and position themselves to survive and succeed” (p. 1). Unfortunately, there is ample evidence to support that typically, middle managers in colleges have not been provided with adequate leadership development opportunities (Filan, 1999; Miller & Seagren, 1997; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011). This is a major barrier to be addressed. Most of the studies related to the role of the Associate Dean/Chair stress just how little training and support they receive when they begin the job, and how unprepared they are when they assume the role. Filan and Seagram (2003) confirm this point stating, “Those filling the positions generally receive little or no formal training for the job. This is especially the case for academic department chairs” (p. 22). Leadership competencies, specifically those related to leading change will be required now.

**Summary.** Changes taking place in the Ontario CAAT system have taken what was already a challenging role and added a new level of complexity to the Associate Deans and/or Chairs position. Of significance, the changes are re-defining the relationships between Associate Deans/Chairs, and the faculty who report to them. To that end, the focus of the paper is to explore the leadership competencies that would help Associate Deans/Chairs in Ontario’s CAAT system to be successful in their roles as they navigate the changes currently taking place within the system.

**Gaps in the Existing Literature**

There have been former extensive studies exploring the role of American college administrators (Moore, Twombly, & Martorana, 1985). There have also been major studies conducted on the role of chairs in American universities (Seagren et al., 1993), and more recently on the role of chairs in American colleges (Edwards, 2006), the role of the chair in Canadian universities (Boyko, 2009), and an investigation of the experiences of a group of Academic Chairs at South City College (SCC), a primarily university-transfer
post-secondary institution in Vancouver, Canada (Denholm, 2015). In 1999, Filan undertook an extensive study on the position of the chair in American community colleges with a focus on developing a leadership training program (that evolved into the Chair Academy). However, a review of the literature did not reveal a substantial study related to the role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean/Chair, or a study related to an exploration of leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles. In my opinion, this validates the need for a study specifically on the role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean/Chair with a focus on leading change currently taking place in the system.

Another common theme that evolved through a review of the literature is that there has not been a major amount of research done on middle-management leadership, specifically at it relates to middle-management in educational institutions. Osterman (2008) states, “While most literature focuses on those at the top, the role of the middle managers is often overlooked” (p. 66). Inman (2009) relates this sentiment to the chair role of colleges in England and Wales claiming, “…little research exists on how leaders in higher education have learned to lead, particularly those in ‘middle-leadership positions’ such as heads of faculties and departments” (p. 417) and Craig (2005) furthers this opinion saying, “It is evident that continued research in the area of department chair leadership is needed to better understand the role as an agent of change” (p. 85). A further exploration of the literature related to this subject will be demarcated in Chapter 2 of this paper; however, the lack of research in this area adds further credence to the need for a study of this nature.

Research Questions

Managing the changes currently taking place in the Ontario college system will require leadership skills. Associate Deans/Chairs, from my perspective, have not adequately been provided the opportunity to develop the leadership competencies to effectively navigate these changes. In order to articulate the leadership competencies required would also necessitate a clear understanding of the role of the Associate Dean/Chair in the Ontario CAAT system. Therefore, the following three primary
questions, and subsequent secondary questions provide a framework from which to embark on this study.

**Research Question 1: Defining the Role**

1. What is the role of the Associate Dean/Chair within the Ontario CAAT system?
   a. Who is hired into these roles?
      i. What is their work and/or education background?
      ii. Do they have prior leadership experience and/or development?
      iii. Has the role of the Associate Dean been effectively communicated, understood and accepted by those assuming the position?
   b. What are the primary responsibilities associated with the role?
   c. Have any of the responsibilities associated with the role changed as a result of recent changes that have taken place within the Ontario CAAT system?
   d. Are there distinctive challenges associated with being defined as middle-management, and if so, what are they?

**Research Question 2: Leadership Competencies Required**

2. What leadership competencies would assist mid-level Ontario CAAT academic administrators (Associated Deans and/or Chairs) to be successful in their roles?
   a. Do Associate Deans/Chairs believe that there are leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles, and if so, what are they?
   b. Which, if any, of the competencies identified in the previous question would assist them most in leading the changes currently taking place in the Ontario college system?
   c. Would an understanding and practice of systems thinking theory assist Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles?

**Research Question 3: Developmental Opportunities**

3. What leadership developmental opportunities are currently available for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs?
a. Are there current leadership developmental opportunities available for Associate Deans/Chairs in the Ontario college system?

b. If so, are the current leadership development opportunities effective and/or adequate?

c. Do Associate Deans/Chairs believe that there should be more assistance to provide them with development opportunities to enhance their leadership competencies?

d. Should there be leadership development opportunities with a specific focus on leading the change currently taking place within the college system?

**Theoretical Framework**

This study was framed within a constructivist worldview. I attempted to gain a deeper understanding of my own workplace and people that work there expressed through concerns that Associate Deans/Chairs be provided with the resources and opportunities they need to build leadership competency. Creswell (2009) states that, “constructivists hold assumptions that individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work” (p. 8) and “they also focus on the specific contexts in which people live and work” (p. 8). Crotty (1998), states that constructivism holds that view that, “all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interactions between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context” (p. 44).

My aspiration to gain deeper understanding of the experiences of Associate Deans/Chairs within their own workplace along with my personal involvement in the subject matter confirms a constructivist approach to this paper.

A constructive worldview frames this paper; however, there are aspects of other worldviews including advocacy and postpositivism that are present. It is obvious in the early stages of this paper that I hold a strong view in support of Associate Deans/Chairs being provided the opportunity (and perhaps professional development required) to build the leadership competencies required to be successful. Proponents of an advocate worldview believe that, “the constructivist stance did not go far enough in advocating for an action agenda to help marginalized peoples” (Creswell, 2009, p. 9). One might
question whether Associate Deans/Chairs are marginalized peoples, but my recollections of some of the challenges I faced in the role leads me to strongly advocate on their behalf to assist them to develop leadership competencies.

Postpositivists rely on quantitative data in order to test and measure variables. There will be a need to objectively gather important data regarding what opportunities currently exist for Associate Dean/Chairs in regards to leadership development, and to firmly ground the context of this study in a backdrop of current practice. It will also be of prime importance to determine whether Associate Deans/Chairs hold the same concerns around the importance of leadership competency as I do. Creswell (2009) refers to a postpositivist worldview stating that, “Being objective is an essential aspect of competent inquiry” (p. 7).

In summary, this paper is framed by a constructivist worldview as I seek a greater understanding of my workplace and people there. It also contains aspects of advocacy as I advocate on behalf of Chairs and/or Associate Deans for leadership development. Finally, there are postpositivist elements present as I intend to frame the argument based on a review of both quantitative and qualitative data. An explanation of the methodology involved in gathering and analysing data for this study shall be provided in Chapter 3.

This study takes place within the context of changes taking place within the Ontario CAAT system. It seeks to explore the leadership competencies that would help those who hold the role of Associate Dean and/or Chair to successfully lead those changes. There appears to be no single leadership or change management theory would be applicable to the entire study. In social science studies such as this, theory or theoretical frameworks alone cannot provide a comprehensive explanation of the issue being studies (Tavallaei & Talib, 2010). In order to accommodate the expansive nature of this project, a reasonable approach would be to situate this study within a theoretical framework of existing social theories and leadership practices, those being:

1. organizational role theory (Biddle, 1986; Katz and Kahn, 1978)
2. transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns 1978)
3. 8-stage process of leading change (Kotter, 1996)
4. systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990)
Organizational Role Theory

Question 1 specifically probes into the role of the Associate Dean and/or Chair, and seeks to gain a greater understanding of those who inherit it. Role theory, with aspects of ORT, forms a suitable framework through which to explore the role of the Associate Dean/Chair.

Baily and Yost (2001) explain role theory in the following manner, “Fundamentally, roles are organized behavioural patterns and expectations that attend a given position (hierarchical, functional, or social) or that accompany a specific situation” (p. 2422). Individuals are hired into roles in organizations based on expertise and previous experience. They explain; however, that there is always more involved in role performance than what is defined in a job description or a performance review, but that there are also informal mechanisms through which the individual’s behaviour is guided, and that is often through organizational culture. They claim it to be an excellent theory from which to embark on a study of how change affects individuals stating, “No theoretical construct is more suited to examine the impact of such changes on the social system and the individual than role” (p. 2425). Elements of this study seek to understand the role of the Associate Dean/Chair within the context of changes currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system. Bailey and Yost’s findings validate the usage of role theory, with aspects of ORT, as a realistic framework from which to examine the role of the Associate Dean/Chair as they lead change in the Ontario CAAT system.

Role theory life began as a theatrical metaphor (Biddle, 1986) based on the fact that actor’s performances were predictable based on playing roles that were constrained to parts for which scripts were written. The hypothesis concluded that, “social behaviours in other contexts were also associated with parts and scripts understood by social actors” (p. 68). Confusion entered the theory as different proponents applied the term role within different contexts; however, Biddle claims that, “Agreement persists among role theorists that the basic concerns of the orientation are with characteristic behaviors, parts to be played, and scripts for behavior” (p. 69).
ORT espouses that roles in organizations are assumed to be associated with hierarchical social positions and are generated by normative expectations. Norms, however, vary amongst individuals and may reflect either official or informal expectations. Individuals can suffer from conflict for behavior that does not conform to norms, and that conflict must be resolved for the individual to be happy and the organization to prosper (Biddle, 1986). It is primarily derived from the works of Katz and Kahn (1978) and Biddle (1986) and implies the following two principles:

1. Role expectations are reflective of the organization’s culture and norms of behaviour.
2. In order for an organization to function effectively, the role has been effectively communicated, understood and accepted by those that assume the position.

The employee’s performance is based on a review process that is dynamic and underpinned by the following four assumptions (Parker & Wickham, 2005):

1. The role taking assumption. “This assumption states that an individual will ‘take’ or accept a role that is conferred upon them by their employer” (p. 3).
2. The role consensus assumption. “This assumption states for that for organizations to function optimally, there needs to be consensus regarding the expectations of enacted roles and the manner in which they interact” (p. 3).
3. The role compliance assumption. “This assumption states that each role has a set of behaviors that are well defined and consistently adhered to by employees” (p.4).
4. The role conflict assumption. “This assumption states that conflict will arise when role expectations embedded in one role conflict with expectations associated with another role” (p. 4).

The supposition is that the process of role-sending and role-receiving will continue between supervisor and employee until the employee’s role-enactment conforms to the role-expectations of the employee’s colleagues and supervisors. There are some concerns regarding the efficacy of organizational role theory based on the limitations of the preceding assumptions. For example, Biddle (1986), a leading expert on role theory, cautions that it is questionable to assume that participants will be happy and productive
solely based on resolving role conflict. However, he does declare it an important variable in determining job satisfaction stating that, “Nevertheless, substantial empirical research has appeared based on this perspective, and much of what we know about role conflict and its resolution today has come from that effort” (p. 74).

Despite concerns that organizational role theory does not account for all behaviour associated with an employee’s role within an organization, it seemed reasonable to utilize the two underlying principles of ORT (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978) and the four basic assumptions associated with role-taking, role-consensus, role-compliance and role-conflict (Parker & Wickham, 2005) as part of an exploratory process to understand the role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean/Chair. These principles and assumptions are addressed in Question 1 of this study.

Jahnke (2005) claims that Bindle’s (1986) definition of a role as a set of prescriptions defining what the behaviour of a position member should be is not comprehensive enough to understand role behaviour in social systems. Jahnke’s (2005) view is that a role has the following four dimensions as summarized:

1. Position: the hierarchy level within an organization, which is linked to certain functions or tasks.
2. Function/Tasks: work assignments/tasks, usually explicitly documented that are expected behaviours associated with the role.
3. Behavioural Expectations: activity associated with the role performed outside of the formal job description. This includes expectations that are not explicitly defined.
4. Social Interactions: the ability of the role owner to actively shape the role that he/she has assumed within the social system. The role owner transfers the role into concrete behaviour based on interactions with others, thus, individual participants fill the same role slightly differently.

In addition to addressing the two principles and four assumptions associated with role theory, where appropriate, a component of this study will review the role of the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair within the framework of the four dimensions associated with organizational role theory as defined by Jahnke (2005).
Understanding the role of the Associate Dean/Chair is a vital component in developing a leadership competency based model to assist them to lead change in the Ontario CAAT system. Only once the role is clearly defined, and challenges associated with the role identified, would it be possible to articulate the leadership competencies required to be successful at this mid-level administrator position. Mapping the findings of the study against the two principles associated with organizational role theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Biddle, 1986) and against the four assumptions associated with role theory (Parker & Wickham, 2005) provides a clearer understanding of the responsibilities and challenges associated with the role. Research Question 1 will attempt to gain a deeper understanding of the role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean/Chair.

**Transformational Leadership Theory**

Choosing an appropriate leadership theory through which to frame this research proved challenging as there is a large amount of literature written on the topic (Yukl, 2002). However, based on existing competency based leadership development programs that have already taken place for mid-managers and chairs in community college settings in the United States (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2005; Bechtel, 2010; Filan, 2002; Pielstick 1995), transformational leadership theory is a logical conceptual framework through which to frame this study. Pielstick (1995) originally developed a college administrator’s competency based leadership development program based on transformational leadership. Filan (2002) used transformational leadership theory as the basis for the Chair Academy’s Leadership Program for Chairs based on a competency model (Chair Academy, 2015). (This is the program that I have already participated in.) The AACC’s (2005) competency based leadership development program is also drawn from transformational leadership theory. Finally, Bechtel (2010) employed transformational leadership theory as the conceptual framework for his analysis on the effectiveness of a leadership competency development program for Chairs at a large American college. The preceding examples of utilizing transformational leadership theory as a conceptual framework for developing competency based leadership
programs for mid-level college administrators and chairs confirms its relevance to this study.

Transformational leadership theory began with the work of James Burns (1978) in his study of the leadership qualities of American presidents. He juxtaposed transformational leadership with transactional leadership which he viewed as opposite ends of the spectrum. The concept of transformational leadership was refined (and made popular) by Bernard Bass (1985) who refined Burns’ ideas. Bass (1999) states, “Transformational leadership refers to the leader moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration” (p. 11). He identifies four components of transformational leadership:

1. Intellectual Stimulation. Transformational leaders not only challenge the status quo; they also encourage creativity among followers. The leader encourages followers to explore new ways of doing things and new opportunities to learn.

2. Individualized Consideration. Transformational leadership also involves offering support and encouragement to individual followers. In order to foster supportive relationships, transformational leaders keep lines of communication open so that followers feel free to share ideas and so that leaders can offer direct recognition of each follower’s unique contributions.

3. Inspirational Motivation. Transformational leaders have a clear vision that they are able to articulate to followers. These leaders are also able to help followers experience the same passion and motivation to fulfill these goals.

4. Idealized Influence. The transformational leader serves as a role model for followers. Because followers trust and respect the leader, they emulate this individual and internalize his or her ideals. (p. 11)

Further explanation and rationale for using transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985, Burns, 1978) as a theoretical leadership framework for this paper will be provided in the literature review (Chapter 2). Primarily, transformational leadership theory will apply to Research Question 2a. Leadership competencies identified as significant by Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs will compared to transformational leadership theory concepts looking for associations and contrasts.
Process for Leading Change

This study is referred to as leading change from the middle. John P. Kotter is considered by many to be one of the world’s leading experts on the topic of leading change. The Harvard Business School (n.d.) website describes him in the following manner, “John P. Kotter is internationally known and widely regarded as the foremost speaker on the topics of Leadership and Change. His is the premier voice on how the best organizations actually achieve successful transformations” (para. 1). Kotter (1996) establishes an 8-stage process of leading major change initiatives:

1. Establishing a sense of urgency
2. Creating the guiding coalition
3. Developing a vision and strategy
4. Communicating the change vision
5. Empowering broad based action
6. Generating short-term wins
7. Consolidating gains and producing more change
8. Anchoring new approaches in the culture. (p. 21)

Research Question 2 refers to the leadership competencies required by Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles. Question 2b refers specifically to the competencies required to lead the changes currently taking place in the system. The findings of this study will be compared to Kotter’s eight stages of change with commentary provided as to whether the competencies required by Associate Deans/Chairs to help them successfully navigate the changes currently taking place in the Ontario college CAAT system are reflected in Kotter’s model. Further elaboration on leading change associated with academic leadership is contained in the literature review section of this paper.

Systems Thinking Theory

This study is focussed on leading change within the context of the Ontario CAAT system and therefore requires knowledge of systems thinking. Berdrow (2010) acknowledges that although we have made progress in understanding the role of the
academic chair, “few studies have considered them from the perspective of the individual taking on that role within the context of the organization as a system” (p. 499). Peter Senge’s (1990) work is highly regarded in terms of clarifying systems thinking. Senge refers to systems thinking as being able to see the big picture, seeing the forest and the trees. He claims, “The art of systems thinking lies in seeing through complexity to the underlying structures generating change” (p. 128). He further expands his definition saying, “Systems thinking is a discipline for seeing wholes, it is a framework for seeing interrelationships rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than static snapshots” (p. 68). Research Questions 1 and 2 both refer to role of the Associate Dean/Chair with the Ontario CAAT system. The findings of this study (particularly Question 2c) will be analysed to determine whether an understanding and practice of Senge’s theory of systems thinking, would assist Associate Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles. (Further elaboration of systems thinking theory is contained in the literature review section of this paper).

Summary

This study is based on a study of leadership competencies that will assist Associate Deans/Chairs to successfully lead change in the Ontario CAAT system. To that end, the findings from the study shall be mapped against the following theoretical constructs.

1. organizational role theory (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978) addressed by Research Questions 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d.
2. transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) addressed by Research Questions 2a and 2b.
3. 8-stage process for leading change (Kotter, 1996) addressed by Research Questions 2b and 3b.
4. systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990) addressed by Research Question 2c.

The following explanation outlines how the data for this study is correlated within the four theoretical frameworks:
1. Changes in the Ontario CAAT system have affected the role of the Associate Dean/Chair. Changes include:
   a. Advancement of degrees
   b. Movement towards polytechnic model
   c. Applied research agenda
   d. International students
   e. On-line course delivery
   f. Budget constraints
   g. Enrollment challenges

2. This is creating confusion to the role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean/Chair. The role is defined through the principles and assumptions associated with ORT:
   Principles:
   a. Role expectations are reflective of organizations culture?
   b. Role has been effectively communicated, understood and accepted?
   Assumptions:
   a. Employees accepts a role that is conferred upon them by members of the organization (the role-taking assumption)
   b. There will be consensus regarding the expectations of all roles (the role-consensus assumption)
   c. Employees will comply to the behaviour that is expected (the role-compliance assumption)
   d. Role-conflict will arise if expectations are not consensual (the role-conflict assumption)

3. Leadership Competencies are needed in order for the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean Chair to be successful. The competencies identified are compared/contrasted to the following theoretical leadership constructs:
   a. transformational leadership theory
   b. process for leading change
   c. systems thinking theory

4. The Ontario Associate Dean/Chair develops the competencies to effectively lead change from the middle of the institution.

5. The development of the competencies assists the Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles.

Figure 1 illustrates the preceding mapping of the theoretical frameworks used.
Scope and Limitations of the Research

This study takes place within the boundaries of the Ontario CAAT system and therefore only examines academic mid-management leadership from an Ontario
perspective (as opposed to a national or international study). It is not apparent to me whether college systems in other provinces are experiencing the same level of change that we are experiencing here in Ontario. I acknowledge that there are differences between Ontario’s college system and systems in other provinces; however, this study will only focus on leadership competencies associated with mid-management college administrators in Ontario’s system. It should be noted that there might be extremely different findings if the research were to be conducted in other provinces, or in other countries for that matter.

Of significance is the fact that this paper begins with my declaring that I hold the strong personal belief that colleges should do more to assist Associate Deans/Chairs build the necessary leadership competencies required to be successful in their roles as they navigate changes currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system. Caution was taken to ensure that my opinion was not revealed so as not to influence participants of this study, or to skew the data collection tools used. This declaration might have potentially negatively affected the willingness of certain institutions to allow their Associate Deans/Chairs to participate. It is unlikely that any institution would want it publicly acknowledged that their academic middle-managers lack certain leadership competencies. Care was given to inviting participation in the study from the perspective of creating positive change for the entire Ontario CAAT system. There was also attention given to ensuring that all participants’ identities remained anonymous and that institutions were not directly referred to by name. Strategies of how this was achieved is expanded on in the methodology section in Chapter 3 of this paper.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, is the acknowledgement of my own bias in this study. I clearly state that in my personal experience, I do not believe I was provided with the opportunities to develop the leadership competencies crucial to success in the position. There is a place for my own perspective in the recommendations section of this paper where I believe it is relevant to compare the results of the findings to the literature and against my own experiences; however, great care was given so that I did not influence the data gathered by asserting my own beliefs. It was of prime importance to
ensure that data was gathered in a non-biased and objective manner and that my personal viewpoints did not unduly influence the results.

**Chapter Summary**

Chapter 1 outlines what I consider is currently a shortcoming in the Ontario CAAT system. I do not believe that college academic middle-management administrators, Associate Deans and/or Chairs, are adequately provided opportunities to develop the leadership competencies required to be as successful as they might otherwise be. This challenge is framed against the backdrop of significant changes that are currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system. A review of the changes include college’s being granted authority to offer degrees, the new emphasis on applied research and the differentiated status granted to institutions. Many colleges are also experiencing other changes such as an increase in international students, more on-line course delivery, enrollment challenges, demographic shifts (such as the high numbers of mature students that attend Fanshawe) and budget shortfalls.

This study therefore sought to understand the current responsibilities and challenges associated with the role of the Associate Dean/Chair, and to explore leadership competencies that would help them to be successful as they navigate changes currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system.

Chapter 2 will focus on a review of the literature pertinent to this subject, particularly an understanding of the role of the Associate Dean/Chair, the challenges associated with middle management from an academic viewpoint, a review of leadership competencies associated with the role, and a review of various leadership constructs evident from the study questions, specifically transformational leadership, process for leading change and systems thinking as they relate to dealing with change taking place within the current Ontario CAAT system.
Terms and Definitions

Associate Dean. Mid-level college administrator who works within the college system. The position is usually responsible for the management of an academic unit or a school within a college or ITAL and reports to a Dean.

Chair. Mid-level college administrator who works within the college system. The position is usually responsible for the management of an academic unit or a school within a college or ITAL and reports to a Dean. There are sometimes small distinctions between the salary pay-bands of Associate Deans and Chairs; however they are minimal and many institutions do not abide by these recommendations. (Confirmed in personal conversations between myself and various Heads of HR in Ontario colleges.) (See Fanshawe College job posting, Appendix B.)

Note. For the purpose of this study, the terms Associate Dean and Chair shall be deemed interchangeable. As demonstrated in the analysis of institutional documentation, some Ontario colleges refer to this position as Associate Dean and some refer to it as Chair. (The position is considered the same within the Ontario college system, with each college introducing slight variations regardless of the title. [Personal correspondence with Linda Ballantyne, Executive Director, Human Resources Fanshawe College, 2012.])

Change Management. In an article for the Harvard Business review, Kotter (2007) claims that defining change management has, “gone under many banners: total quality management, reengineering, rightsizing, restructuring, cultural change, and turnaround” (p. 2). However, he claims the underlying goal is almost always the same, so for the purposes of this paper, I use Kotter’s definition of change management which is, “to make fundamental changes in how business is conducted in order to help cope with a new, more challenging market environment” (p. 2).

Competencies. “The fundamental knowledge, abilities, values and skills associated with a specific area” (Bechtel, 2010, p. 20).

Difference between University and College Chair and/or Associate Dean. A University Chair is a faculty member who temporarily holds the position of Chair, but then returns to faculty and remains part of the faculty bargaining unit (Boyko, 2009).
However, an Ontario CAAT Associate Dean/Chair is a full-time administrative position (as identified in the Fanshawe job posting, Appendix B). Due to the permanent nature of the position, and the implied authority associated with the administrative levels, there will be differences as well as similarities associated the roles of University level and College level Chairs.

Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO). “Created through the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario Act, 2005, HEQCO is an agency of the Government of Ontario that brings evidence-based research to the continued improvement of the postsecondary education system in Ontario. As part of its mandate, HEQCO evaluates the postsecondary sector and provides policy recommendations to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities to enhance the access, quality and accountability of Ontario’s colleges and universities” (HEQCO, 2015, para. 2).

Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (ITAL). Certain Ontario colleges that have been granted authority from the MTCU to offer 15% degree activity in their programming. Colleges Ontario’s website identifies the following institutions as ITALs in Ontario: Humber, Sheridan, and Conestoga (Colleges Ontario, n.d.).

Leadership. Defining Leadership is next to impossible as the topic is one of the most popular in modern literature and there is a plethora of information available. Gary Yukl (2002), one of the most acknowledged experts on the topic states, “Researchers usually define leadership according to their individual perspectives and the aspects of the phenomenon of most interest to them” (p. 3).

It would be difficult to personally define leadership without considering the context of this study. To that end, for the purpose of this study, based on his intensive research on the topic, Yukl’s (2002) definition appears the most plausible. In an effort ensure that leadership is treated as both a specialized role and as a social influence process, Yukl defines leadership in the following manner, “Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives” (p. 9).
Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU). The Ontario ministry responsible for post-secondary education. In the area of postsecondary education, the Ontario College Quality Assurance Service (n.d.) states MTCU is responsible for:

planning and administering policies related to basic and applied research in this sector...distributing funds allocated by the provincial legislature to colleges and universities...registering private career colleges. (para. 3)

Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT) system. The province’s 24 colleges of applied arts and technology (CAAT). CAATs in Ontario include: Algonquin, Collège Boréal, Cambrian, Canadore, Centennial, La Cité collégiale, Conestoga, Confederation, Durham, Fanshawe, Fleming, George Brown, Georgian, Humber, Lambton, Loyalist, Mohawk, Niagara, Northern, St. Clair, St. Lawrence, Sault, Seneca, and Sheridan (Colleges Ontario, 2014).

Polytechnic Institution. Can be generically defined as a hybrid between a college and a university offering a wide range of credentials including (but not limited to) certificates, diplomas and degrees. The Polytechnics Canada (2015) website claims:

Polytechnics Canada is the voice of leading research-intensive, publicly funded colleges and institutes of technology. We are dedicated to helping colleges and industry create jobs for tomorrow. Located in Canada’s key economic regions, the current eleven member colleges and institutes of Polytechnics Canada are: British Columbia Institute of Technology (BCIT), Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT), SAIT Polytechnic, Saskatchewan Polytechnic, Red River College, Conestoga Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, Sheridan Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, Humber College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, George Brown College, Seneca College and Algonquin College of Applied Arts and Technology. (para. 1)

Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB). An arms-length advisory agency that makes recommendations to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities of Ontario on applications for ministerial consent under the terms of the Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act, 2000 (para. 1).

Role. For the purpose of this paper, the definition of role provided by Jahnke (2005) who builds on the work of Biddle (1986) shall be used. Jahnke states, “A role is
the sum of all behavioural expectations of a social system towards the concrete owner of a role. He/she is in a certain position, which is linked to tasks and functions” (p. 625).

*Transformational Leadership*. Based on a review of the literature (see Chapter 2), transformational leadership theory proved the most appropriate theoretical framework related to this study. Bass (1999) considered to be the founder of modern transformational leadership theory defines it as such:

Transformational leadership refers to the leader moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration. It elevates the follower’s level of maturity and ideals as well as concerns for achievement, self-actualization, and the well-being of others, the organization, and society. (p.11)
CHAPTER 2.

Review of the Literature

“I beg your pardon, I never promised you a rose garden” are the lyrics from the classic country-western song made famous by Lynn Anderson. Gillet-Karam (2002) states, “She could very well be talking about midlevel management in community colleges. This job is all about relationships, and it doesn’t promise a rose garden” (p. 5).

The purpose of this study was to explore the leadership competencies that would help Associate Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles as they navigate the changes currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system. A review of the pertinent literature therefore required a review of the following subject areas:

1. The role and responsibilities of the Associate Dean/Chair
2. Challenges and rewards associated with middle management
3. Leadership development opportunities for academic middle managers
4. Transformational leadership theory
5. Process for Leading Change: particularly as it relates to academic middle managers
6. Systems thinking theory: as the study is situated within the change currently taking place within the CAAT system

Role and Responsibilities of the Associate Dean/Chair

In examining the role of the Chair in the Ontario CAAT system, a reasonable starting point was to review the responsibilities associated with an existing position as listed on a recent job posting at Fanshawe College (see Appendix B for specifics). Most of the responsibilities were predetermined through the college’s human resources department and are consistent with all Chair positions at Fanshawe. The expectations associated with the role are:
• Contribute to enrollment growth for the college
• Inspire and strengthen teamwork and cross-school collaboration
• Enhance the student experience at Fanshawe, passion for student success
• Demonstrate progressive administration/leadership experience
• Establish strong working relationships, partnerships, alliances with related stakeholder groups/community
• Knowledge of program/curriculum design and development; program planning
• Experience with budget management
• Effective leadership and team building skills (integrity/credibility; foresight/vision)
• Ability to rally others around a shared vision; and ability to deliver results
• Political savvy and strong negotiating and conflict-resolution skills
• Excellent interpersonal and communication skills
• Collegial and collaborative management approach

Ironically, there is no mention of leading change or systems thinking referred to in the job posting, yet they are two primary competencies associated with the role of the Associate Dean/Chair that this paper seeks to examine. Regardless of the lack of reference to leading change or systems thinking, many of the characteristics identified in the Chair position at Fanshawe are congruent with much of what has been identified in the literature as will be demonstrated in the following segments.

Previous Studies

To my knowledge, there has not been an extensive study exploring the role of the Associate Dean/Chair in the Ontario CAAT system to date. There has been a major study conducted on the role of the Chair in Canadian universities by Lydia Boyko (2009), and while there are similarities between the roles, there are also major distinctions. The most significant difference is that a university Chair is a faculty member who temporarily occupies the Chair role and then returns to faculty, while an Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair is a permanent administrator. As previously noted, many college Associate Dean/Chairs are promoted to their administrative roles from the ranks of faculty which
presents its own set of challenges. More discussion on the topic of transitioning from faculty to administration will be explored later in this review of the literature.

There has been a considerable amount of work done, primarily in the United States, in regards to understanding and defining the role of the Chair in both community colleges and universities. It would be unreasonable to review every study conducted but, for the purposes of this paper, a chronological review of some of the influential studies forms a rational context from which to explore the role of the Chair. The following studies were all conducted in the U.S. unless otherwise noted. (A summary of these studies is provided at the end of this section.)

An early major study of the Chair role was conducted by Tucker in 1981, with subsequent editions in 1984 and 1992 (Tucker, 1992). Tucker’s work originally identified 28 roles that Chairs assume to some degree, with the list being expanded to 54 roles in the 1992 (3rd ed.) of his work. Major tasks that Chairs perform identified by Tucker include departmental governance, faculty recruitment and selection, student recruitment and selection, preparation of budgets, preparation of annual reports, and professional development. Tucker also presented findings on various leadership styles associated with the Chair role, and how different leadership styles determined leadership behaviour.

A substantive study was conducted on the role of the Chair by Moore et al. (1985). Their study involved sampling 2,048 administrators from 1,219 public and private community colleges exploring the backgrounds, roles, and challenges associated with the position. Of the many issues the survey addressed, the internal responsibilities of: financial management, faculty development, student recruitment and retention, administrator training and career development, collective bargaining issues, admissions standards and resource allocation all surfaced as major themes. It is extraordinary how the more things change, the more they remain the same. Many of these issues identified back in 1985 are equally relevant today as evidenced in the Fanhawe job posting previously reviewed.

Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, and Beyer (1990) developed one the more significant pieces of work related to this topic. In their book, The Academic
Chairperson’s Handbook, they identify 97 activities associated with the role of the Chair. The study involved 200 department Chairs from 70 colleges and universities where they developed 15 strategies grouped into three categories: preparing for the Chair position; role as academic leader; and creating a positive and interpersonal work relationship. The strategies associated with the role as academic leader include: establishing a collective department vision; developing faculty ownership of the vision; initiating change slowly; allocating resources of time, information, and assignments to encourage vision; and monitoring the progress toward vision achievement. The aforementioned strategy of creating a shared sense of vision is referenced in the Fanshawe posting while as previously stated, the reference to managing change is not. They also encourage implementing an orientation program for new Chairs where they can learn from the experience of existing Chairs stating, “Consider starting an orientation program on your campus if one does not already exist. Individuals typically learn the role from practical experience, and veteran chairs have much to offer in the way of practical tips” (p. 112).

Gmelch and Burns (1993) conducted a study involving 808 university Chairs from 101 institutions that focussed on aspects of the role that caused stress. Using the Department Chair Stress Index (DCSI) of 22 stress-related items, the top 13 stress factors identified by 40% or more of the Chairs as serious included:

- Having too heavy a workload; obtaining program/financial approval;
- keeping current in my discipline; complying with institutional rules; job interfering with personal time; making decisions affecting others;
- excessively high expectations; resolving collegial differences; evaluating faculty performance; completing paperwork on time; preparing manuscripts/presentations; meetings taking too much time; telephone and visitor interruptions. (p. 8)

Many of the stress factors indicated align with the challenges that Associate Dean/Chairs face today as I previously described in Chapter 1; notably, the overwhelming nature of the work, complying with institutional rules, and the need to obtain financial approval.

In a subsequent paper from Gmelch and Gates (1995), role ambiguity surfaced as another leading cause of stress for Chairs. They found, “Role ambiguity is the only stress factor showing an influential relationship with two Chair performance areas, management and faculty leadership” (p. 27). I have not previously mentioned role ambiguity as a
challenge faced by Associate Dean/Chair in this paper, but it is certainly something I have personally experienced. They go on to state, “If deans expect department chairs to perform well, then the role ambiguity inherent in the chair position needs to be addressed” (p. 27). From their research (congruent with my personal experience), defining the Associate Dean/Chair position is difficult, and the ambiguity associated with the role makes the already stressful job, all the more difficult.

Seagren et al. (1993) led some of the more influential work on defining the role of the Chair in American universities and colleges, and more specifically on identifying implications for leadership development. They present their findings based on existing literature and research. Chairs reported the following as common tasks and functions associated with the role based on their perceptions: internal administration, budgeting and planning, personnel administration and communications, recruiting, evaluation, program development, decision making, organization, leadership ability, governance of department, instruction, faculty affairs, student affairs, professional development, and motivator. Many of these activities share commonalities to what has been previously discussed, as well as with the Fanshawe posting.

In addition, the study explores various leadership theories associated with the Chair role: natural leaders, organizational behaviour, and organizational environment. Certain findings of their work related to leadership were incorporated into the curriculum for the Chair Academy that will be further discussed in the next section. Their study also explored the role that power and politics, both internal and external, play on the role of the Chair. Finally, the study presented findings on the type of institution, the training and development of department Chairs, department topologies, and the impact of discipline on the role of the Chair. Much of this work, while pertinent, relates to the roles and responsibilities of chairs in 4-year institutions, and does not specifically relate to community and technical college Chairs.

To that end, the Chair Academy, under the direction of Gary Filan (1999), contacted Alan Seagren with the intention of completing a further survey specifically focussed on the department Chair in a community and technical college setting. The survey (Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, & VanHorn-Grasmeyer, 1994) was
designed to develop a profile of the characteristics of department Chairs, identify implications for leadership development, and identify areas for future understanding of the Chair position. The study returned a response rate of 30% from a sample of 9,000 with a demographic profile of 3,000 community college Chairs from the United States and Canada. The Chairs reported roles that were grouped into three major clusters: interpersonal role, related to communication skills; administrator role, related to resource allocation, evaluator, negotiator, and conflict resolver; and the leader role, related to visionary, motivator, entrepreneur, delegator and planer.

Other relevant findings from the survey include the following. Dominant themes identified by community college Chairs as very important or important were: planning, work environment, curriculum selection and feedback to faculty, communication, personal and professional goals, and professional development for faculty. Ten skills identified in the survey as important for Chairs to have included: problem analysis, judgement, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, stress tolerance, oral communication, written communication, and educational values. The top 4 challenges faced by Chairs were determined to be: maintaining program quality, strengthening the curriculum, maintaining a high-quality faculty, and changing the curriculum in response to technological development.

There are other more recent studies that have been conducted related to the role of the Chair; however, the preceding review satisfies an important requirement of this review; that is, verifying that the responsibilities associated with the Chair role as listed on the Fanshawe posting (Appendix B) are fairly congruent with the findings in the literature. More importantly, many of the findings from these studies, specifically the survey from Seagren et al. (1994) and the work of Tucker (1992), were used by Gary Filan (1999) and his team to developed the curriculum for the Chair Academy. This is of extreme significance as the Chair Academy is the premier professional development vehicle used to train new Associate Deans/Chairs in the Ontario CAAT system. The focus of the Academy is to provide Associate Deans/Chairs with an opportunity to develop leadership competencies to help them be successful in their roles. Both Fanshawe and Humber send Associate Deans/Chairs and potential Associate
Deans/Chairs to the Academy. I personally attended one of the Chair Academies. A more fulsome description of the Academy and a reflection on my experiences there are further discussed later in this chapter.

A study from Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, and Tucker (1999) identified that one of the main responsibilities associated with the Chair role involves advocating for their departments, faculty and students. This role of advocate is not mentioned in the Fanshawe posting. They also find the role to be multifaceted stating that:

The lengthy list of department chair responsibilities can be organized into the following categories: department governance and office management; curriculum and program development; faculty matters; student matters; communication with external publics; financial and facilities management; data management; and institutional support. (p. 8)

A study from Graham and Benoit (2004) focused on constructing the role of the department Chair, written specifically for the American Council of Education (ACE) Department Chair Online Resource Center, found similar results. Interviews with Chairs from four universities identified the following four roles associated with the position: administrative, leadership, interpersonal, and resource development.

An interesting study was conducted by Gillett-Karam et al. (1999) where Rosemary Gillett-Karen interviews six U.S. community college presidents regarding the role of the Chair. One of the Presidents, Donald Cameron defines the role in the following way:

To function effectively as a department chair, an individual must possess excellent leadership, management, facilitation, mediation, communication, planning and organizational, evaluation, instruction, public and student relations, and supervision skills. The chair’s position and duties are so broad and comprehensive, that all known skills must be utilized by the successful department chair. (p. 38)

Bowman (2002) found comparable results confirming the complexity of the role stating, “The real work of academic chairs demands a diverse set of leadership capabilities: well-honed communication skills, problem-solving skills, conflict-resolution skills, cultural-management skills, coaching skills, and transition-management skills” (p. 161). These
studies, while acknowledging the difficulty of the role, also affirm that many of the core duties associated with the position remain relatively consistent.

In a study on the role of the Chair in two North Carolina colleges, Edwards (2006) investigated the roles, and leadership implications through a series of intensive interviews. The following characteristics associated with the role were ranked in order by how many times they were commented on during the interviews: Supervisor, Troubleshooter, Scheduler, Information Disseminator, Evaluator, Resource Allocator, Liaison, Teacher, Developer, Recruiter, Advisor and Advocate. Many of the responsibilities would be associated with management duties; however some are clearly related specifically to leadership, notably teaching and advising.

One of the most extensive studies done on the role of the Chair in Canadian universities, to my knowledge, was conducted by Lydia Boyko (2009) who investigated the position in terms of determining the role of Chairs, examining their backgrounds, and leadership required of the role. She found the top-10 tasks as reported by Chairs in her study to be:

1. Participating in department meetings
2. Recruiting faculty and other staff
3. Implementing department plans
4. Championing the unit
5. Maintaining morale
6. Developing departmental plans
7. Remaining current in the discipline
8. Encouraging good teaching
9. Managing faculty tenure, promotion
10. Dealing with serious performance issues

(p. 260)

She finds the top-10 list heavily dominated by managerial tasks, stating that “only two priorities on the list—morale and teaching—are directly people oriented, although it can be argued that nine of the 10 activities deal with concerns of people in the unit” (p. 260).
In a local study at a private university in the northeast region of the U.S., Berdrow (2010) examined the roles of the 21 department Chairs and the leadership competencies that would assist them in their roles. In addition to interviewing the Chairs, her team used a 360 survey tool to solicit feedback from other stakeholders. Further exploration of the leadership competencies she exposed will be addressed at a later section in this paper, but in regards to the role of the Chair she found six main categories associated with the position. Four of the categories were found to be managerial in nature:

1. Faculty Development
2. Student Development
3. Communication and Representation
4. Operations and Administration

And two of the categories were more of found to be more transformational leadership in nature:

1. Climate Enhancement
2. Catalyst for Innovation

Of interest, she found that:

In conducting the data collection and analysis it became clear that the normal practice of identifying an incoming chair and transitioning them into the position within the span of a few months was ineffective. Incoming department chairs needed time to embrace the expectations of the role, acquire the knowledge and shadow the current department chairs to learn the procedures. (p. 507)

As previously stated, there are distinctions between the role of Chair in a University and a Chair in an Ontario community college; primarily, Chair’s in colleges are permanent administrators (Edwards, 2006) while university Chairs are faculty members who hold the position temporarily and then return to faculty (Boyko, 2009).

Summary

This section of the literature review addresses Research Question 1 of this study, that is, an exploration of the responsibilities and backgrounds associated with the role of
Chair in the Ontario CAAT system. There are countless articles and many studies related to defining the role of the Academic Chair (Dyer & Miller, 1999); however, this review focusses on the more influential studies, while also acknowledging some recent work (Bowman 2002; Boyko, 2009; Edwards, 2006).

A review of the literature finds that certain characteristics of the role fluctuate based on when and where the studies were conducted, the type and size of institution and geographical location. However, the review also revealed that there are many characteristics associated with the role that remain fairly consistent, and that many of these characteristics are reflected in the Fanshawe posting.

Some of the common themes referenced throughout the literature that are also referred to in the Fanshawe posting include:

- Commitment to student success
- Progressive administration/leadership experience
- Establish strong working relationships, partnerships, alliances with related stakeholder groups/community
- Knowledge of program/curriculum design and development; program planning
- Experience with budget and resource management;
- Effective leadership and team building skills
- Ability to rally others around a shared vision
- Political savvy and strong negotiating and conflict-resolution skills
- Excellent interpersonal and communication skills
- Collegial and collaborative management approach

There are also some major themes referenced through the literature that are not referenced in the Fanshawe posting including:

- Advocating for the department

One of the requirements listed on the Fanshawe posting relates specifically to enhancing enrollments, yet this was not a theme that was prevalent in the literature. The declining enrollment demographic experienced by certain Ontario CAATs such as Fanshawe is one
of the changes currently occurring in the college system that Associate Deans/Chairs now have to address.

The results of the research conducted, as a result of this study, were compared and contrasted to the preceding findings to determine if the changes currently taking place within the Ontario CAAT system has significantly altered the role and responsibilities of the Associate Dean/Chair.

It is important to once again note, as referenced by Filan (1999) and Stone and Coussons-Read (2011), that most of the studies related to the role of the Associate Dean/Chair stress just how little training and support they receive when they begin the job, and how unprepared they are when they assume the role. Miller and Seagren (1997) emphasises this point emphatically stating, “the need remains to vigorously examine the career preparation of community college Chairs and determine a grounding point for developing a theoretical base for providing training to Chairs” (p. 495). This confirms my assertion that there is a need to provide effective training to enhance the leadership competencies of Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs in order to help them be more successful in their roles.

Table 1 provides a summary of the management and leadership responsibilities associated with the role of Associate Dean and/or Chair.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (publications)(^a)</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Management Functions(^b)</th>
<th>Leadership Qualities(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tucker (1992) | Examines various types of departments and chair leadership styles, grounded in empirical research. | • Extensive list of actual activities and tasks organizes 54 duties into eight areas:  
• Departmental governance (e.g., conduct departmental meetings)  
• Instruction (e.g., schedule classes)  
• Faculty affairs (e.g., recruit and select faculty members)  
• Student affairs (e.g., advise students)  
• External communication (e.g., improve and maintain the department's image and reputation)  
• Budget and resources (e.g., seek outside funding)  
• Office management (e.g., monitor building security and maintenance)  
• Professional development (e.g., stimulate faculty research and publication) | • Change agent  
• Teacher  
• Mentor  
• Advisor-counsellor  
• External liaison  
• Planner  
• Motivator  
• Innovator  
• Peacemaker  
• Entrepreneur  
• Peer-colleague  
• Consultant |
| Moore et al. (1985) | Study based on a sample of 2,049 administrators in 2-year colleges. Conducted by the Centre for the Study of Higher Education to analyze the employment backgrounds, career aspirations, career paths, and concerns. | • Financial management  
• Faculty development  
• Student recruitment and retention  
• Administrator training and career development  
• Collective bargaining issues  
• Admissions standards  
• Resource allocation | • Acknowledges, there has not been adequate research done related to leadership for midlevel college administrators.  
• Study raises more questions than it answers about leadership in community college administration. |
| Creswell et al. (1990) | Study involving 235 department Chairs from 70 colleges and universities. 15 strategies to assist Chairs grouped into three categories: preparing for the Chair position; role as academic leader; and creating a positive and interpersonal work relationship | • Evaluator  
• Advocate  
• Liaison  
• Professional developer  
• Resource Allocator | • Change Agent/Catalyst  
• Listener  
• Role Model  
• Mentor  
• Coach/Motivator Collaborator  
• Feedback Provider  
• Establishing a collective department vision  
• Developing faculty ownership of the vision |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (publications)</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Management Functions</th>
<th>Leadership Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gmelch & Burns (1993) | Study involving 808 university Chairs from 101 institutions that focused on aspects of the role that caused stress. | Causes of stress:  
  • Having too heavy a workload  
  • Obtaining program/financial approval  
  • Keeping current in my discipline  
  • Complying with institutional rules  
  • Job interfering with personal time  
  • Making decisions affecting others  
  • Excessively high self-expectations  
  • Resolving collegial differences  
  • Evaluating faculty performance  
  • Completing paperwork on time  
  • Preparing manuscripts/presentations  
  • Telephone and visitor interruptions  
  • Meetings taking too much time |  
  • Providing long-term direction and vision for the department  
  • Soliciting ideas to improve the department  
  • Working with their external constituents to coordinate department activities  
  • Leader  
  • Scholar |
| Gmelch & Miskin (1993) | Three studies conducted by the Center for the Study of the Department Chair at Washington State University, using both interviews and surveys. |  
  • Preparing budgets  
  • Maintaining department records  
  • Assigning duties to faculty  
  • Supervising non-academic staff  
  • Faculty developer  
  • Maintaining finances, facilities, and equipment  
  • Planning and evaluating curriculum development  
  • Conducting departmental meetings  
  • Representing the department at professional meetings  
  • Participating in college and university committees |  
  • Providing long-term direction and vision for the department  
  • Soliciting ideas to improve the department  
  • Working with their external constituents to coordinate department activities  
  • Leader  
  • Scholar |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (publications)</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Management Functions</th>
<th>Leadership Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Seagren et al. (1993)  | Review of existing studies related to the roles, responsibilities and challenges associated with the role of Chair in U.S academic institutions. Focused on Chairs in universities and institutions offering 4-year programs. | Duties related to faculty:  
• Recruit and select faculty  
• Prepare and conduct orientation programs  
• Assign faculty responsibilities  
• Encourage development of each faculty member  
• Stimulate faculty research and publications  
• Evaluate faculty performance  
• Provide feedback to faculty  
• Administer merit and salary | • Spoke of the importance of leadership and leadership development  
• Recommends that Chairs gain a clear understanding of the role and tasks before accepting or continuing in the position of chair  
• Advises to have a professional development plan  
• Recommends Chairs to manage their own career plans |
|                       |                  | Duties related to staff:  
• Hire staff  
• Orient staff  
• Evaluate staff |                  |
|                       |                  | Duties related to students:  
• Recruit students  
• Help students register  
• Advise and counsel students |                  |
|                       |                  | Duties related to academic affairs:  
• Prepare for accreditation or program reviews  
• Update curriculum and courses  
• Foster good teaching in unit  
• Promote affirmative action  
• Prepare enrollment projections |                  |
|                       |                  | Duties related to external affairs:  
• Develop relationships with business and community groups  
• Seek external funding  
• Represent department to the public |                  |
|                       |                  | Duties related to finance and facilities:  
• Prepare budget  
• Allocate dollars to priority activities  
• Monitor budget  
• Manage facilities and equipment |                  |
|                       |                  | Duties related to department functions:  
• Build and maintain databases  
• Develop long-range plans  
• Create a positive work environment  
• Communicate needs to upper administration  
• Conduct unit meetings  
• Create unit committees  
• Schedule classes  
• Process paperwork  
• Answer correspondence |                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (publications)(^a)</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Management Functions(^b)</th>
<th>Leadership Qualities(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Seagren et al. (1994)     | Survey with response rate of 30% from a sample of 9,000 with a demographic profile of 3,000 community college Chairs from the United States and Canada. | • Resource allocation  
• Evaluator  
• Negotiator  
• Conflict resolver  
• Delegator | • Visionary  
• Motivator  
• Entrepreneur  
• Planner |
| Hecht et al. (1999)       | Paper written on the roles and responsibilities of the department Chair. Adapted from Chapter 2 of the book, The Department Chair as Academic Leader. | • Department governance and office management  
• Curriculum and program development  
• Faculty matters  
• Student matters  
• Communication with external publics  
• Financial and facilities management  
• Data management  
• Institutional support. | • Leading the department  
• Motivating faculty to enhance productivity  
• Motivating faculty to teach effectively  
• Handling faculty evaluation and feedback  
• Motivating faculty to increase scholarship  
• Motivating faculty to increase service  
• Creating a supportive communication climate  
• Managing conflict  
• Developing chair survival skills  
• Liaison to community  
• Mediator  
• Motivator  
• Excellent communication skills |
| Gillett-Karam et al. (1999) | Study based on interviews with six current and past college presidents about their perceptions of Chairs at their institutions. | • Curriculum and program review  
• Class scheduling  
• Evaluation  
• Hiring  
• Budgeting  
• Faculty professional development  
• Supervision of office and staff  
• Student advisor  
• Committee member |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (publications)</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Management Functions</th>
<th>Leadership Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wolverton, Gmelch, Wolverton, & Sarros (1999) | Study of Australian and U.S. academic department chairs in colleges and universities based on how chairs in the two countries define the tasks that exemplify their role as chair. | Administrative Tasks:  
- Coordinate departmental activities with constituents  
- Plan and evaluate curriculum development  
- Inform faculty of department, college and university concerns  
- Plan and conduct department meetings  
- Assign teaching, research and other related duties to faculty  
Resource Management Tasks:  
- Manage department resources (finances, facilities, equipment)  
- Manage non-academic staff  
- Prepare and propose budgets  
- Assure the maintenance of accurate departmental records | Leadership Tasks:  
- Encourage professional development efforts of faculty  
- Provide informal faculty leadership  
- Maintain conducive work climate which includes reducing conflicts among faculty  
- Encourage faculty research and publication  
- Develop and initiate long-range departmental goals |
- Resource manager  
- Instant problem solver  
- Spokesperson  
- Deep listener  
- Motivator  
- Enabler  
- Meaning maker  
- Systems designer  
- Cultural rainmaker | Academic chairs function as leaders when they focus on key aspects of organizational culture:  
- Mission  
- Vision  
- Engagement  
- Adaptability |
| Filan & Seagren (2003) | Article based on the importance of leadership development opportunities for College mid-level administrators. |  
Six critical issues associated with leadership in higher education serve as the basis for academy training:  
- Understanding self  
- Understanding transformational leadership  
- Establishing and maintaining relationships  
- Leading teams  
- Leading strategic planning and change  
- Connecting through community |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (publications)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Management Functions&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Leadership Qualities&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Edwards (2006)                    | PhD dissertation based on the Department Chair role in the community college. (North Carolina University). | • Supervisor  
• Trouble-shooter Scheduler  
• Information Disseminator  
• Evaluator  
• Resource Allocator  
• Teacher  
• Developer  
• Recruiter  
• Advocate | • Liaison  
• Advisor |
| Boyko (2009)                      | PhD dissertation based on an examination of academic department chairs in Canadian universities. (University of Toronto). | Top-10 duties identified by faculty:  
• Participating in department meetings  
• Recruiting faculty and other staff  
• Implementing department plans  
• Championing the unit  
• Developing departmental plans  
• Remaining current in the discipline  
• Managing faculty tenure, promotion  
• Dealing with serious performance issues | • Maintaining morale  
• Encouraging good teaching |
| Berdrow (2010)                    | Study based on a 360-degree exploration of the role, expectations and competencies of department chairs, carried out at a private business university in the Northeast area of the USA, including both business and liberal arts department chairs. Summarizes the role of the Chair from the perspective of both Actor and Agent. Breaks duties down into six categories: four of which she defines as managerial, and two she defines as related to transformational leadership. | Faculty development:  
• Mentor faculty  
• Support scholarship  
• Support teaching  
Student development:  
• Advising  
• Conflict mediation  
• Outreach  
Communication and representation:  
• Communication link between department and others  
• Represent department in college and beyond  
• Manage flow of information in department Operations and administration:  
• Budget  
• Evaluation  
• Recruitment  
• Reports  
• Resource allocation/scheduling  
• Student administration  
• Staff management | Catalyst/innovation:  
• Lead department implementation of college mission  
• Mobilize departmental resources  
• Link faculty internally and externally  
• Stimulate curriculum  
Climate enhancement:  
• Build department culture  
• Crisis and conflict management  
• Monitor daily life of department  
• Meeting leadership |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (publications)a</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Management Functionsb</th>
<th>Leadership Qualitiesc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fanshawe College, job posting Chair, Language and Liberal Studies (Appendix B). | Operations/management  
- Contribute to enrollment growth for the college  
- Enhance the student experience at Fanshawe, passion for student success  
- Demonstrate progressive administration/leadership experience  
- Establish strong working relationships, partnerships, alliances with related stakeholder groups/community  
- Knowledge of program/curriculum design and development; program planning  
- Experience with budget management  
- Political savvy and strong negotiating and conflict-resolution skills  
- Collegial and collaborative management approach | Leadership/inspirational  
- Inspire and strengthen teamwork and cross-school collaboration  
- Effective leadership and team building skills (integrity/credibility; foresight/vision)  
- Ability to rally others around a shared vision; and ability to deliver results  
- Excellent interpersonal and communication skills |

a Where the author of the study referenced did not differentiate between management and leadership characteristics, Kotter International's (2015) framework was used as a lens through which to filter the responsibilities. The framework is included here again as a reminder.
b Management defined as: Planning, Budgeting, Organizing, Staffing, Measuring, Problem solving, Doing what we know how to do exceptionally well, Producing reliable dependable results constantly.
c Leadership defined as: Establishing direction, Aligning people, Motivating, Inspiring, Mobilizing people to achieve astonishing results, Propelling us into the future.

Challenges (and Rewards) Associated with Middle Management

Communication: Up and Down

The next section of this literature explores the unique challenges (and rewards) associated with middle-management positions, as this is a reflection of the hierarchical level that Associate Deans/Chairs hold in Ontario colleges.

A common challenge faced by middle managers found prominent in the literature is the responsibility of communicating information, often regarding direction or policy, between senior management and direct reports and vice-versa (Fitzgerald, 2009; Herzig & Jimmieson, 2006; Osterman, 2008). Osterman (2008) confirms this stating “middle managers are the communication conduits within organizations” (p. 91). The importance of mastering this communication challenge is crucial for success in the role as emphasized by Stone and Coussons-Read (2011) who explain, “Effective communication
can make the difference between a good outcome and a train wreck when you are dealing with passing layers of information through an organization” (p. 5). McMahon (2008) refers to this challenge of communicating from the middle as the murky swamp squarely in the middle between upper management and front line workers.

This delivering the message from the middle is often taxing as expressed by Herzig and Jimmieson (2006) who found, “some managers reported that conflicting messages from senior management and employees increased their uncertainty and made their role difficult” (p. 637) and by Fitzgerald (2009) who explained that “being a middle manager means I have to translate the views of the boss and make sure my department understands what it we have to do to make things happen” (p. 58). This sometimes leads to suspicion by members of their departments, “who question whether they are really working for the interests of the department or for those of the leadership team” (Bush as cited in Busher, Hammersly-Fletcher, & Turner, 2007, p. 409).

The theme of having to “deliver the message from the middle” appears to be one of the most trying tasks faced by middle managers and appears to be common between academic middle managers and those in the private sector. In reference to the role of the Chair, Craig (2005) states, “The Chair has the intricate challenge of connecting the basic organizational unit to the larger institution, requiring leadership…” (p. 82). This challenge is unique to middle managers as defined by Gillett-Kirram (2002) who finds, “Long considered the buffer between faculty and administration, the chair is more a mediator, communicator, and facilitator than any of the conventional descriptors bestowed on leaders by the literature” (p. 5). This issue of being a conduit between senior management and front line workers is further complicated by the fact that, “operating-level employees tend to view middle managers’ behaviours as being representative of the top” (Tsui, Yang, & Zhang, 2010, p. 659) and this sometimes leads to distrust. Unfortunately, middle managers are not the ones who set agendas; however, they are tasked with carrying them out (Osterman, 2008). The literature supports the notion that one of the greatest challenges faced by middle managers in both the private sector and in academic environments is the issue of communicating the messaging and direction of senior management to front line workers.
Stuck in the Middle

The issue of connecting messaging from senior management to front line workers often leaves middle managers, particularly Chairs and/or Associate Deans with the unenviable sensation of feeling stuck in the middle between the front line personnel that report to them, and senior management to whom they report. This sensation of feeling stuck in the middle was a dominant theme that surfaced in most studies related to the role of the Academic Chair (Buller, 2012; Boyko, 2009; Edwards, 2006; Seagren et al., 1993; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011; Wilson 1999). Buller (2012) states that, “…almost all department chairs find themselves trapped sooner or later between the upper administration and their faculty on an issue with intense disagreement” (p. 152). The perception of being caught between a rock and hard place (Wilson, 1999) is one of the leading causes of stress, particularly for new Chairs who assume the position. Gmelch and Burns (1993) explain this in the following manner, “In effect, the position is like that of the Roman god Janus, with faces oriented in opposite directions, or what others have referred to as a "swivel" effect, not knowing which way to turn” (p. 260).

Sirkis (2011) confirms this challenge associated with the role stating, “Department chairs sit squarely in the middle—between faculty and administration—and have daily interaction with students, faculty, administrators, and staff personnel” (p. 48). The significance of this sensation of feeling stuck in the middle cannot be underestimated. Perhaps Boyko (2009) sums it up most effectively, stating, “the most common longstanding descriptor of the chair’s job has not changed over time: it is a position between a rock and a hard place—the meat in the middle of a sandwich” (p. 40). This concept of middle managers feeling they are stuck in the middle appears valid based on the evidence presented in the literature.

Ambiguity (Leading to Stress)

There are mixed perceptions from both senior management and front-line workers as to what middle managers really do. Much of what they do goes unnoticed and is hard to define as stated by Osterman (2008), “the deeper issue is that much of what they do is relatively invisible and hard to capture in clean measures” (p. 108). Fitzgerald (2009)
found that middle managers in the New Zealand school system were not sure what middle management leadership even meant. Gmelch and Gates (1995) state, “Department chairs hold the classic middle of the road position,” and “the position of chair is viewed differently by faculty, deans, students and department chairs themselves” (p. 3).

Role ambiguity surfaced as a leading cause of stress for Chairs as previously illustrated by Gmelch and Gates (1995). They found, “Role ambiguity is the only stress factor showing an influential relationship with two Chair performance areas, management and faculty leadership” (p. 27). They go on to state, “If Deans expect department Chairs to perform well, then the role ambiguity inherent in the chair position needs to be addressed” (p. 27). Seagren et al. (1993) find, “the multiple expectations of others for Chairs, the ambiguous mandate of the office, the unclear lines of authority, transitional issues of the role, contribute to stresses that accompany the position” (p. 28).

Compounding this issue, middle-management roles typically have a high level of responsibility, yet there is confusion regarding the level of authority they are granted in order to effectively manage that responsibility (Osterman, 2008). Stone and Coussons-Read (2011) claim that the role of Associate Dean is one of considerable responsibility but with ambiguous power. The ambiguity associated with the role of middle managers in both the private sector and in academic environments is an issue that should be corrected in order to alleviate their stress.

**Complexity (and More Stress)**

The role of middle managers, including those in academic institutions, is extremely complex (Filan, 1999; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; McMahon, 2008). Gmelch and Burns (1993) find that, “The university department chair represents one of the most complex, elusive, and intriguing positions” (p. 259). Wilson (1999) refers to the “multiplicity and complexity of the duties of an academic department chair and the stresses caused by these factors” (p. 3). Michelle Malloy, global portfolio manager for the Centre for Creative Leadership’s (CCL) Leadership Development Program, confirms the complexity of the role in the following manner:
“Leadership becomes more complex when you are leading from the middle of an organization for three big reasons” (Malloy as cited in Centre for Creative Leadership, 2010, para. 2):

1. “You have the challenge of getting the top and the bottom of the hierarchy to work together” (para. 3).
2. “You have the challenge of collaborating across the organization” (para. 4).
3. “You have the challenge of a demanding job and demanding roles outside of work” (para. 5).

This complexity leads to further stress. Antonioni (2000) says, “as managers work to keep the operations running, they are frequently called upon to put out fires that arise from crises” (p. 28). As previously referenced, in a study involving 808 University Chairs from 101 institutions that focussed on aspects of the role that caused stress, Gmelch and Burns (1993) found the complexity of the job contributed to the following 13 stress factors identified by 40% or more of the Chairs as serious:

Having too heavy a work load; obtaining program/financial approval; keeping current in my discipline; complying with institutional rules; job interfering with personal time; making decisions affecting others; excessively high expectations; resolving collegial differences; evaluating faculty performance; completing paperwork on time; preparing manuscripts/presentations; meetings taking too much time; telephone and visitor interruptions. (p. 8)

One of the factors compounding the complexity of the role is the fatigue associated with working long hours and lack of control over managing one’s own time (Parris, Vickers, & Wilkes, 2010; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011). Middle managers find that having adequate time management skills becomes moot when supervisors can arbitrarily override their calendars. Added to this, modern technology has added yet another layer of stress to the role. Parris et al. (2010) state that, “The intrusion of paid work into non-work time and space has been particularly accelerated by the development of new technology, such as mobile phones and laptop computers, potentially making people available 24 hours a day” (p. 106). Stone and Coussons-Read (2011) advise Associate Deans against burning the candles at both ends, but claim that certain
individuals find it difficult to refuse work at home in fear of reprisal from their Deans. Gillett-Karam (2002) states that, “burnout and stress are occupational hazards of this job that frequently takes a toll on individuals’ personal lives, health, and outside commitments” p. 5. The complexity of the role and the constant demands on their time (compounded by advancements in technology) all contribute to challenges associated with middle management positions.

**Lack of Understanding and Respect**

Another challenge faced by middle managers is the perception that the position is often not respected. McMahon (2008) explains, “Middle managers are in the unenviable position of holding a position that everyone in the organization believes that they can do better than the middle-manager holding the position” (p. 119). Lack of respect might be a consequence of the fact that much of the work done by middle management is invisible and hard to capture (Osterman, 2008). This lack of respect is sometimes demonstrated by their supervisors who expect middle managers to share information up to senior managers, yet often do not share information back to them. In spite of this lack of sharing information, middle managers are still held accountable. Cawthorne (2010) states, “Despite receiving less information than they give, there is a sense of accountability for the decisions that fall within their scope of responsibilities” (p. 155). Osterman (2008) cites case studies that take this lack of respect one step further and there are suggestions that because of their attachments to functional departments, middle-managers are actually considered burdens to their respective organizations.

**Transitioning from Faculty to Management**

In regards to challenges that are unique to the role of the academic Chair, I find it germane to address an issue referred to earlier regarding the background of most Chairs, that being, that many Chairs are hired into the role from faculty positions (Berdrow, 2010; Boyko, 2009; Filan 1999; Robinson, 1996; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011). Robinson (1996) finds that because of this, many new chairs are more empathetic to faculty concerns than higher level administrators. Berdrow (2010) refers to department
Chairs as “Kings amongst Kings”, underpinning the tenuous relationship that new chairs who have recently been promoted from faculty have with their former faculty colleagues. Stone and Coussons-Read (2011) describes some of the challenges faced by new Chairs who are promoted from faculty stating, “Given that you come from faculty ranks, it is highly likely that you were never trained in the skills supervisors need to deal with conflict, motivating unmotivated employees, dealing with poorly performing individuals etc.” (p. 83). Filan (1999) eloquently illustrates the challenge of transitioning from faculty member to Chair:

Chairs are typically thrust into positions that require behaviors considerably different from those they practiced as faculty members. Three of the most difficult aspects of the job are learning how to shift one’s loyalty from a specific discipline to the institution as a whole, developing the skills to resolve conflicts, and knowing how to build an effective team whose members respect one another and appreciate differences. Unfortunately, few community and technical colleges provide any kind of formalized training to assist either their new or experienced chairs to develop these academic and administrative skills. (p. 48)

I have personal experience with this this as the three chairs who formerly reported to me at Fanshawe were all prior faculty members. Most of my former co-workers who held the rank of Associate Dean at Humber were also hired into their administrative positions from faculty. Many of them struggle with the new relationships they must now manage with their former colleagues, the faculty, who report to them. Gmelch and Miskin (1993) claim:

The drastic differences between the two roles of scholar and administrator help explain the difficulty in making the transition to department chair…These new chair work styles are much different from what you were used to as a faculty member and will take some adjustment. (p. 11)

The transition from faculty to administration is a huge challenge faced by middle managers unique to the academic environment.

**Lack of Leadership Development**

In spite of research validating that performing the role of academic middle manager is no easy task (Filan & Seagren, 2003; Gillett-Karam, 2002) they are seldom
provided with the leadership training that would help them be successful in their roles (Filan 1999; Inman, 2009; Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006). Inman (2009) confirms this observation finding that, “when asked what training and development they had had for their current role, most leader-academics in the sample identified for this research had little positive to say” (p. 422). Wolverton and Ackerman (2006) find that even when middle managers do participate in leadership development opportunities, the programs are seldom of the duration or quality required for them to be effective.

The lack of leadership development opportunities becomes more crucial for Academic middle managers in Ontario colleges as we are entering a time of extreme change within the CAAT system (Clark et al., 2009; Colleges Ontario, 2015a; MTCU, 2013a). Changes include the introduction of the degrees in colleges, an intensified focus on research in colleges, the movement towards differentiation between colleges, an influx of international students, an increase in online course delivery, and fiscal restraints from the provincial government. The current climate of change will make their roles even more pertinent as supported by Hecht et al. (1999) who claim that, “Institutional reliance upon department Chairs as primary change agents and managers will continue to increase as institutions respond to external pressures for productivity and accountability” (p. 15). The lack of appropriate leadership development programs to help middle managers in Ontario colleges’ lead this change is a concern.

**Rewards of Middle Management**

Despite the challenges faced by middle managers, there are substantial rewards associated with the position, including those in academic institutions. Clearly, the roles Chairs play are crucial to success as emphatically stated by Seagren et al. (1993), “An institution can run for a long time with an inept president, but not for long with inept chairpersons” (p. 19). There are many studies confirming that Chairs are the primary link between senior management and faculty and students (Filan, 1997; Sirkis, 2011; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011). They are essential for the success of day-to-day campus activity (Filan, 1999; Inman, 2009; Lindholm, 1999). In a study of mid-level college managers in England, Naylor, Gkolia, and Brundrett (2006) found that “Middle leaders continue to
make a vital contribution to school improvement and have an important role in implementing educational reform” (p. 11).

Middle-managers work closely with and are loyal to the teams they represent (Osterman, 2008). “Middle managers, for example, can have important insights about the organization’s strategy because of their familiarity with operations and the technical aspects” (Anonioni, 2000, p. 29). Fitzgerald (2009) found that middle managers found it exciting that they could influence what actually happens in their organizations. Osterman (2008), also finds that they “make day-to-day choices and trade-offs that escape the attention of top management yet are central to the organization’s performance” (p. 87).

There are clearly many positive characteristics and rewards associated with middle management.

My own personal experiences would once again concur with the findings in the literature. In spite of the many challenges I experienced in my former role as an Associate Dean, the rewards far outweighed the negatives. I felt I made a positive contribution to the success of the organization I worked in; I enjoyed extremely positive relationships with both those who reported to me, and those to whom I reported; and the overwhelming feeling of joy one experiences through serving students cannot be quantified. The literature, combined with my personal experience, confirms that while there are many challenges associated with the role of middle managers, there is also evidence to support that they provide an essential role in the success of their organizations and that there are rewards associated with the position.

Summary

This section of the literature review addresses Research Question 1d, specifically the question related to the challenges associated with the position and the backgrounds of those assuming the position of Associate Dean/Chair. It becomes apparent from a review of the literature that there are significant challenges associated with the role of middle management, and that many of those challenges are shared by middle managers from both the private sector, and those in academic institutions. A summary of the challenges identified includes:
• The challenge of getting front line workers to perform in accordance with management’s strategic decisions made at the senior level, yet having little or no say in creating strategy
• The ambiguity associated with the role
• The time management stresses associated with the role, particularly the blurring of work and home-life that has become more prominent with the advances of technology
• The lack of leadership development opportunities provided for middle managers, particularly Ontario CAAT Chairs and/or Associate Deans as the system is currently experiencing unprecedented change

McMahaon (2008) summarizes the challenges associated with middle management most articulately in the following manner:

They are the warriors in the true sense of the word. They sacrifice so much of themselves and their identity to make organizations work. They battle against insurmountable odds in a pitched battle against unrelenting, insidious forces, both internal and external to the kingdom organization. (p. 41)

Leadership Development Opportunities for Academic Middle Managers

Leadership: What Competencies Are Important?

Much of the literature previously referenced in this review in regards to the role of the Associate Dean/Chair forms a foundational base delineating what skill sets are required of the role. Following is a review of previous initiatives related to defining what leadership competencies are most desired by college administrators.

The AACC (2005) initiated a major project from 2003–2005 in order to develop a framework of leadership competencies required by college administrators. The project involved an intense collaborative effort involving 95 American institutions. The project determined that, “Leadership can be learned. While it can be enhanced immeasurably by natural aptitude and experience, supporting leaders with exposure to theory, concepts, cases, guided experiences, and other practical information and learning methodologies is essential” (p. 2).
The report defined the following as six essential leadership competencies required by college administrators:

1. Organizational Strategy
2. Resource Management
3. Communication
4. Collaboration
5. Community College Advocacy
6. Professionalism

The report also states that, “One hundred percent of the respondents noted that each of the competencies was either ‘very’ or ‘extremely’ essential to the effective performance of a community college leader” (p. 1).

A similar study by Knight and Trowler (as cited in Inman, 2009) identified the following seven types of leadership and management knowledge required of academic leaders.

1. Control knowledge: identified as self-knowledge gained by various means of reflection.
4. Conceptual knowledge: knowing about management and leadership concepts and research.
5. Process knowledge: processes of leadership and management
6. Situational knowledge: understanding contingencies that have made faculty what it is and affect what it might be.
7. Tacit knowledge that integrates the other six forms in expert practice.

(p. 168)

A comparison of the two studies reveals that: the ability to work with people through communication and collaboration; the ability to manage resources; acting professionally within the context of the situation; and community college advocacy along with knowledge of educational practices are competencies valued by mid-manager college administrators. Many of these findings are congruent with the skill sets
previously noted in the Fanshawe job posting for the Chair of Language and Liberal Studies.

Filan and Seagren (2003) define the following six traits as critical components of leadership required by mid-management college administrators:

1. Understanding self
2. Understanding transformational leadership
3. Establishing and maintaining relationships
4. Leading teams
5. Leading strategic planning and change
6. Connecting through community

Many of their findings are derived from the earlier work of Seagren et al. (1994) previously referenced in the role section of this review. These competencies are incorporated into the curriculum of the Chair Academy, a topic that is explored more fulsomely later in this segment. Of note is that Filan and Seagren (2003) identify leading strategic plans and change as a critical component of academic leadership. Lucas (2000) also identifies the ability to lead change as the essential role for academic department Chair. This study is positioned within the context of changes currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system. To that end, leading change will be a subject area this literature review explores more acutely in a future section.

Bryman (2007) reviewed the literature referenced in journals for the period 1985-2005, and found the following to be the most prevalent mentioned aspects of leadership (in higher education) behavior that were found to be associated with effectiveness at the department level:

1. Clear sense of direction/strategic vision
2. Preparing department arrangements to facilitate the direction set
3. Being considerate
4. Treating academic staff fairly and with integrity
5. Being trustworthy and having personal integrity
6. Allowing the opportunity to participate in key decisions/encouraging open communication
7. Communicating well about the direction the department is going in
8. Acting as a role model/having credibility
9. Creating a positive/collegial work atmosphere in the department
10. Advancing the department’s cause with respect to constituencies internal and external to the university and being proactive in do so
11. Providing feedback on performance
12. Providing resources for and adjusting workloads to stimulate scholarship and research
13. Making academic appointments that enhance the department’s reputation.

(p. 697)

Buller’s (2012) work provides a comprehensive desk reference for department chairs outlining an extensive set of strategies to help Chairs be successful, although much of his work is more applicable to university Chairs. He provides advice on a variety of topics including:

• Departmental management and politics
• Hiring and firing processes
• Mentoring challenges and opportunities
• Faculty development
• Best practices in evaluation and assessment
• Essentials of budgeting and planning

Of all the competencies referred to, effective communication, in various settings, appears to be one of the most common (Bryman, 2007; Craig, 2005; Inman 2009; Osterman, 2008). This level of communication would be in addition to the former mentioned challenge of communicating messages back and forth between senior management and direct reports. The Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC, 2005) identifies communication as a core leadership competency defining it as “uses clear listening, speaking and writing skills to engage in honest and open dialogue at all levels of the college and its surrounding community, to promote the success of all students and to sustain the community college mission” (p. 3). Leaders require more sophisticated communication skills when dealing with negative situations as outlined by Antonioni (2000) who states, “…leaders, need courage, especially to engage in helpful,
caring, candid conversations with individuals who need constructive feedback” (p. 29). Bryman (2007) found that, “it was important for chairs to stress the communication aspects of their roles more than they in fact do” (p. 701). There is strong evidence in the literature emphasising the importance of having strong communication skills as a vital leadership competency for academic middle managers.

Previously referenced, and of major significance to this study is the leadership competency model developed at the Chair Academy. This competency framework is particular relevant to this study as “the Leadership Academy Program Competencies are aligned with the Competencies for Community College Leaders developed by the American Association of Community Colleges, and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges” (Chair Academy, “Academy Program Competencies,” 2014, para. 27). The 26 leadership competencies deemed as important for college mid-level managers include:

1. Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others
2. Clarify values through a personal and professional mission statement
3. Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership
4. Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles
5. Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence
6. Engage in reflective practice and journaling
7. Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator capable of building and sustaining relationships for individual and organizational success
8. Use effective and principle-centered communication
9. Be inclusive by appreciating, respecting, and valuing diversity
10. Build and maintain effective relationships and work team
11. Manage individual and team performance by appropriate delegation
12. Integrate recognition and celebration into the culture of teams and the organization
13. Be a thoughtful and diligent manager of talent who develops, coaches, and mentors others for individual, team, and organizational success
14. Differentiate and develop talent and skill in roles and responsibilities as a leader and manager
15. Develop and effectively lead high performance teams and work groups
16. Effectively mentor, coach, and develop talent
17. Resolve and manage conflict productively
18. Understand and utilize clear and effective practices for hiring for excellence
19. Orient and retain employees and staff through effective management
20. Develop employees and staff through succession planning and professional development opportunities
21. Develop inclusive strategic plans for effectively managing and leading part-time staff
22. Be a studied, strategic, forward-thinking, and innovative leader who creates success through excellence in transformational leadership
23. Investigate and employ contemporary research and theory into organizational excellence and best practices in management and leadership
24. Develop and implement planning processes for strategic planning, scenario thinking, and disciplined decision making
25. Dissect processes and strategies for successfully implementing and managing change
26. Explore and develop specific constructs and behaviors of transformational leadership.

Of the competencies identified in the preceding studies, the themes related to creating a shared vision; leading change; managing resources; building relationships (including working with teams and collaboration); and effective communication appear to be the most prevalent. These competencies are all inferred, either directly or indirectly, as required skills associated with the Chair job posting at Fanshawe College previously referenced. It will be of interest to observe whether the results of this study find that Ontario Associate Deans/Chairs share this viewpoint.

Leadership Development Opportunities

It has already been referred to many times in this paper; however, it is important to reiterate that there is overwhelming documentation in the literature regarding the need
for effective training programs to assist in the development of leadership competencies
for mid-level college administrators (Craig, 2005; Filan, 1999; Inman, 2009; Miller &
suggests to mid-mangers, “Attend a high-quality leadership training program that
provides you with multiple source feedback on your leadership style” (p. 30). However,
despite the evidence of a need for effective training programs, Inman (2009) states, “there
is a surprising shortage of research and literature on professional development for
middle-level leader academics” (p. 420). This once again confirms the need for further
research in this area.

There does appear to be importance placed on delivering training programs
designed to develop leadership competencies in mid-level college administrators in
England and Wales (Inman, 2009; Naylor et al., 2006). One such program was developed
at the Centre for Educational Leadership at the University of Manchester. A Leading
from the Middle (LftM) program was introduced in 2003. Based on the responses from
the 710 mid-managers who participated in the program in 2003, it would suggest, “the
programme had a had a positive influence on middle leaders’ perceptions of their
confidence as leaders; their awareness of their team; knowledge of team roles; ability to
delegate and coaching skills” (Naylor et al., 2006, p. 11). This would suggest that
programs of this nature can have a positive influence.

More recently, in the United Kingdom, there is progress in the development of
academic leadership, albeit focussed on the context of the university sector (Middlehurst,
2007). Evolving from a need to enhance leadership training for academic administrators
in the U.K. (primarily in England, Scotland, and Ireland), the Leadership Foundations for
Higher Education (LFHE) was established in 2004. In 2004-2005, membership of the
LFHE in 2004–2005 totalled 162 higher education institutions and related agencies,
including a growing international membership. Middlehurst (2007) explains, “The
foundation combines four integrated work streams: developing individuals, building
institutional capacity in leadership, governance and management, and creating learning
networks and generating ideas and innovation” (p. 53). The LFHE has established an
international reference network with high-level institutional and agency members
including the World Bank, UNESCO, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It offers a broad training mandate geared at all levels of academic administration.

There are other leadership competency development models. One of the programs often referred to in this review that both Fanshawe and Humber participates in, is the Chair Academy. The program originated in the findings of the national study of community and technical community college Chairs that included participants from both Canada and the United States (Filan, 1999; Seagren et al., 1994). Originally the program was established to develop leadership competencies for mid-level managers in the U.S. Mariposa college system, but was eventually expanded and now serves the entire United States and Canada. The Academy was founded with the following concerns in mind, “Although the midlevel manager/chair position is widely regarded as key to the effective functioning of a college or university’s major academic and career programs, those filling the positions generally receive little or no formal training for the job” (Chair Academy, 2015, para. 3). The program focuses on developing transformational leadership competencies for mid-level college and university leaders. Topics include:

- Complex Role of the Organizational Leader
- Leading and Managing Effective Teams and Work Groups
- Managing Conflict Productively and Engaging in Crucial Conversations
- Facilitating, Integrating, and Celebrating Strengths
- Leader as Manager
- Coaching, Developing, and Talent Management
- Leading Part-Time Staff

The program takes place over a 1-year period and incorporates two individual 1-week residency modules that take place at the beginning and end of the year. Participants are expected to practice the newly acquired competencies, reflect daily on their learning, and interact with a mentor during the year between residencies.

I participated in one of these academies, and it is my personal belief is that the program does not adequately embed the skills required to lead from the middle in the
practice of participants. In conversations with many of my peers who had attended the Academy, most hold the same opinion that I do. We felt the program suffered from the compressed nature of the 1-week residency periods, the lack of formal structure during the transition year, and was overly ambitious in regards to the volume of content delivered. Many of us who participated in the Academy training also experienced a utopian sense of leadership invigoration during the residencies, only to return to our own institutions and have the enthusiasm quelled.

In a review of other leadership development programs for Chairs in American academic institutions, Wolverton and Ackerman (2006) found similar results. The American Council on Education (ACE) sponsors national workshops and through support of the Lumina Foundation, makes available the Department Chair Online Resource Centre. The Harvard Graduate School of Education offers various academic leadership programs including a 2-week development program for department Chairs. In addition, many campus specific Chair development programs exist at several institutions including Stanford University, Louisiana State University, University of Minnesota and Pace University in New York. Wolverton and Ackerman (2006) find three inherent flaws with the short term development programs:

1. They are not of duration to embed the skill sets in participants.
2. They are not necessarily meaningful in terms of the unique, institution-specific culture, political environment, and processes already in place.
3. Unless a large number of chairs from the same campus attend, participants return home full of ideas and enthusiasm, but with little opportunity to support them and put them in place their enthusiasm is squelched. (p. 16)

As previously mentioned, these concerns are similar to what many of us experienced at the Chair Academy. It should be noted, that there is no intention to diminish the positive intentions, the quality of the curriculum, or the distinction of the facilitators at the Academy. The curriculum was thorough and the facilitators were exceptional. My concerns were, and continue to be, the compressed nature of the training, the length of time between residencies, and the lack of follow up at the local institution.
In another study previously referred to in this chapter conducted by Berdrow (2010), she identifies the following as desirable leadership skills: Personal Management; Communicating; Managing People and Tasks; Leading Peers; Boundary Spanning; and Mobilizing Innovation and Change. These competencies are fairly consistent with those espoused by the Chair Academy.

Summary

This review of existing training opportunities for leadership development for middle management academic administrators identifies that there are opportunities, and that there have been some successes, notably in the U.K. and through the Chair Academy in the U.S. and Canada. However, there is anecdotal and much empirical evidence to support the need for more effective training to be developed and implemented for Associate Deans/Chairs. This section of the literature review refers to Research Question 3. The research will provide insight as to what competencies current Chairs/Associate Deans find beneficial.

Transformational Leadership Theory

As previously mentioned in the theoretical section of this paper, transformational leadership theory is the basis for many of the existing competency based leadership development programs used to develop mid-level college managers and Chairs in the United States (AACC, 2005; Bechtel, 2010; Chair Academy 2015; Quinn, 2007). Transformational leadership theory is also one of the most prevalent leadership models discussed in popular, respected leadership literature (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989; Yukl, 1998).

Bass (1985), the modern theorist on transformational leadership, built his theory on the works of James Burns (1978). He claims transformational leadership to be the most effective form of leadership where the interaction goes beyond the self-interest of both parties (Bass, 1999). Kouzes and Posner (2007) say that, “transformational leadership occurs when, in their interactions, people raise one another to higher levels of morality” (p. 153). This ability to lead at a higher level, beyond one’s self interests is at
the core of Burns’ (1978) original musing in transformational leadership theory in his reference to historical figures throughout history such as Ghandi and John F. Kennedy.

To review, transformational leadership is based on the following four principles (Bass, 1999; Burns, 1978):

1. Intellectual Stimulation. The leaders encourages creativity and challenge followers to explore new ways of doing things
2. Individualized Consideration. Transformational leadership fosters supportive relationships, and keep lines of communication open so that followers feel free to share ideas and so that leaders can offer direct recognition of each follower’s unique contributions.
3. Inspirational Motivation/ Transformational leaders have a clear vision that they are able to articulate to followers.
4. Idealized Influence/ The transformational leader serves as a role model for followers.

While all of the preceding four principles associated with transformational leadership theory are important, one of the most predominant themes associated with transformational leadership is the ability to inspire action around a shared theme or vision (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Roueche et al., 1989; Yukl, 1998). Bolman and Deal (1997) say, “Transforming leaders are rarer…They are visionary leaders, and visionary leadership is inherently symbolic” (p. 314). In Yukl’s (2002) guidelines for transformational leadership, he emphasizes that the abilities to articulate an appealing vision and explain how the vision can be attained are critical competencies. Roueche et al. (1989) accentuate the importance of this competency stating, “Indeed, vision is the distinguishing characteristic of the transformational leader” (p. 110). The ability to articulate and inspire a shared vision is one of the most predominant themes associated with transformational leadership.

Konorti (2008) states that, “Transformational leadership is about inspiration, intellect, charisma, and individualized consideration. Scholars and researchers refer to this new leader as a change agent” (p. 11). Quinn (2007) relates transformational leadership specifically to the role of the college chair claiming:
For the purpose of transforming the climate and culture of an academic department, a chair can encourage active participation by faculty, staff, and students to create a democratic community that values the voice of every member, not just the senior members. (p. 8)

This ability to elevate leadership beyond self-interest and act as an agent of change make transformational leadership theory the ideal framework from which to explore leadership competencies that would assist Associate Deans/Chairs lead change in the current Ontario CAAT system.

**Leading Change: 8-stage Process**

An exploration of the leadership competencies required for Associate Deans/Chairs to successfully manage and lead change is crucial to this study as it is positioned within the changes currently taking place in the Ontario college system. John Kotter’s (1996) 8-stage process for leading change, as previously been referenced in the theoretical framework section of chapter 1, forms a foundation from which to explore this topic.

There is an abundance of literature related to the competency of managing change, with much of it directly relating to academic leadership (Filan & Seagren, 2003; Foote, 1999; Fullan, 2004; Lucas, 2000; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011, Buller, 2012). Kotter (1996) is accepted by many to be the world’s leading authority on change management. Buller (2015) confirms this stating, “Perhaps the most influential approach to change management today was developed by John P. Kotter” (p. 7). Kotter’s 8-stage process for leading change is one of the frameworks against which the results of this study will be compared and contrasted. A review of Kotter’s 8-stage process for leading change is:

1. Establishing a sense of urgency
2. Creating the guiding coalition
3. Developing a vision and strategy
4. Communicating the change vision
5. Empowering broad based action
6. Generating short-term wins
7. Consolidating gains and producing more change
8. Anchoring new approaches in the culture. (p. 21)

One of the most influential works related to leading academic change, specifically for Academic Chairs, was compiled by Ann Lucas (2000). Through a series of essays and case studies, some written by her and some by other academics, she espouses a series of strategies that would help Associate Deans/Chairs champion change in various scenarios. She endorses the use of Kotter’s process as highly effective in an academic environment stating the following reasons:

1. It is based on his extensive experience with organizations and has thus been demonstrated to work;
2. It reflects the elements deemed essential by most authors on the literature of change, but it goes beyond the work of other researchers by integrating these elements in a natural progression that provides useful guidelines;
3. My own experience consulting with universities that have been unsuccessful in their change efforts have convinced me that they failed to succeed because several of these processes were not implemented. (p. 35)

Lucas’s (2000) endorsement of Kotter’s work provides further support for using his 8-stage process for leading change as a valid theoretical framework against which to ground this study. In addition to supporting Kotter’s process, Lucas suggests using a teamwork approach and describes a collaborative model for leading academic change. She submits that resistance to change needs to be handled respectfully stating, “Instead of defending the need for change, change agents have to be prepared to do a lot of active listening. Chairs leading change need to get behind the eyes of the person doing the objecting” (p. 52).

Chu (2010) believes “The power of the chair to create change within the college and university is vastly underrated” (p. 2) furthering that “department chairs have the power to lead significant change because they ‘have their hands on the tiller’” (p. 1). This suggests that leading from the middle might actually prove advantageous for Associate Deans/Chairs when initiating change. Foote (1999) advises that, “New academic chairs
and deans can assume their new challenges with less frustration if they understand the essential elements for developing a culture of proactive change” (p. 79). She furthers this stating, “It is important to understand that change is a process, not an event; it is accomplished by individuals; it is a highly personal experience; and involves developmental growth” (p. 79).

Bolman and Deal (1997) state that one of the effects of change is that, “it affects individual’s ability to feel effective, valued, and in control” (p. 339). As previously stated, the inability of many current faculty members to participate in the development and delivery of the new degree programs, and their lack of experience around applied research, have many of them questioning their value. This would validate Bolman and Deal’s assumptions.

Stone and Coussons-Read (2011) recommend the following three tips to Associate Deans in managing the change process:

1. Recognize fatigue
2. Listen and learn
3. Provide support

They confirm the need for Associate Deans/Chairs to master this competency stating, “It’s been said that change is the only constant, and that is certainly true in higher education” (p. 148).

Michael Fullan (2004), in reference to leading academic change, defines the following five components of leadership: moral purpose; understanding change; building relationships; creating and sharing knowledge; and making coherence. He explains that there will naturally be resistance to change and suggests that, “People often express doubts about new directions and sometimes outright opposition to them” (p. 97), all sentiments that faculty have recently communicated to me. He suggests acknowledging the anxiety that people are feeling and work through the change process with them in a participatory manner.

James O’Toole (1966) makes the argument for adhering to strong values while leading change initiatives. This would be congruent with Fullan’s (2004) suggestion of
following a high moral purpose. O’Toole (1966) also makes the point that, “Assuming that people will follow you because you are right is an error that trips up most potential leaders before they ever get out of the starting blocks” (p. 13). Many of the leadership strategies espoused by Salacuse (2006) could also prove very beneficial during this time of change. He suggests focusing on: direction; integration; mediation; education; motivation; representation; and trust creation.

Buller (2015) suggests the possibility of the dropping the word ‘change’ entirely and adapting other ways of describing the proposed initiatives. He states, “Rather than frightening people with how revolutionary and innovative the new approach will be, the goal becomes to calm people by reassuring them how minor and painless the process will be” (p. 31). He supports Kotter’s (1996) first principle of establishing a sense of urgency suggesting one take it to a deeper level stating, “…your argument for change is far more effective when you can demonstrate that change is needed rather than merely desired” (p. 71). However, he does sometimes question Kotter’s process, as well as other known change management theories as being effective within the context of higher education due to its distributed organizational culture as opposed to a hierarchical or decentralized organization. He calls for a creative leadership approach to change management noting that, “Change in higher education is not like a guided tour; it’s more like a voyage of discovery” (p. 93). However, he does still advocate borrowing aspects of change theories, including Kotter’s.

The topic of leading change management is sufficiently complex that it could warrant a study unto itself; however, this review of the literature addresses the ambitions of this paper. The review confirms the acceptance of Kotter’s 8-stage change-management process as valid theoretical construct within the context of higher education. The review also confirms that leading change is a recognized essential leadership competency for mid-level academic managers including Associate Deans (Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011) and Academic Department Chairs (Buller, 2015; Lucas, 2000). This section of the literature review addresses Research Questions 2b and 3d. The research component of this study will seek to gain a greater understanding of leadership competencies, including the ability to lead change that would help Associate
Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles as they navigate the changes currently taking place in the system.

**Systems Thinking Theory**

This study is situated within the context of the Ontario CAAT system, and is being conducted largely in response to changes currently taking place within the system. The purpose is to explore leadership competencies to help Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles as they navigate the changes currently taking place in the system. It is therefore helpful to briefly review the literature on leadership related to systems thinking.

Peter Senge (1990) describes systems thinking as “the art of seeing the forest and the trees” (p. 127). He espouses the ability to understand and work in systems is one of the five disciplines required to be effective in organizational leadership. Senge (1990) views issues as challenges and not as problems. He developed a series of systems archetypes that analyses challenges from the framework of causal loops and looks for solutions in finding intervention points where the most positive influence can be leveraged. His work on systems thinking and the theory associated with the five disciplines: Systems Thinking, Personal Mastery; Mental Models, Team Learning and Shared Vision would all prove valuable to the leadership competency development of Associate Deans/Chairs. The Learning Organization that Senge talks of us constitutes the background work from which many colleges, including Humber, draw their aspirations to be learning colleges where focus on the success of students is paramount.

Oshrey (1996) describes organizations as living systems that he categorizes as tops, middles, and bottoms. He encourages middles to “support one another in pursuing personal goals” (p. 161) and to “create regular mechanisms for sharing information, supporting one another, and coaching one another” (p. 161). He claims that in order to be of maximum benefit to organizations, it is necessary for people at all levels, including those in middle, to see and understand systems.
In the context of applying systems thinking to the leadership associated with academic middle managers, Bowman (2002) makes an important point when he states that:

The real work of chairs as managers is to create systems around people, not design systems and attempt to splice colleagues into them. In concert, the real work of academic chairs as leaders is to make colleagues’ strengths effective and their weaknesses irrelevant. (p. 161)

There are many variances involved in systems thinking theory as it relates to organizational leadership. The predominant theme is that of seeing the big picture, and to assess challenges within the construct of the entire system, and not to isolate difficulties to the local level as, “the parts of a system are all connected directly or indirectly, therefore a change in one part ripples out to affect all the other parts” (O’Connor & McDermott, 1997, p. 26).

This concept is central to this study as it is important for Associate Deans/Chairs to develop leadership competencies to help them be successful and to address changes going on within the context of the Ontario CAAT system. It is necessary to address these challenges from a systems perspective, and in my opinion, it will be helpful for Associate Deans/Chairs to recognize this. In order to put systems thinking theory into practice, it will be important for them to reassess their issues and see them as challenges rather than problems (Senge, 1990), and to look for leverage points where they can assert the most positive influence. An understanding of the leadership competencies associated with systems thinking theory is an important component of this study and addresses Research Question 2c.

**Chapter Summary**

A review of the literature provides evidence that there is need for further study in relationship to the leadership competencies required by academic middle managers (Associate Dean/Chairs) to be successful in their roles. There is support found in the literature that one of the most challenging aspects of the position is the sensation of feeling stuck in the middle between senior management and front line workers, yet not
being provided with the resources required to be successful. There is also support in the literature confirming that Associate Deans/Chairs are not provided with appropriate training that would help them to be successful in their roles.

The research component of this study seeks to expand on the work that is referenced in this review. Chapter 3 will provide a description of the research design and methodology.
CHAPTER 3.

Research Design and Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore the role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean and/or Chair, and specifically focus on an investigation of the leadership competencies that would help them to be successful. The study was situated within the context of change currently taking place within the Ontario college system as those changes are redefining aspects of the role, notably the relationships between Associate Deans/Chairs and faculty. To that end, this study attempted to answer the following questions:

Research Questions

Research Question 1: Defining the Role

1. What is the role of the Associate Dean/Chair within the Ontario CAAT system?
   a. Who is hired into these roles?
      i. What is their work and/or education background?
      ii. Do they have prior leadership experience and/or development?
      iii. Has the role of the Associate Dean been effectively communicated, understood and accepted by those assuming the position?
   b. What are the primary responsibilities associated with the role?
   c. Have any of the responsibilities associated with the role changed as a result of recent changes that have taken place within the Ontario CAAT system?
   d. Are there distinctive challenges associated with being defined as middle-management, and if so, what are they?
Research Question 2: Leadership Competencies Required

2. What leadership competencies would assist mid-level Ontario CAAT academic administrators (Associated Deans and/or Chairs) to be successful in their roles?
   a. Do Associate Deans/Chairs believe that there are leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles, and if so, what are they?
   b. Which, if any, of the competencies identified in the previous question would assist them most in leading the changes currently taking place in the Ontario college system?
   c. Would an understanding and practice of systems thinking theory assist Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles?

Research Question 3: Developmental Opportunities

3. What leadership developmental opportunities are currently available for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs?
   a. Are there current leadership developmental opportunities available for Associate Deans/Chairs in the Ontario college system?
   b. If so, are the current leadership development opportunities effective and/or adequate?
   c. Do Associate Deans/Chairs believe that there should be more assistance to provide them with development opportunities to enhance their leadership competencies?
   d. Should there be leadership development opportunities with a specific focus on leading the change currently taking place within the college system?

Research Design and Rationale

Carter and Little (2007) believe that epistemology (justification of knowledge), methodology (justification of method), and method (research action) are intimately connected. To that end, every attempt was made to ensure the research methodology and data collection tools properly addressed the knowledge sought through the study. The intention of this project is to explore the role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean/Chair and to explore leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles. To my knowledge, there is no epistemological theory per se that could define the
role of the Associate Dean/Chair, and even to a lesser extent determine the leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles. However, the study seeks to explore these phenomena directly from those living the experience, the Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs.

It was incumbent to acknowledge and reiterate my biases at the onset of this study. The two primary biases are my assumptions that:

1. There are unique challenges associated with this role focused primarily around the sensation of feeling “stuck in the middle.”
2. Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs are not adequately provided with the development opportunities to help them attain the leadership competencies to help them successfully navigate the changes currently taking place within the system.

These biases contribute to my belief that it is indeed possible to more fulsomely understand the role of the Associate Dean/Chair, and that there are leadership competencies that would assist them to be successful in their roles.

It is my belief that the best way to investigate these phenomena was by gathering both quantitative data in the form of survey responses and reviews of existing human resource documentation and qualitative data in the form of interviews from current Associate Deans/Chairs. It was also helpful to gain perspective from Deans, the direct supervisors of Associate Deans/Chairs, regarding their opinions on the activities associated with the role and leadership competencies they believe would assist Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful. It was determined that a three-level mixed methodological sequential approach would be best suited for this study.

Methodology

As stated earlier, this paper is framed by a constructivist worldview as I seek greater knowledge and understanding of my own workplace. It also contains aspects of advocacy as I advocate on behalf of Chairs and/or Associate Deans for leadership development opportunities. Finally, there are post-positivist elements present as there is a
need to gather hard quantitative data in order to frame this study against a backdrop of existing theories and practices.

The study followed a sequential mixed methodology approach as described by Creswell (2009). He states, “the study may begin with a quantitative method in which a theory or concept is tested, followed by a qualitative method involving detailed exploration with a few cases or individuals” (p. 14). The need to gather data to compare to existing theories and practices, along with the need to gain a more fulsome insight into the practices and beliefs of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean/Chair required collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. There are strengths and limitations to both methods, but the strength in one often helps to offset the limitation in the other (Frankel & Wallen, 2003; Patton, 1997). This sequential mixed method approach recognizes the connection between epistemology, methodology and method as previously referenced from Carter and Little (2007).

There is evidence to support a sequential mixed method approach for a study of this nature that involves an exploration of individuals in their roles. Guba and Lincoln (2005) find that no one method can ideally deliver the ultimate truth and that human phenomena are inherently controversial and inconsistent. Also, the breadth of this study is extensive and, “a mixed-method approach also allowed the researcher to answer a broader, more complete range of research questions because the researcher is not confined to a single method or approach” (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 21). Connelly (2009) concurs with this approach stating, “Mixed methods research has many advantages, such as providing narrative to and meaning to numbers but also using numbers to add precision to narrative data” (p. 31). The literature supports a mixed method approach to this study.

**Data Sources**

Following Creswell’s (2009) sequential mixed methods model, four sources were employed to gather data for this project.

Source 1: Online surveys with Associate Deans/Chairs. Quantitative data was collected in the form of an online survey questionnaire delivered to Associate
Deans/Chairs across the English language Ontario CAAT system to gather descriptive information including an understanding of the role, how they were selected for the job, review of responsibilities associated with the role, importance placed on leadership competencies, review of existing leadership development opportunities, relevance to changes taking place in system, and whether Associate Deans/Chairs feel there is a need for additional leadership competency development to assist them in their roles. The surveys also included open-ended questions collecting qualitative data from respondents by allowing them to provide further commentary to clusters of descriptive questions in accordance with a sequential mixed-methods approach.

Source 2: Online surveys with Deans. Quantitative data was also gathered from Deans across the English language Ontario CAAT system through an abbreviated version of the same online survey used with Associate Deans/Chairs. Deans are the direct supervisors of Associate Deans/Chairs in most colleges. It is possible that Deans and Associate Deans/Chairs might share different opinions on what responsibilities they deem as most important to the role and what leadership competencies believe are important. Therefore, the Dean’s survey focused on what they deemed as essential responsibilities associated with the role of Associate Deans/Chairs as well as their opinion of what competencies they felt would help Associate Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles. The Dean’s survey also included open-ended questions collecting qualitative data from respondents by allowing them to add further commentary to clusters of descriptive questions in accordance with a sequential mixed-methods approach.

Source 3: Semi-structured interviews with Associate Deans/Chairs. Qualitative data was gathered through semi-structured interviews with Associate Deans/Chairs who agreed to supplementary participation in the study. The purpose of this study was to delve into an exploration of the leadership competencies that would assist Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful; therefore, one of the online survey questions was a request for a follow-up interview to further investigate this topic. The semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted on an individual basis with the Associate Dean/Chair (who agreed to the interview) in order to add meaning to the quantitative data obtained through the online surveys (Connelly, 2009), obtain their stories and perceptions of the
role, consequences (if any) of changes currently taking place within the system, the relevance they place on leadership, whether they feel they are provided with adequate leadership development opportunities, and an exploration of leadership competencies that would help them be successful in their roles.

Source 4: Institutional documentation. Institution documentation and information was gathered where possible, particularly HR information such as job descriptions and responsibilities, and professional development opportunities related to leadership for Associate Deans/Chairs. A request went to all heads of HR across the English Ontario CAAT system requesting information of this nature. Some of the information was also publicly available through websites and public job posting sites.

The study was located within the context of the Ontario college system. There are currently 24 colleges of varying sizes within the system. Two of the colleges have French as their primary language of instruction: Collège Boréal with its main campus in Sudbury and satellite campuses across the province and La Cité located in Ottawa. Due to my lack of fluency in the French language, I thought it best to exclude these two colleges from the study out of respect to these fine institutions. I did not want to misinterpret any data obtained from these institutions due to my lack of fluency in French.

There are also distinctions between the colleges in regards to the major changes already described as currently taking place within the system (HECQO, 2013). Some colleges, although not all, are currently offering degree programs. Most colleges, but some to a far greater extent, particularly those with degree activity, place a heightened importance on applied research. Some colleges, although not all, have attained differentiated status (such as ITAL) from MTCU while others brand themselves as Polytechnic Institutions. Also, all colleges have recently signed SMAs with the Ministry further broadening differentiation between institutions (MTCU, 2015a).

The extensive range of varying activity in regards to changes currently taking place within the system led me to believe it was important to attempt to survey as many Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans as possible. Therefore, all 22 English language
colleges in the Ontario system were included in the online survey data collection component of this study.

**Ethical Issues and Considerations**

Ethical issues deal with concerns around harm to the research participants. This is a study intended to provide positive reinforcement for the roles of Associate Deans/Chairs in the Ontario college system and there is minimal perceived risk to participants. However, although there was minimal perceived risk to participants, there was the possibility of career damage if participants were identified as making disparaging comments about their institutions or supervisors. Additionally, there could be negative connotations associated with working for certain institutions if they were perceived as not being supportive of their academic middle-managers.

To that end, great lengths were taken to protect the identities of both the institutions referred to in this study, and to the Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans who participated in the research. In reporting the findings, all 22 English speaking colleges were given a randomly generated numeric indicator identifying them (i.e., Institution 1, Institution 2, etc.). All Associate Deans/Chairs who participated in the online survey component of this research were given a randomly generic code indicator (i.e., Associate Dean/Chair aa101, Associate Dean/Chair bb102, etc.). Deans who participated in the online survey were provided a similar randomly generic code indicator (i.e., Dean aa151, Dean bb152, etc.). There were only seven Associate Deans/Chairs chosen for the qualitative component of the research (face-to-face interviews) so their alpha indicators went from from AD/Chair AA to AD/Chair BB to…AD/Chair GG.

Before embarking on collecting data for this study, Research Ethic Board (REB) approval had to be obtained from the University of Toronto (U of T). In the ethical review, in addition to illustrating that the study represented minimal risk to participants, it also specified that participants had complete freedom to either participate in the study and/or to withdraw at any time, and that participants could expect confidentiality. Additionally, the study did not include Associate Deans/Chairs who either have in the past or currently report directly to me.
The original REB submission to U of T was returned to me and asked that I, the researcher, provide further explanation to the consent section, ensure the online surveys clearly explained consent and confidentiality information, elaborate on the withdrawal process for the online surveys, and provide an explanation as to why REB approval would be necessary at all participating colleges. These issues were dealt with in the following manner:

- The consent explanations for the online surveys were separated and moved to the end of the invitation to participate in the online surveys (Appendices E and F).
- Participants were given a unique identification code upon entering the online surveys allowing them to either self-withdraw their responses from the surveys or to ask to withdraw their responses from the survey.
- Face-to-face participants were assured of confidentiality (as opposed to anonymity) allowing for them to be withdrawn from the study should they so desire.

The information in the research protocol was clarified and resubmitted to U of T REB approval was granted on June 10, 2014 and subsequently renewed for 1 year on June 10, 2015 (see Appendix H).

As per policy at Ontario colleges, REB approval (Appendix I) was required from all 22 English speaking colleges as the research involved human subjects at the respective colleges. This is confirmed in Fanshawe College’s Research Ethics Board guidelines that state, “Fanshawe's Research Ethics Board (REB) is accountable to ensure any and all research involving human subjects conforms to the ethical standards outlined in College Policy A201 - Research and Innovation” (Fanshawe College, 2015, para. 1). This was further confirmed through a personal conversation between me and Dr. Otte Rosenkrantz, Chair of the Fanshawe College Research Ethics Review Board, who assured me that similar REB approvals are expected at all colleges—and that I required REB approval from all institutions (personal communication, July 16, 2014).

Obtaining REB approval (Appendix I) from all 22 English speaking Ontario colleges proved to be onerous and time consuming. REB submissions were sent to all colleges during the last week of July, 2014. Some approvals came quickly requiring no
modifications, some REBs required slight modification to the original protocol, some required admin approval before they would be considered for REB approval, and some REB committees did not meet until mid-fall 2014 causing delays to the project. Common changes that were made as a result of feedback from various REBs include:

- Clarification on where the data would be stored (in my office, the researcher)
- There were other minor suggestions; however, nothing of significance and they were easily addressed

Table 2 indicates the varying dates that REB approval was attained from the 22 English language colleges, and confirms the need for greater consistency in the REB approval process for projects of this nature in the Ontario college system.

Table 2. Dates of REB Approvals from Ontario Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Date REB approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algonquin College</td>
<td>Sep 2, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambrian College</td>
<td>Sep 2, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadore College*</td>
<td>Oct 27, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial College</td>
<td>Aug 5, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conestoga College</td>
<td>Sep 8, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation College</td>
<td>Aug 14, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham College</td>
<td>Oct 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanshawe College</td>
<td>Aug 22, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming College</td>
<td>Sep 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Brown College</td>
<td>Aug 5, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian College</td>
<td>Oct 17, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber College</td>
<td>Sep 2, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton College</td>
<td>Sep 22, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalist College</td>
<td>Sep 4, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk College</td>
<td>Oct 20, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara College</td>
<td>Sep 4, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern College</td>
<td>Aug 18, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair College</td>
<td>Nov 7, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence College</td>
<td>Sep 25, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sault College</td>
<td>Sep 25, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca College</td>
<td>Oct 24, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan College</td>
<td>Sep 3, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* REB at Canadore is handled by Nipissing University.
Data Collection and Recording

Data Sources 1 and 2: Online surveys with Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans

As previously described, an online survey questionnaire was used to gather data from Associate Deans/Chairs as well as from Deans in all 22 English language colleges across the Ontario CAAT system. Online survey questionnaires were determined an appropriate method to gather the quantitative data. Creswell (2009) states that, “A survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of the population” (p. 145). Schmidt (1997) advocates that one of the benefits of using an online survey is access to a large population, in this case all Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans in the Ontario CAAT system. He also states that another advantage of collecting data through an online survey is the savings to both time and money. Couper, Kapteyn, Schonlau, and Wintern (2007) find that “the promise of the Internet for survey data collection lies in the power of self-administration and interactivity on the one hand, and the advantages of speed and massive reductions in cost over interviewer-administered surveys on the other” (p. 132). A final advantage of online surveys as a data collection tool is the ease of use for participants (Van Selm & Jamkowski, 2006). The ability to gather data across a relatively large sampling size, the ease of use for participants and the savings in both time and money all supported the use of an online survey tool as a suitable means for collecting data from Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans from across the Ontario CAAT system.

In order to garner support for the project, I sought the help of my Vice President Academic (VPA) colleagues from across the province. I had the project added as an agenda item on the November 25, 2014 agenda for the Ontario Coordinating Committee of VPAs where I sought and gained their endorsement for the study. I also asked and received permission to seek assistance from them as required. This proved very helpful as each of their offices provided me with up to date email listings of all Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans from their respective institutions. Gathering this information proved more time consuming than originally assumed.
The online survey was used to collect data of a quantitative nature. The information gathered was used to determine an understanding of the role, how candidates were selected, a review of responsibilities associated with the role, challenges associated with the role, new responsibilities or challenges associated with the role that were directly related to changes to taking place in the system, importance placed on leadership competencies, review of existing leadership development opportunities, and whether Associate Deans/Chairs felt there is a need for additional leadership competency development to assist them in their roles.

This quantitative section of this research was similar in nature to a study formerly conducted by Lydia Boyko (2009) who studied the role of the Chair in Canada’s universities. There are distinctions between the role of Chair in a university and a college; primarily, in a University a Chair generally remains a tenured faculty member while in a college a chair is permanent administrator (Boyko, 2009; Edwards, 2006). However, there are similarities between the intention of Boyko’s study and a significant section of this study, which is to explore the role of the Chair. It seemed reasonable that an adaptation of the tool used by Boyko (2009) in the form of an online survey questionnaire would appropriately capture some of the data pertinent to this study. Specifically, Boyko’s online survey attempted to address the following two elements, those being “(1) a description of the position and characteristics thereof and (2) a determination of the relationships between the position and the individual in the position” (p. 80). Both those determinants are relevant to this study, and would address Research Questions 1a and 1b. Boyko’s study did contain elements that referred to leadership; however, that was not the critical piece of her analysis. Therefore, the online questionnaire, in addition to an adaptation of the questions used by Boyko contained a second and third element of questions specifically dealing with the topic of leadership competencies and related development opportunities. Lydia Boyko was contacted by email and she graciously granted permission to adapt her online survey for use in this study.

The online survey for Associate Deans/Chairs was divided into three distinct sections, each focused on answering the three primary research questions.
Section 1 focussed on defining and understanding the role. Section one contained 51 questions related to the background, education, day to day activity and responsibilities associated with the role. The section contained clusters of multiple choice questions, often followed by an open-ended section allowing participants opportunity to add commentary to expand on what they felt the quantitative questions did not capture. The section also contained two multi-dimension questions, one adapted from Boyko’s study on typical activities of the Associate Dean/Chair, and one adapted from the literature on challenges associated with middle-management. Both these multi-dimension questions employed a 4-point Likert-scale ranking system (from least important to very important). This allowed respondents an opportunity to answer with a non-comital viewpoint providing me with a means to rank the importance participants placed on these items, while also allowing comparison/contrast with other sample groups, in this case the Deans, who were provided with identical questions.

Section 2 focused on leadership. The second section contained 14 questions specifically related to leadership. It also employed a series of multi-choice questions followed by open-ended questions providing opportunity for additional commentary (specifically related to leadership within the context of change) as well as a multi-dimensional question based on a series of leadership competencies adapted from the Chair Academy Program Leadership Competencies that are aligned with the Competencies for Community College Leaders developed by the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (Chair Academy, 2014). Again a 4-point Likert scale was employed for reasons previously described.

Section 3 focused on leadership developmental opportunities. The third section of the survey asked a series of 14 questions related to leadership developmental opportunities. Clusters of multi-choice questions were again followed by open-ended questions allowing participants to provide commentary on their opinions of leadership developmental opportunities that they had either personally experienced or were provided by their respective organizations.
The online survey for Deans consisted of 14 questions, many of them identical to the Associate Dean/Chair survey as the intention was to determine whether Associate Deans/Chairs and their direct supervisors (the Deans) shared viewpoints on topics such as roles, responsibilities, and importance of leadership competencies. The survey also contained three multi-dimension questions focused on roles/responsibilities, challenges associated with mid-management, and leadership competencies required by Associate Deans/Chairs. The multi-dimension questions employed an identical sequencing of questions and 4-point Likert scale employed in the Associate Dean/Chair survey allowing for comparative analysis between the data sources.

Once the research tool had been developed, further advice was sought from my dissertation advisory committee as all three members have enjoyed significant research experience and are well published in the academia field. Based on their advice, the online survey tool was further refined.

As I did not have technical experience in building online surveys, and on the advice of my supervisor, a programmer was employed to build and host the online survey. The programmer had done work before for my supervisor, and came highly recommended. He also clearly understood the confidential nature of the survey, and was informed of REB protocols. The online survey was set up on a unique website that was deleted by the programmer at the end of the project. The online survey was also coded in a way (i.e., Yes = 1, No = 2) that would allow for ease of manipulation through digital software analysis programs such as SPSS and Excel. The online tool for both Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans was built and tested.

Finally, before going live, the tool was pilot tested by four colleagues of mine (three Chairs and one Dean) who were either acquaintances or had formerly reported directly to me (and therefore not permitted in the study). Their results were not included in the analysis. The online survey was tested for length of time it took to complete the study, clarity of questions, etc. The online survey for Associate Deans/Chairs took approximately 45 minutes to complete and the survey for Deans took approximately 25 minutes to complete. The participant pilots also noticed a few formatting errors in the survey that were easily corrected.
In setting up the final survey, each Associate Dean/Chair and Dean was provided a unique identifying code that allowed them to enter the survey and gave them the ability to withdraw at any time. The code allowed them to either exit and/or re-enter the survey, and/or gave them the ability to let me know whether they would like their responses edited or removed.

**Participant invitations: Online surveys.** In order to invite participants to the survey, email lists had to be developed for every Associate Dean/Chair and Dean in the English language Ontario college system. Every individual Associate Dean/Chair required a unique code to enter the survey (as explained above). Also, every college required the use of a unique version of the letter to participate and consent form that included their individual institution’s REB contact info.

In order to expedite this process, I enlisted the help of a friend to assist with emailing invitations to Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans, based on lists provided by the VPAs, to participate in the survey. There was no risk of violating confidentiality protocols at this point as this person was only helping with the emailing out of invitations—and these were going to everyone in the system. This assistance proved incredibly helpful. Appendix E contains a sample of the letter asking Associate Deans/Chairs to participate in the study and Appendix C for a sample of the questions used for Associate Deans/Chairs in the online survey questionnaire.

An identical process was followed and a condensed version of the online survey was also made available to Deans across the 22 English language colleges in the Ontario CAAT system. Information obtained from the Deans focused on the responsibilities associated with the role of the Associate Dean/Chair, as well as the Dean’s perspective on leadership competencies that would help Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful. See Appendix F for a sample of the invitation asking Deans to participate in the study and Appendix D for a sample of the questions used in the Dean’s online survey questionnaire.

The invitations to the online survey were sent to all Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans as per the email lists provided from their respective VPA offices over a few days beginning on March 9, 2015. Nulty (2008) suggests that providing incentives to
participate as well as reminders have proved effective at boosting online survey response rates. Both of these strategies were employed in this study. In order to encourage participation, incentives were offered in the form of eight $25 coffee gift cards as well as one $500 gift certificate at a known electronics store if there were more than 100 responses to the Associate Dean/Chairs survey. (The participation rate exceeded this level; therefore, using a random selection process, winning participants were selected and informed of incentives during the second week of July, 2015).

In total, there were 289 invitations sent to Associate Deans/Chairs and 113 invitations sent to Deans. As of March 26, 2015, there were 87 responses from Associate Deans/Chairs (response rate of 30.10%) and 38 responses from Deans (response rate of 33.63%). As of April 10, 2015, there were 95 responses to the Associate Dean/Chair survey (response rate of 32.87) and 44 responses to the Deans survey (response rate of 38.94%).

In an effort to attain higher participation, reminders were sent to all participants again over a few days beginning on April 17, 2015. On May 14, 2015 the survey was taken down. By that date there had been 116 total responses from Associate Deans/Chairs (40.14%) and 48 responses from Deans (42.48%).

Tables 3 and 4 further clarify the number of invitations to the online surveys that were distributed and the subsequent response rates. Of note, as stated in the REB protocols, in order to protect confidentiality of the individual institutions, none of the colleges are actually listed—they were all randomly coded with an identifier known only to myself.

Table 3. Number of Invitations Sent to Associate Deans/Chairs and Response Rate to Online Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of invitations sent</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 26, 2015</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>32.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14, 2015 (Reminders sent)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Number of Invitations Sent to Deans and Response Rate to Online Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of invitations sent</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 26, 2015</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14, 2015 (Reminders sent)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistical significance of the response rate.** A challenge associated with the online survey is whether the sample population appropriately represents the whole population of the study. I did not find a study of a similar nature conducted in Ontario thus precluding comparison to any base data such as gender, age, or work experience of participants. Additionally, there were strict restrictions based on REB protocols that prohibited revealing the identity of individual colleges thereby making it unethical to compare, contrast or comment on differences in the findings or cross references between colleges (as this might provide evidence of their identity). These issues are referenced in the limitations section of the study found in Chapter 5. Chapter 4 provides further breakdown of the responses according to region, discipline and provides rationale why size of the institution was not used as a comparison metric for analysis of the findings of this study.

The online surveys distributed to Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans attained a response rate of 40% and 42% respectively. It is difficult to determine an acceptable response rate for the online survey component of this project considering the nature of the study and the uncertainty associated with online surveys. It would appear that the rates attained are respectable. Boyko’s (2009) study garnered responses from 426 University Chairs and 64 Deans representing response rates of 32% and 24%, respectively (p. 94). It should be noted that Boyko employed a far larger sample size and that the rates she obtained were quite extraordinary; however, it is the only study of a similar nature that I am aware of in Canada.

Nulty (2008) finds that, “online surveys are much less likely to achieve response rates as high as surveys administered on paper” (p. 302). In a study comparing the
response rates in eight major online surveys, he found the average response rate to be 33%. In an online article related to best practices for conducting online research, Mirzaee (2014) found the average response rate for email surveys to be 24.8%; additionally, the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2010) finds “for web surveys, a 30-40% response rate is common, even with populations that are young and have easy access to the web” (p. 14). Nulty (2008) states that the response rate is not the best way to judge the accuracy of survey results; more importantly, it is respondent representativeness. In this study, all respondents were actually living the research topic giving credence to the fact that response rates of 40.14% and 42.48% are to be considered respectable for a study of this nature.

It is also difficult to determine what motivated participants to (or not to) respond to the survey. As previously stated, Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans have incredibly busy jobs. The invitation to the online survey stated that it might take up to one hour to complete the Associate Dean/Chair online survey; therefore, this might well have been a mitigating factor. Also, as previously stated, in spite of a commitment to confidentiality as stated in the REB protocols, there might have been fear from certain participants in commenting on their roles, leadership competencies, etc. I am extremely pleased with the responses from all participants and reiterate my gratitude to them.

**Data analysis and technology employed: Online surveys.** The online survey results from the Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans groups were gathered and analyzed using various techniques, dominated by descriptive statistics, and augmented by inferential statistics using a 2-tailed $t$-test. The surveys contained multiple choice questions as well as three multi-dimension questions that employed a 4-point Likert scale ranging from not important to very important. As stated earlier, the online surveys were coded in a manner such that results could be analyzed and presented utilising SPSS and Excel software. The data from the multiple choice questions were analyzed and presented in graphical format where applicable (in the form of tables, charts and graphs) with explanation of mathematical computations used to produce the graphs along with written commentary.
The multi-dimensional Likert-scale responses were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. First, using a descriptive statistical analysis, the survey responses to the multi-dimensional Likert-scale questions were sorted by mean importance scores to determine a ranking of the importance participants placed on various items within the multi-dimension questions, and the analysis is presented graphically with accompanying explanation and analysis. Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans were presented with identical multi-dimensional questions in the online surveys allowing for contrast/comparison of results between the two data sets.

Second, using inferential statistical analysis, a 2-tailed $t$-test was used to test the significance of differences in mean importance scores between the Associate Dean/Chairs and Deans groups when questioned on the importance of items within the multi-dimension questions. A 2-tailed $t$-test, “is a calculation based on a prediction that two samples (or sub-groups) within your achieved sample) will differ significantly in terms of their scores, but without a prediction of which set of scores will be larger” (Gorard, 2001, p. 187). The probability level was set at .05% or $p < .05$, a standard level of probability in social science studies. Palys (2003) explains:

> We can never be certain that a difference is real: we can only be confident to varying degrees. Traditionally, the social sciences have adopted $p < .05$ as the default criterion that is the criterion to use unless there’s some reason articulated beforehand to do otherwise. (p. 372)

SPSS data analysis software was used to sort and rank data gathered using the mean importance scores in the multi-dimension Likert-scale questions and perform the calculations for the 2-tailed $t$-tests. As I did not have experience with SPSS software, a data analyst was employed to assist with this section of the analysis. The focus of the analysis was to gain an understanding (by ranking where appropriate) of which responsibilities participants believed were most important to the role of Associate Deans/Chairs, the importance placed on certain challenges associated with middle-management, and which leadership competencies they deemed most important. The results from the Dean’s survey were over-layered with results from the Associate Deans/Chairs allowing for a visual comparative analysis between the two data sets of the online surveys.
The open-ended questions were analyzed using theme analysis which is described more fulsomely in the next section. For the most part, the open-ended questions allowed participants to expand on their responses to the quantitative-type questions in the survey in accordance with a sequential mixed-methods approach.

Data triangulation as defined by Denzin (1970) and Jick (1979) was then employed to compare and contrast the findings across three data sets: (a) the results from the online survey delivered to Associate Deans/Chairs; (b) the results from the online survey delivered to Deans; (c) the theoretical leadership constructs through which the study is viewed.

**Data Source 3: Semi-structured Face-to-face Interviews**

As previously described, and following Creswell’s sequential mixed methodology approach (Creswell, 2009), a qualitative research component followed the online surveys in the form of semi-structured face-to-face interviews. The interview questions were designed to allow participants to expand on and provide deeper context to the responses already obtained from the online surveys thus allowing me to “establish the meaning of a phenomenon from the viewpoint of participants” (p. 16). All questions in the face-to-face interviews had a direct correlation to the primary research questions (see Appendix J).

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as they allowed participants to tell their individual stories without being restricted by constant questioning from the interviewer. Semi-structured interviews were well suited to this project as, “Although the interviewer in this technique will have some established general topics for investigation, this method allows for the exploration of emergent themes and ideas rather than relying only on concepts and questions defined in advance of the interview” (Hockey, Robinson, & Meah, 2011, para. 2)

Semi-structured interviews are most appropriate when the interview involves a series of open-ended questions. I intended to probe into the opinions of the Associate Deans/Chairs in an attempt to capture and understand their beliefs. A semi-structured interview approach allowed a substantial amount of freedom for research participants to expand the interview in areas they felt important. Major benefits of semi-structure
interviews were that they are less intrusive to those being interviewed as the semi-structured interview encourages 2-way communication. Those being interviewed can ask questions of the interviewer (D’Arcy, 1990). While discussing the appropriateness of semi-structured interviews, Mathers, Fox, and Hunn (2002) suggest, “If the interviewee has difficulty answering a question or provides only a brief response, the interviewer can use cues or prompts to encourage the interviewee to consider the question further” (p. 2). Allowing Associate Deans/Chairs opportunity to describe their experiences through gentle suggestions or prompts seemed most appropriate.

Some consideration was given to using unstructured interviews for this project. Although unstructured interviews can be an excellent manner of collecting in-depth data, my prior experience as an Associate Dean led me to believe that without focus, the interviews might be informative, but not as focused on addressing the research questions as desired. “Unstructured interviews are exactly what they sound like—interviews where the interviewer wants to find out about a specific topic but has no structure or preconceived plan or expectation as to how the interview will proceed” (Mathers et al., 2002, p. 3). There was clear intent in this research to gain focused knowledge regarding the Associate Dean/Chair’s opinions around their experiences and the leadership competencies they felt would help them be successful in their roles. Comparing structured and semi-structured interview techniques, Gibson (1998) states that, “in semi-structured interviewing, the interviewer requires more focused information, and asks specific questions to gain it. The researcher opens the discussion, listens, and uses prompts to guide the respondent” (p. 470). The decision to use semi-structured interviews as the research method for this project is well supported.

**Considerations while conducting interviews.** Semi-structured interviews were well suited for this research project; however, there were other factors to be considered. During an interview, the interviewer becomes an active participant in the research. Careful consideration was given not to lead or make suggestions to participants based on my own experience. Mathers et al. (2002) caution injecting one’s own thoughts into the interview stating, “The interviewer should avoid bringing their personal perspectives into the discussion” (p. 10). Futrell and Willard (1994) suggest interviewers rigorously
examine their own role in the interview process stating that, “viewed as an active participant in the creation of dialogue, the researcher emerges as an instrument in the data-gathering phase of the research—one to be treated with the same caution social scientists apply to any research instrument” (p. 85). As a former Associate Dean and an advocate for Associate Deans/Chairs to be provided with leadership developmental opportunities, I needed to ensure that I did not bias the research process. Extra care was taken to examine my own assumptions by journaling notes related to the interview questions about my personal opinions before and after the interviews.

Participants: Face-to-face interviews. As previously described, there are varying degrees of change taking place within different colleges. The study attempts to explore leadership competencies to help Associated Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles as they navigate the changes currently taking place within the system. Due to the physical impossibility of interviewing participants from all 22 English speaking colleges and the considerable differences in change taking place across the college system, I employed a purposeful sampling methodology in selecting the Associate Deans/Chairs to be interviewed.

Purposeful sampling, when used in selecting participants for qualitative research, involves identifying and selecting individuals experienced with a phenomenon of interest, and equally important, are available, willing to participate, and have the ability to communicate experiences and opinions in an articulate, expressive, and reflective manner (Palinkas et al., 2013). A purposeful sample increases the value of information obtained from a relatively small sample size (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). It can also be described as a type of sampling where, “particular settings, persons, or events are deliberately selected for the important information they can provide that cannot be gotten as well from other choices” (Maxwell, 1997, p. 87). Following Maxwell’s definition, there were four concerns taken into consideration when selecting the Associate Deans/Chairs for the interviews:

1. The role of the Associate Dean/Chair is incredibly busy. It proved difficult to find participants who had time for the interviews.
2. There were extreme variances to the extent that change had affected institutions.

3. Geographical considerations had to be considered as to whether it was feasible for me to be able to physically meet face-to-face with research participants.

4. I had to exclude all Associate Deans/Chairs that either currently or previously directly reported to me.

These considerations were weighed carefully in the selection of participants.

For the purpose of this study, as it focused within the context of changes currently taking place within the system, it was determined that seven Associate Deans/Chairs were to be interviewed, and that they would collectively represent a cross-section of changes currently going on within the college system. Of note: originally there were to be six face-to-face interview participants; however, in order that participant characteristics met all criteria (as defined below) deemed important to achieve a purposeful sampling (Maxwell, 1997), a seventh participant was added.

There was consideration given to ensuring that there was representation from a minimum of at least one Associate Dean/Chair that characterised opposing aspects of each of the three major changes taking place in the system as earlier described in this study including degrees, applied research and differentiation. That is to say:

1. an Associate Dean/Chair who was substantially involved in degree activity and/or development, and an Associate Dean/Chair who had no involvement with degree activity.

2. an Associated Dean/Chair who was involved in applied research activity, and an Associate Dean/Chair who had little or no involvement in applied research activity.

3. an Associate Dean/Chair who worked in a college that had obtained differentiated status such as Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (ITAL) or Polytechnic, and an Associate Dean/Chair who worked in a college that had not obtained differentiated status.

In addition to the selection criteria based above, I also wanted to ensure I had an:

4. an Associate Dean/Chair who represented each of the four major programming clusters as defined by MTCU: Applied Arts, Business, Health, and Technology (MTCU, 2015b).
In order to obtain a purposeful sample (Maxwell, 1997), participants were invited to the face-to-face interviews based on their agreement to a follow up interview provided in their feedback in the online survey, and/or on my knowledge regarding the institute where they worked. This ensured that interview participants represented a broad cross-section of the major changes taking place in the Ontario college system, that is, degrees, applied research, and institutional differentiation.

A sample of the letter requesting selected participants to participate in the interviews (Appendices G) and a sample of the interview questions (Appendix J) which is identical to the protocols used to obtain various REB approvals (Appendix I). Participants in the interviews were all given the opportunity to review the interview questions, and at that point to either ask for clarification, or if they chose to, withdraw from the research project completely. The protocols ensure confidentiality of participants, and also clearly state that participants can withdraw (or have their responses withdrawn) at any time during the study. During the month of July, 2015, seven Associate Deans/Chairs were interviewed. The data analysis section found in Chapter 4 describes characteristics of the face-to-face interviewees, confirming that the participants represented a purposeful sample.

It is acknowledged that the sampling size proved to be one of the limiting aspects of face-to-face interview data collection aspect of this project; however, it seemed improbable to find more than seven Associate Deans/Chairs who would have the time and/or willingness to be interviewed for the project. As previously stated, there were also geographical considerations to be considered. Deliberation was given to using technology (such as Skype) to conduct the interviews; however, I did not feel I would be able to elicit the same level of comfort through Skype as I would be able to in a face-to-face setting.

Palys (2003) states that, “gathering data is easy, gathering meaningful data is a whole other challenge” (p. 150). In order to gain a meaningful understanding of what Associate Deans/Chairs experienced in their roles, and gather what could be considered delicate information required getting up close and personal. Mathers et al. (2002) confirm the suitability of using face-to-face interviews as a research method in situations such as this stating that, “face-to-face or personal interviews are very labour intensive, but can
also be the best way of collecting high quality data. Face-to-face interviews are preferable when the subject matter is very sensitive” (p. 3).

The semi-structured interviews were conducted with a purposeful sampling (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997; Suri, 2011) of seven Associate Deans/Chairs who represented a cross section of the changes currently taking place within the Ontario college system. The intention of the interviews was to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the role of the Associate Dean/Chair and to explore leadership competencies that would help them be successful in their roles as they navigate the changes currently taking place in the system.

**Data analysis: Face-to face interviews.** The results from the interviews were gathered and analyzed using techniques suited to qualitative methods. The data were transcribed from digital recordings to MS Word, reviewed numerous times, and then coded into themes in alignment with the research questions. The digital recordings were also revisited many times, allowing me to capture nuances such as voice inflections, thoughtful pauses etc. not easily captured in text. All questions in the face-to-face interviews had a direct correlation to and were specifically designed to address the primary research questions (Appendix J). It should be noted that I did offer to return transcripts for verification of accuracy to all interviewees. This offer was declined by all interview participants primarily due to their busy work schedules, but additionally because they trusted me to accurately convey their responses. They all asked to be provided a copy of the results of the study. This trust elicited an even higher level of commitment on my part to ensure that I accurately represented responses. To that end, I did follow up with a few interview participants asking for clarity around certain details.

Theme identification was used as a methodology for analysing the qualitative data as it “captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82). It also allowed for identification of issues important to the description of the phenomenon (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006), in this case the experiences and sentiments of the Associate Deans/Chairs. Bernard and Ryan (2010)
outline various methods that were utilized to identify themes including: identify word repetitions; look for local terms that sound unfamiliar or are used in unfamiliar ways; examine key-words-in-context; compare and contrast text; search for missing information; watch for transitions and connectors between comments.

The data were reviewed, and separated into categories that reflected answers to the primary research questions. Bernard and Ryan (2010) also suggest searching interviews for evidence of social conflict, cultural contradictions, things people do in managing interpersonal social relationships, methods by which people acquire and maintain achieved and ascribed status, and information about how people solve problems. Following this advice, the data were re-read several more times looking for: word repetitions (the find command in MS Word proved very beneficial for this task); terms that sounded familiar; and evidence of what occurred during social interactions between interviewees and other people. The latter task proved the most onerous as the data had to be reviewed numerous times.

After searching the data for similarities, Bernard and Ryan (2010) suggest cutting and sorting through the data which is a technique most of us learned at a young age with paper and scissors. They suggest cutting out quotes that seem important in light of having read and re-read the data, noting the context the quote was used in, and pasting the information onto small index cards. The data were separated into individual quotes; however, the “cut and paste” and “highlighting” functions available with modern software was used to separate quotes as opposed to paper and scissors. Each quote/statement that appeared significant was copied and grouped with similar quotes from other participants. The data was then re-read several more times noting patterns or indications of interpersonal relationships within the context of the themes.

A final review of the data (re-reading the transcripts) was conducted to ensure that any data applicable to a relevant theme was not overlooked. Any newly discovered relevant information was added to each respective theme. The data that originally appeared not to fit into a specific category was reviewed (and highlighted) and added to the analysis findings as appropriate.
Once the data was divided into themes according to the above methods, it was sorted into various categories within the framework of the three primary research questions. This allowed me to not only review the qualitative data in a stand-alone context, but to compare and contrast, where appropriate, with data obtained from the online surveys, providing a richer set of answers to the research questions congruent with the sequential mixed methodology approach as defined by Creswell (2009).

**Data Source 4: Institutional Documentation**

Institution documentation associated with the role was gathered through two sources. First, most college websites contain a link to employment opportunities. A search of the CAAT websites provided some job postings for Associate Deans/Chairs, and a review of the postings addressed many of the criteria. Second, an email requesting pertinent information, including an example of a job posting and/or description related to an Associate Dean and/or a Chair and an overview of professional development opportunities related to leadership for Associate Deans/Chairs, was sent to the heads of HR of all 22 English language CAATs. (See Appendix K for a sample of the letter that was sent to the heads of HR across the Ontario CAAT system.) As a follow up strategy in an effort to solicit higher response rates, I enlisted the help of the Senior-Manager, Organizational Development and Learning at Fanshawe College, and she graciously contacted her colleagues across the Ontario college system encouraging them to participate in the study.

**Data analysis: Institutional documentation.** Institutional data were organized using a structured themed approach. Job postings/descriptions were separated by theme as well as by activities within those themes. A similar approach was utilized to record professional development opportunities related to leadership development for Associate Deans/Chairs. The information gathered was very much of a quantitative nature, and a comparative analysis was used to compare and contrast information received from various institutions.
Comparison of Findings:

Triangulation

The quantitative data (from the online survey questionnaires), the qualitative data (from the semi-structured interviews), and the institutional documents and information were then analyzed using a between-method triangulation (Denzin, 1970) comparative methodology to determine similarities and differences. The results of the data, where appropriate, were also compared to the theoretical leadership constructs that this paper is viewed through: organizational role theory (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978), 8-stage process for leading change (Kotter, 1996), transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978), and systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990) to look for relevance to the aforementioned theoretical constructs.

A summary of the analysis of the findings as determined through triangulation, as well as an identification of limitations of the study, are presented in the final chapter (Chapter 5).

Chapter Summary

Chapter 3 provided an explanation as to why a sequential mixed methods (Creswell, 2009) approach was used to gather data for this study. An online survey questionnaire was adapted from a previous study by Boyko (2009) who investigated the role of the Chair in Canadian universities. The quantitative data in the survey was used to develop an understanding of and review of activity associated with the role, challenges accompanying the role, added responsibilities as a result of changes taking place in the system, the importance placed on leadership competencies, review of existing leadership development opportunities, and whether Associate Deans/Chairs feel there is a need for additional leadership competency development to assist them to be successful in their roles. Certain elements of the quantitative data were also obtained from Deans; specifically, the Dean’s perspective on responsibilities associated with the role and the leadership competencies deemed important. Qualitative data was then gathered through semi-structured interviews with Associate Deans/Chairs (who agreed to the interview) to
provide further context to the results from the online surveys. It also allowed participants to expand their narrative on topics such as perceptions of their role, relevance of leadership, implications (if any) of changes currently taking place within the system, and an exploration of leadership competencies that would help them be successful in their roles. Institutional documentation was gathered where possible, particularly HR information such as job postings and descriptions as well as professional development opportunities related to leadership for Associate Deans/Chairs. The data collected were analyzed using appropriate data analysis techniques and strategies as previously described.

All 22 English speaking colleges in the Ontario system were contacted (through the assistance of the Coordinating Committee of VPAs and asked to participate in the study. All Associate Deans/Chairs in those colleges were invited to participate in the online survey that focussed on an in depth analysis of the role and associated leadership competencies. All Deans in those colleges were also invited to participate in a condensed version of the survey. In order to add meaning to the quantitative data and gain a deeper understanding into their personal stories, semi-structured interviews were conducted with seven Associate Deans/Chairs representing a cross-section of major changes taking place within the Ontario college system. The semi-structured interviews combined with open-ended questions in the online surveys represented the qualitative data collection of the study. Institutional documentation, mainly of a Human Resources nature, were gathered through contacting HR Directors across the system. This constituted the data collection and analysis methodologies used for the study.

Chapter 4 will present the results of the research and an analysis of the findings.
CHAPTER 4.

Research Findings and Analysis

Overview

As previously described, the purpose of this study was to explore the role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean and/or Chair, and specifically focus on an investigation of the leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles. Leading from the role of the department Chair presents unique and complex challenges (Filan & Seagren, 2003; Gillett-Karam, 2002; Sirkis, 2011). The literature also confirms that they are seldom provided with leadership training that would help them to be successful in their roles (Filan, 1999; Inman, 2009; Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006). These challenges become more apparent when examined against the backdrop of change that is currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system.

To that end, this study attempted to answer the following questions:

Research Question 1: Defining the Role

1. What is the role of the Associate Dean/Chair within the Ontario CAAT system?
   a. Who is hired into these roles?
      i. What is their work and/or education background?
      ii. Do they have prior leadership experience and/or development?
      iii. Has the role of the Associate Dean been effectively communicated, understood and accepted by those assuming the position?
   b. What are the primary responsibilities associated with the role?
   c. Have any of the responsibilities associated with the role changed as a result of recent changes that have taken place within the Ontario CAAT system?
d. Are there distinctive challenges associated with being defined as middle-management, and if so, what are they?

Research Question 2: Leadership Competencies Required

2. What leadership competencies would assist mid-level Ontario CAAT academic administrators (Associated Deans and/or Chairs) to be successful in their roles?

   a. Do Associate Deans/Chairs believe that there are leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles, and if so, what are they?

   b. Which, if any, of the competencies identified in the previous question would assist them most in leading the changes currently taking place in the Ontario college system?

   c. Would an understanding and practice of systems thinking theory assist Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles?

Research Question 3: Developmental Opportunities

3. What leadership developmental opportunities are currently available for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs?

   a. Are there current leadership developmental opportunities available for Associate Deans/Chairs in the Ontario college system?

   b. If so, are the current leadership development opportunities effective and/or adequate?

   c. Do Associate Deans/Chairs believe that there should be more assistance to provide them with development opportunities to enhance their leadership competencies?

   d. Should there be leadership development opportunities with a specific focus on leading the change currently taking place within the college system?

The study gathered four sources of data through which to answer the research questions:

1. Online surveys with Associate Deans/Chairs
2. Online surveys with Deans
3. Semi-structured interviews with Associate Deans/Chairs
4. Institutional documentation
The following section attempts to answer each of the research questions based on the data collected as appropriate. The research questions are answered sequentially, by data source, adhering to Creswell’s (2009) sequential mixed methodology. A review of the data collection confirms that the online surveys were followed by semi-structured face-to-face interviews of a much smaller sample size. The institutional documentation was collected in a more ad hoc manner as some of it was available online via college and various job posting websites etc.; however, in keeping with a sequential mixed methodology approach, those results shall be presented last.

Throughout the analysis of the findings, the data are presented in the form of text, tables, charts and graphs often utilizing descriptive statistical analysis. For multi-dimensional questions that contained a Likert-scale, in addition to descriptive statistical analysis, inferential statistical analysis was employed. A 2-tailed t-test was used to test the significance of differences in mean importance scores between the Associate Dean/Chairs and Deans groups when questioned on the importance of items within the multi-dimension questions. The probability level is set at .05% or $p < .05$, a standard level of probability in social science studies.

In the summary section of the data analysis found in Chapter 5, a triangulation methodology is employed to compare and contrast the findings between the various data sets to the literature and the theoretical frameworks defined earlier in the study that includes: organizational role theory (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978); transformational leadership theory (Burns, 1978); 8-stage process of leading change (Kotter, 1996); and systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990).

Prior to answering the research questions, a brief review of the characteristics of the respondents for the four data sources is presented.
Data Sources 1 and 2:

Online Survey Results from Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans

Characteristics of the Online Survey Respondents

The first data source reviewed includes the online survey results from both Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans. Much of this data is presented employing a descriptive statistical analysis. A comparison, employing both descriptive and inferential statistical analysis, of the results between the Associate Deans/Chair’s and Dean’s surveys is also used to determine whether there are similarities and/or discrepancies in the perceptions of the two groups relative to various aspects of the role.

The response rates from the online survey for the Associate Deans/Chairs (116 responses) and Deans (48 responses) were 40.42% and 42.48% respectively. Tables 5 and 6 show the number of invitations to the online surveys that were distributed to each group and the subsequent response rates. As stated in the REB protocols, in order to protect confidentiality of the individual institutions, the colleges have been randomly coded with an identifier known only to me.

Four records from the online survey were removed from the analyses for the following reasons:

1. One Dean emailed stating that they did not have any direct reports and did not feel they should be included in the study;
2. One of the Associate Deans/Chairs stated they were in an acting role, and that they were aware that the permanent incumbent had also received the survey and that the incumbent intended to participate in the survey;
3. One individual emailed stating they were not an Associate Dean/Chair or Dean;
4. An Associate Dean/Chair emailed stating their role was unique and they were not responsible for any academic programming and did not have any direct reports.

Additionally, one of the VPA offices informed me that their institution did not use the job title of Associate Dean and/or Chair, but that they did have Academic Directors who they believed performed very similar duties. I confirmed that these individual were responsible for Academic
mid-management duties at their respective college, and they are included in the survey with the Associate Deans/Chairs.

Table 5. Number of Invitations Sent to Associate Deans/Chairs and Response Rate to Online Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Identifier</th>
<th>No. of invitations</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not identify college:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6. Number of Invitations Sent to Deans and Response Rate to Online Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Identifier</th>
<th>No. of invitations</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not identify college:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were limitations inherent with the online survey component of this study. The email lists were compiled based on information received from Vice President Academic offices across the English language CAAT system and it was next to impossible to verify whether the lists were 100% accurate. One of the college’s email lists did not have any Associate Deans and/or Chairs while another did not have any Deans. There were no responses to the Associate Dean/Chair survey from eight of the colleges, and no responses to the Dean’s survey from seven colleges. (This would account for the lack of response from a college in each sampling group due to the fact that one of the colleges does not have any Associate Deans/Chairs and another does not
have any Deans.) A complete explanation of limitations associated with the study are presented in Chapter 5.

I committed to protecting the identity of the individual colleges (as per REB protocols); however, in order to provide more clarity to the characteristics of the online survey respondents, it seemed appropriate to review the responses through other filters. Ontario colleges, generally for the purposes of marketing, are often clustered regionally by north, south, east, and west. Table 7 indicates where the 22 English language colleges referenced in this study are clustered by region.

Table 7. Ontario Colleges by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Northern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conestoga</td>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td>Algonquin</td>
<td>Cambrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanshawe</td>
<td>George Brown</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Canadore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton</td>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>Loyalist</td>
<td>Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk</td>
<td>Humber</td>
<td>St. Lawrence</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Sault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Ontario Colleges, 2015b.

Utilizing the coded identifiers (known only to me) to represent the colleges, Tables 8 and 9 represent the online survey results from Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans by region.

Table 8. Number of Invitations Sent to Associate Deans/Chairs and Response Rate to Online Survey by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of invitations sent</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not identify college:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Number of Invitations Sent to Deans and Response Rate to Online Survey by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of invitations sent</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not identify college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.48%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tables indicate that there was a significantly lower response rate from colleges in the north compared with the rest of the province. This is weighed as a consideration and acknowledged in the limitations of the study described in Chapter 5.

The MTCU (2015b) identifies four clusters as primary areas of programming across the Ontario CAAT system: Applied Arts; Business; Health; and Technology. Table 10 identifies which clusters of programs the respondents manage as per the survey results. The results demonstrate a healthy representation from the four major program clusters areas across the college system. It should be noted, that unlike Universities, I know from personal experience that each Ontario college clusters programs according to their own needs and that there is no uniformity across the system. It was therefore deemed unnecessary to focus analysis of the data by program cluster in order to support the primary research objectives of this project.

Table 10. School Name or Program Cluster Chairs/Associate Deans Manage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Arts</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE/ Area campuses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and other services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple areas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The preceding results show that 9 of 116 (7.76%) respondents manage portfolios across multiple areas of programming. That would appear to indicate an added layer of complexity to the role for some.

A HEQCO (2013) study found that the sizes of colleges (based on enrolment) in Ontario, “shows the ordering of colleges on the basis of enrolment size…is a smooth gradient and suggests no natural points of delineation” (p. 10). Based on this finding, I did not cluster the responses based on the size of the institution. However, based on the geographical location of Ontario’s large colleges as identified in the HEQCO (2013) study, it is reasonable to assume that there were far more responses from large colleges than small, a factor to be acknowledged in the limitations of the study. Additionally, based on the small sizes of northern colleges combined with the poor response rate from colleges in that region creates difficulty in assessing whether the results and conclusions draw from this study apply equally to Ontario’s northern college and will also be acknowledged in the limitations of the findings

**Research Question 1: Defining the Role**

The first primary research question attempts to provide a fulsome understanding of the role of Associate Dean/Chair. Bailey and Yost (2001) find that, “roles are organized behavioral patterns and expectations that attend to a given position (hierarchical, functional, or social) or that accompany a specific situation” (p. 2422). In this context, the role of Associate Dean/Chair shall be reviewed within the context of the middle-management hierarchical positions that they hold in Ontario CAATs. The primary question is followed by a series of secondary questions focused on their background, prior leadership experience and development, a review of associated responsibilities, whether there is a direct correlation between change currently taking place in the system and the role, and on challenges specifically associated with mid-management.
A brief review of organizational role theory (ORT) principles (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978) and assumptions (Parker & Wickham, 2005) are provided prior to presenting an analysis of the data related to Research Question 1.

**ORT principles.**

1. Role expectations are reflective of the organization’s culture and norms of behaviour.
2. In order for an organization to function effectively, the role has been effectively communicated, understood and accepted by those that assume the position.

**ORT assumptions.**

The employee’s performance is based on a review process that is dynamic and underpinned by the following four assumptions (Parker & Wickham, 2005):

1. The role taking assumption. “This assumption states that an individual will ‘take’ or accept a role that is conferred upon them by their employer” (p. 3).
2. The role consensus assumption. “This assumption states for that for organizations to function optimally, there needs to be consensus regarding the expectations of enacted roles and the manner in which they interact” (p. 3).
3. The role compliance assumption. “This assumption states that each role has a set of behaviors that are well defined and consistently adhered to by employees” (p.4).
4. The role conflict assumption. “This assumption states that conflict will arise when role expectations embedded in one role conflict with expectations associated with another role” (p. 4).

Following is a breakdown of responses from Associate Deans/Chairs (and Deans where appropriate) based on the online survey questions that characterize various aspects of the role.

**1a. Who is hired into these roles?** Tables 11 and 12 reveal demographical characteristics of those who currently occupy the role of Associate Dean/Chair as based on the online survey results. Very few of the respondents (3.45%) reported being younger than age 35, and an equal percentage (3.45%) reported being over 65 (Table 11). The
findings results suggest that most Associate Deans/Chairs have likely enjoyed substantial work and/or life experience prior to assuming the role. The results also establish that few remain in the role once the standard retirement age of 65 is reached.

Table 11. Age of Chairs/Associate Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows the tenure of the Associate Deans/Chairs who responded to the survey. The highest proportion (34.48%) have only occupied the position for less than 1 year, and a very small percentage (4.31%) have held the job for more than 6 years suggesting a high turnover rate for this position.

Table 12. Tenure of Chairs/Associate-Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1ai: What is their work and/or education background? Figure 2 indicates that most Associate Deans/Chairs have a graduate level credential with by far the highest proportion having a Master’s degree.
Almost all credentials attained by Associate Deans/Chairs fit into the four primary programming clusters as identified by MTCU (2015b): Applied Arts, Business, Health, and Technology. Only 8 of 116 (6.90%) respondents stated that, either their credential was in another discipline (Table 13), or they did not identify where they obtained their credential. There was no research question asking for a direct correlation between the credential of the respondent and the respective portfolio that they managed; however, these results indicate that there is close alignment between credentials Associate Deans/Chairs hold and the four primary program clusters identified by MTCU (2015b).

Table 13. Field of Study of Last Credential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Applied Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Respond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Academic credential of Chairs/Associate Deans
Note: (N = 116)
Of interest, the majority of the respondents, 65.52%, obtained their final credential in Canada, but in a province other than Ontario (Table 14).

Table 14. Location of Academic Institution for Last Credential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 illustrates the positions that Associate Deans/Chairs held prior to assuming their current roles. A large majority, 70 of 116 (60.35%), of those entering the role are already employed at their respective institutions, with the largest percentage (39.66%) being promoted from faculty.

Table 15. Role Prior to Current Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative role at college</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support role at college</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty role at college</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External role to college</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This result is expanded upon in Table 16 showing that 17 of 116 (14.66%) were appointed from within the college without an interview and that 53 of 116 (45.69%) were hired after successfully competing in an interview process confirming a total of 70 of 116 (60.35%) being hired into the role internally.
Table 16. Hiring Process for Chairs/Associate Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiring Process</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed from within the college</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed (another position within the college)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed (another position external to the college)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed (unemployed at the time)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1aii: Do they have prior leadership experience and/or development? Online survey Q9 asked participants if they had any previous leadership experience and Question 10 asked participants whether they had any formal leadership training prior to assuming their current roles. The results indicate that a large majority of them have both (Figures 3 and 4).

![Figure 3. Previous leadership experience of Chairs/Associate Deans. Note: (N = 116)
The survey results show that a large majority (92.24%) of those occupying the role have prior leadership experience with most (68.10%) having participated in some form of leadership development. In order to gain a more fulsome understanding of what these results implied, online survey Question 11 posed an open-ended question asking participants to identify previous leadership development opportunities they had participated in prior to assuming the role. There were 74 of 116 responses (63.79%) to the question. The responses were thoroughly reviewed, and grouped utilizing theme analysis. The following emerged as dominant categories: formal post-secondary education with a focus on leadership; leadership development opportunities provided by their former employer (for those employed from outside of the college); leadership development opportunities provided by their current institution; the Chair’s Academy; military leadership development; self-interest courses related to leadership; and none. The responses, grouped by category are illustrated in Table 17.
Table 17. Previous Leadership Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where participants experienced previous leadership training</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate training related to job</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Post-Secondary education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Academy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various self-interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (N = 116)

Some of the preceding findings bear further comment. A small percentage, 6.75%, indicated that had been provided an opportunity to attend the Chair’s Academy, a training program previously discussed in the literature review. Another 8.11% indicated they had participated in leadership development opportunities with their current employer. Of the participants who responded to the question, all but two had experienced some form of leadership development. A response from an Associate Dean/Chair online survey participant who had been denied an opportunity to participate in a leadership development program struck me as poignant:

In my former role, I had applied to participate in a leadership development program but was denied. My supervisor didn't deem it necessary! Frankly, I found this surprising as well as disappointing.

**1aiii: Has the role of the Associate Dean been effectively communicated, understood and accepted by those assuming the position?** Question 12 of the online survey to Associated Deans/Chairs asked whether they had been provided with job descriptions when they were hired. The results demonstrate that the large majority of them, 87 of 116 (75.99%), were provided with job descriptions, but equally important, 25 of 116 (21.55%) were not, with 4 of 116 (3.45%) not answering the question. In addition, a large percentage of respondents, 48 of 116 (41.38%), were not provided with a clear explanation regarding expectations associated with the role when they were hired, while 65 of 116 (56.03%) of them were, and 3 of 16 (2.59%) did not answer this question.
Most Associate Deans/Chairs (85.34%) indicated that they reported directly to their faculty Dean, and 9.48% indicated they reported to someone other than the Dean. A large majority, 106 of 116 (91.38%), claimed that they participate in an annual performance review.

An additional series of survey Questions 16-20 probed deeper into perceptions of the Associate Deans/Chairs regarding the performance review process. The results are provided in Table 18.

Table 18. Assessment of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How is performance assessed?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual informal review/meeting</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual formal review/meeting</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seemed unusual that 9 of 116 respondents (7.76%) reported some form of performance review other than a face-face meeting. Equally surprising was that 18 of 116 respondents (15.52%) claimed that their performance review was handled informally. Most respondents, 74 of 116 (63.79%), reported a direct correlation between their performance review and their salaries.

Question 18 of the online survey presented participants with a series of yes or no questions related to aspects of their performance review. In most cases, the questions are related to the two principles and four assumptions associated with ORT (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978, Parker & Wickham, 2005). The results are presented in Table 19.
Table 19.  Aspects of Performance Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During your performance review is there:</th>
<th>No. yes responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for dialogue</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of personal goals and objectives</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of departmental goals and objectives</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of leadership</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive to conform to institutional norms and culture</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear reference to your original job posting</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences for not conforming to institutional norms and cultures</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  \((N = 116)\)

There will be further commentary on the alignment of these findings with ORT at the end of this section, but of significance, this study places emphasis on leadership competencies deemed as important to the role, yet only 48.28% of survey respondents reference any discussion of leadership during their performance review.

When Associate Deans/Chairs were asked to assess their performance review process, the majority, 61 of 116 (52.59%), did not find the process accurate while only 45 of 116 (38.79%) did. An additional 10 of 116 (8.62%) did not answer the question.

Online survey Question 20 provided Associate Deans/Chairs with an open-ended question allowing them to further elaborate on aspects of the performance review process. Feedback was provided by 65 of 116 Associate Deans/Chairs (56.93%) for this question with 51 of 116 (43.97%) choosing not to respond. Results were not positive. The dominant theme that emerged from the online responses was that Associate Deans/Chairs did not feel the performance review process represented an accurate reflection of the jobs they actually performed as referenced by 29 of 65 (44.62%) respondents. Following are responses from the Associate Dean/Chair online survey confirming this sentiment:

I do not believe that any performance review, no matter how rigorous, can fully capture an individual’s contribution to an organization as it should be expected that as “admin” we try to go above and beyond in our efforts to promote our discipline and the well-being of our students and staff.

No formal pencil and paper process could ever capture the wide and rich variety of performances required by this or any other management and leadership position.
The review does not reflect the ability to function in crisis management mode and does not reflect the volume of work nor the complexity of the portfolio.

There were only 2 positive responses made by Associate Deans/Chairs referencing the performance reviews, and they were generic at best; however, 21 of 65 respondents (32.31%) had negative overtones with responses as follows:

The current Dean does not follow policy for performance reviews. My past 2 years have not been signed off. She dictates what she wants me to write, some of it not pertaining to goals and objectives. She reviews my report and then tells me what she wants changed. There is little to no discussion and I have never been asked what my personal goals and objectives are.

No negative consequences for those not performing. No incentive to do more than the minimum. I have always obtained fully satisfactory and told if the college did recognize exceptional, I would receive that designation. We don't.

The feedback from Associate Deans/Chairs as found in the online surveys appears to indicate room for improvement in the area of performance reviews.

A review of the preceding findings through the theoretical framework of ORT, Katz and Kahn (1978) and Biddle (1986) finds both alignment and misalignment to the theory. Certain aspects of the performance review process did align with certain elements of ORT as some respondents (27.59%) claimed there were incentives to conform to organizational norms and culture while others (13.79%) claimed there were consequences for not. This would appear to align with the first principle of ORT, that role expectations are reflective of the organization’s culture and norms of behaviour, as defined by Biddle (1986).

However, 61 of 116 (52.59%) respondents reported that the performance review process was not accurate, and when provided an opportunity for further commentary, 29 of 65 (44.62%) claimed the performance review was not an accurate reflection of the jobs they actually performed. Additionally, many of the responses indicated that Associate Deans/Chairs were not always provided with clear and accurate job descriptions. One of the principles inherent with ORT is that in order for organizations to function effectively,
role expectations must be effectively communicated, understood and accepted by those assuming the position.

The negative connotations associated with the performance review process likely creates confusion between Associated Deans/Chairs and their managers (usually Deans) regarding expectations associated with the role. The assumption that role-conflict will arise if expectations are not consensual (Parker & Wickham, 2005) would imply that conflict between Associate Deans/Chairs and those who they report to is likely to occur due to unclear job expectations combined with negative perceptions of performance reviews.

1b: Primary responsibilities associated with the role. A series of online survey Questions 21-24 attempted to assess the volume of work associated with the role, and specifically address the number of direct-reports in terms of full-time and part-time faculty, the number of support persons, and the number of students associated with the position. Figures 5 and 6 illustrate the volume of work associated with the role as reported. A large percentage (25.86%) manage more than 30 full-time faculty, and an even higher percentage (50.00%), reported more than 30 part-time faculty in their departments. From personal experience, I know that part-time faculty are hired on a semester-by-semester basis, and sourcing and hiring quality part-time faculty is extremely time consuming.
Figure 5. Full-time faculty in department
Note: \((N = 116)\)

Figure 6. Part-time faculty in department
Note: \((N = 116)\)
Figure 7 shows the number of support staff reporting to Associate Deans/Chairs. A large majority (75.86%) report they have between 1-10 support persons and over half (55.17%) report they only have between 1-5 support persons reporting to them. This might indicate a level of support not proportionate to the level needed to adequately manage the high volume of faculty.

Even more telling is the data presented in Figure 8 that indicates the huge volume of students these roles are responsible for. The majority (56.03%) responded to the online survey stating that they are responsible for over 800 students.
Online survey Questions 25-26 asked whether the respondents had the help of an administrative assistant, and if yes, whether the assistant reported directly to them. A large majority, 81 of 116 (69.83%), indicated that they did have an administrative assistant. However, only 58 of 116 (50%) claim this position reports directly to them. Of equal significance, in my opinion, is that 25 of 116 (21.55%) of respondents claim they do not have an administrative assistant.

The final question (Question 27) in this section of the online survey asked Associate Deans/Chairs to clarify how many hours they worked on average over a 7-day week (Table 20).

Table 20.  Hours Worked in Average per 7-day Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Hours</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 to 40 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 45 hours</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 50 hours</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50 hours</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results show how time demanding the job is. Only three respondents reported that they actually worked within the time stated in most job descriptions (generally found to be 37.5 hours per week as per institutional documentation). A large proportion, 93 of 116 (80.18%) reported that they worked more than 46 hours in a typical week, and even more startling, 46 of 116 respondents (39.66%) claimed they work more than 50 hours in a week.

The results from online survey Questions 21-27 related to the level of volume of work associated with the role of Associate Dean/Chair demonstrate that the job is highly demanding in terms of high numbers of faculty and students, lack of supports provided, and time commitments. The high demands of the work-load experienced by Associate Deans/Chairs is a recurring theme that surfaces frequently throughout the analysis of the findings from the online survey.

**Quantitative results.** The next question asked Associate Deans/Chairs to rate the level of importance they placed on a series of 38 typical activities associated with the role on a 4-point Likert scale that ranked from not important to very important. The questionnaire is an adaptation of the tool developed by Lydia Boyko (2009) from her work on the study of Chairs in Canadian Universities. The results from the questionnaire are analyzed and presented in multiple formats in order to help interpret the data, and also to allow for ease of comparison/contrast to results from the Deans, who were asked the identical question. Table 21 presents an overview of the responses from both Associate Deans/Chairs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with serious performance issues</td>
<td>N: 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>12.84%</td>
<td>84.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining morale</td>
<td>N: 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>79.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing professional leadership/setting</td>
<td>N: 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>example</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>77.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging good teaching</td>
<td>N: 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>21.90%</td>
<td>76.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting faculty and other staff</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
<td>22.02%</td>
<td>68.81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing departmental plans</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>32.11%</td>
<td>66.97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teambuilding in the department</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>32.71%</td>
<td>66.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating faculty and other staff performance</td>
<td>N 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>33.03%</td>
<td>64.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new programs and curriculum</td>
<td>N 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>33.94%</td>
<td>57.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing existing programs and curriculum</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>38.89%</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing departmental plans</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>40.37%</td>
<td>57.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning faculty course work</td>
<td>N 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
<td>33.94%</td>
<td>56.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in student retention strategies</td>
<td>N 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
<td>34.58%</td>
<td>57.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending convocation, award, celebratory events</td>
<td>N 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>9.17%</td>
<td>33.94%</td>
<td>55.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championing your unit within the college</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
<td>38.53%</td>
<td>53.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing budgets, handling other financial matters</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>41.28%</td>
<td>53.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving faculty member conflicts</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>42.59%</td>
<td>51.85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing your unit outside the college</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.84%</td>
<td>39.45%</td>
<td>47.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring faculty</td>
<td>N 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
<td>44.95%</td>
<td>46.79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining relations with students</td>
<td>N 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>37.96%</td>
<td>46.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining relations with college enabling areas</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
<td>52.29%</td>
<td>42.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relations with other academic departments</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>15.74%</td>
<td>42.59%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Typical Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating in committee meetings within the department</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving other staff conflicts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing institutional policies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in external audits of departmental programs and curricula</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in committee meetings outside the department</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing professional development opportunities for faculty and staff</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession planning</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving faculty and staff leaves</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in student recruitment activities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing revenue-generating initiatives for the department</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning faculty-student advisors</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing facilities, equipment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining departmental records</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing departmental reports</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising (building relations with alumni, foundations, other donors)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining relations with parents of students</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Deans who participated in the study were asked the identical series of questions employing the same Likert-scale. Table 22 shows the results from the Deans.
Table 22. Typical Activities Associated with the Role (Dean’s Response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with serious performance issues</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining morale</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing professional leadership/setting example</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging good teaching</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting faculty and other staff</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>72.92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing departmental plans</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teambuilding in the department</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating faculty and other staff performance</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>14.58%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new programs and curriculum</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing existing programs and curriculum</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing departmental plans</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning faculty course work</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>72.92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in student retention strategies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
<td>65.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending convocation, award, celebratory events</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>52.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championing your unit within the college</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing budgets, handling other financial matters</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>40.43%</td>
<td>48.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving faculty member conflicts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>35.42%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing your unit outside the college</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring faculty</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
<td>40.43%</td>
<td>55.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining relations with students</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>39.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining relations with college enabling areas (i.e., marketing, facilities,</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR, information technologies, registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
<td>53.19%</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relations with other academic departments</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in committee meetings within the department</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
<td>44.68%</td>
<td>48.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving other staff conflicts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>45.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing institutional policies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>52.08%</td>
<td>35.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in external audits of departmental programs and curricula</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in committee meetings outside the department</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>64.58%</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Create professional development opportunities for faculty and staff</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>45.83%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession planning</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>39.58%</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving faculty and staff leaves</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>27.08%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>27.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in student recruitment activities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing revenue-generating initiatives for the department</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>35.42%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning faculty-student advisors</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.64%</td>
<td>40.43%</td>
<td>31.91%</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing facilities, equipment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>35.42%</td>
<td>35.42%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining departmental records</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.42%</td>
<td>35.42%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to analyze the aggregated data, and to allow for a comparative analysis between the results found from the Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans, two analysis techniques were employed. First, a descriptive statistics methodology is used to illustrate the mean scores of participant responses on the importance of activities associated with the role. The second analysis presents an inferential perspective based on a 2-tailed t-test.

First, the survey responses to the Likert question were sorted by mean importance scores to determine a ranking of the importance participants placed on activities associated with the role of Associate Dean/Chair. Figure 9 displays descriptive statistics of all items measuring the importance of typical activities conducted by Associate Deans/Chairs. The graph portrays the responses (Associate Deans/Chairs) when ranked using the mean importance scores for each item.
**Figure 9.** Importance of typical activities (as ranked by Ads/Chairs)
Figure 10 displays descriptive statistics of all items measuring the importance of typical activities conducted by Associate Deans/Chairs. The graph portrays the responses (Deans) when ranked using the mean importance scores for each item.

![Figure 10. Importance of typical activities (as ranked by Deans)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deans - mean importance scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging good teaching</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with serious performance issues</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing departmental plans</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating faculty and other staff performance</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing existing programs and curriculum</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting faculty and other staff</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing professional leadership/setting</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teambuilding in the department</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new programs and curriculum</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in student retention strategies</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining morale</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning faculty course work</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing departmental plans</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring faculty</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in external audits of…</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving faculty member conflicts</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in committee meetings within…</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending convocation, award, celebratory…</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing budgets, handling other financial…</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relations with other academic…</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving other staff conflicts</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining relations with students</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining relations with college enabling…</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing your unit outside the college</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing institutional policies</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championing your unit within the college</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in student recruitment activities</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Create professional development</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in committee meetings outside…</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession planning</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving faculty and staff leaves</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing revenue-generating initiatives for…</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing departmental reports</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining departmental records</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing facilities, equipment</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning faculty-student advisors</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising (building relations with alumni,)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining relations with parents of students</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of the descriptive statistics finds some commonality of opinion between the two groups. Eight of the top-10 activities identified as being important to Associate Deans/Chairs when ranked using mean importance scores also appear in the top-10 list of Deans when ranked using the same method. They are:

1. Dealing with serious performance issues: ranked 1st by AD/Chairs and 2nd by Deans
2. Providing professional leadership, setting example: ranked 3rd by AD/Chairs and 7th by Deans
3. Encouraging good teaching: ranked 4th by AD/Chairs and 1st by Deans
4. Implementing department plans: ranked 5th by AD/Chairs and 3rd by Deans
5. Teambuilding in the department: ranked 6th by AD/Chairs and 8th by Deans
6. Evaluating faculty and staff performance: ranked 7th by AD/Chairs and 4th by Deans
7. Recruiting faculty and other staff: ranked 8th by AD/Chairs and 6th by Deans
8. Reviewing existing programs and curriculum: ranked 9th by AD/Chairs and 5th by Deans

Two activities that appear in the top-10 list for Associate Deans/Chairs that do not appear in the top-10 list for Deans are:

1. Maintaining morale: ranked 2nd by AD/Chairs and 14th by Deans
2. Developing departmental plans: ranked 10th by AD/Chairs and 13th by Deans

Two activities that appear in the top-10 list for Deans that do not appear in the top-10 list for Associate Deans/Chair are:

1. Developing new programs and curriculum: ranked 9th by Deans and 12th by AD/Chairs
2. Involvement with student recruitment activities: ranked 10th by Deans and 30th by AD/Chair

Of equal significance is a comparison between what Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans did not rank as important activities. A review of the findings confirms that both
groups expressed like opinions in this regard. Using the ranking methodology as previously described, results show agreement on the bottom five least important activities (in descending order of importance). They are: maintaining departmental records; managing facilities equipment; assigning faculty-student advisors; fundraising (building relationships with alumni); and maintaining relationships with parents of students.

Figure 11 provides a comparative analysis of the results for the two groups. The graph compares the descriptive statistics of all items measuring the importance of typical activities conducted by Associate Deans/Chairs. The graph portrays the responses (Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans) when ranked using the mean importance scores for each item.
**Figure 11.** Typical activities associated with the role: Comparative view between Associate Deans/Chair and Deans
These findings, based on an adaptation of Boyko’s (2009) survey tool, provide a powerful visualization of typical activities associated with the role of the Associate Dean/Chair. The results appear to illustrate that Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans generally share similar viewpoints when asked to rate the importance they allocate to these activities.

Second, in order to obtain an inferential perspective, a 2-tailed t-test was used to test the significance of differences in mean importance scores for the Associate Dean/Chairs and Deans groups when questioned on the importance of activities associated with the role of Associate Deans/Chairs.

Table 23 demonstrates the results of the 2-tailed t-test demonstrating a significant difference on the mean importance score for six of the items. As defined in the methodology chapter, the probability level is set at .05% or p < .05, a standard level of probability in social science studies.

Table 23. Results of 2-tailed t-test: Importance of Activities Associated with the Role of AD/Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Associated with the Role</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementing departmental plans</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>41.911</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>2.738</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing existing programs and</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>7.607</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in external audits</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>3.075</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of departmental programs and</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championing your unit within the</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-2.824</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating faculty and other</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>14.081</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff performance</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging good teaching</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>31.156</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>2.572</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from a 2-tailed t-test indicate a significant difference on the mean importance scores between Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans (who participated in the
online survey) on the importance they place on the following six activities associated with the role.

Rated more important by Associate Deans/Chairs:

1. Championing your unit within the college
2. Evaluating faculty and staff

Rated more important by Deans:

3. Implementing departmental plans
4. Review existing programs and curriculum
5. Participating in external audits of programs and curricula
6. Encouraging good teaching

**Qualitative results.** An open-ended question in the online survey probed even deeper into the role from the perspective of the Associate Dean/Chair. Question 29 allowed Associate Deans/Chairs to express, in their own words, what they felt were the three most important responsibilities associated with the role and then rank them in order of importance from 1 to 3. One hundred and eight out of the 116 Associate Deans/Chairs provided feedback to this question for a response rate of 93.10%. It proved difficult to determine an exact ranking of the responses, as many of the respondents replied in narrative format and provided more than three responses. The data results are therefore displayed in two formats. First, using theme analysis based on a count of key phrases, comments and words, 14 themes emerged. Then, the total number of responses related to each theme were counted, and ranked within each theme in order of importance from 1 to 3 in accordance with how participants ranked them in the survey responses. The results are presented in Table 24.

Table 24. Most Important Tasks Associated with Associate Deans/Chairs Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Themes</th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>2nd most important</th>
<th>3rd most important</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty: scheduling/workload, performance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty: hiring and recruitment, onboarding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty: mentoring, support, and PD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second, the responses were sorted based on a weighted analysis according to the respondents perceived level of importance. It would be impossible to absolutely determine an exact ranking that Associate Deans/Chairs place on responsibilities associated with the role as the responses were so varied and of mixed format (some providing one-word answers, and some providing commentary). However, using a theme analysis followed by a weighted ranking as noted, Table 25 provides a representation of respondent’s comments to this study question.

Table 25. Most Important Tasks Associated with Associate Deans/Chairs Role (Weighted Ranking)
Top 14 themes: ranked in order of importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>2nd most important</th>
<th>3rd most important</th>
<th>Weighted total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget, managing finances</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Management: admin functions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty: hiring and recruitment, onboarding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning, future vision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students - dealing with issues, appeals etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table represents responses from Associate Deans/Chairs clustered into 14 themes and ranked using a weighted analysis. Each response under most important was given a weighting of 3, each response under 2nd most important was given a weighting of 2, and each response under 3rd most important was given a weighting of 1. The rows were totaled and sorted based on the total weighting.

Many Associate Deans/Chairs chose to provide commentary when answering the preceding question (as opposed to being specific). The following responses illustrate the level of complexity some associate with the role:

Preparation for the next semester, year, and decade. Program health (financial, KPI, etc.) program renewal, new programs, contract work, PD for staff, renewal of Program Advisory Committees (PACs).

Fostering a climate of teamwork amongst the entire 100-member school team, including full-time faculty, partial-load faculty, part-time faculty, and support staff.

The preceding findings warrant further discussion. Themes that emerged from this study related to typical activities of the Associate Dean/Chair including ensuring student success, managing and supporting faculty, ensuring excellence in teaching and learning, and administrative functions such as budget responsibilities and resource allocation are congruent with themes found in former studies reviewed in the literature review (Berdrow, 2010). It bears reiterating that the more things change, the more they remain the same. The comparison also shows that when asked to comment on their roles, Associate Dean/Chairs identify more responsibilities with management than with leadership when those responsibilities are distributed through the framework provided by Kotter International (2015).

The final point on this topic is a reminder that this study is situated within the context of change currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system, primarily focused on the impacts of degrees, applied research and differentiation. A quick word count
looking for reference to the aforementioned topics in the comments provided by Associate Deans/Chairs finds the following:

- Applied Research: only referenced once
- Change: was referenced 10 times

It would appear on surface that recent changes in the Ontario CAAT system have not affected the role and responsibilities of the Associate Dean/Chair. The next series of online survey questions probes this issue further.

1c. Changes to responsibilities as a result of recent system changes. This study is situated within the context of change currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system. Therefore, Research Question 1b focuses on whether change currently taking place impacts the role of the Associate Dean/Chair. The online survey questions related to change are posed to both the Associate Dean/Chairs and the Deans groups, and are worded identically. Question 30 asked respondents whether they felt that significant changes had taken place within the Ontario college system between the years 2000 and 2014. Responses from both sample groups are shown in Table 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you believe there have been significant changes?</th>
<th>Associate Deans/Chairs</th>
<th>Deans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings confirm that the majority of respondents from both groups believed that significant change has taken place within the Ontario CAAT system since the new Ontario Colleges of Arts and Technology Act, 2002. A substantial number of Associate Deans/Chairs (24.14%) and Deans (12.50%) did not.

A follow up question asked both groups to provide further commentary as to what they considered the most noteworthy changes. Theme analysis was used to interpret the
written responses. An analysis of written responses from Associated Deans/Chairs showed:

- 76 of 116 participants answered the question for a response rate of 65.62%.

The following themes evolved:

- Degrees: 17 of 76 (14.66%) made direct reference to degree activity being a significant change in the system. Of note, only 3 made any reference to research.
- Differentiation: 9 of 76 (7.66%) made some sort of reference to differentiation; however, none of them referred to differentiation in the context of the rebranding of their respective institution, that is, no references to ITAL or Polytechnic; however, 7 of the 9 references to differentiation directly referred to the SMA.
- Changing student populations: 6 of 76 (5.17%) referenced an increase in international students.

Of significance is that there was only one positive comment associated with the changes currently going on in the system. The majority of comments were not positive, and were themed around frustrations over restricted financial resources, additional workloads, heightened importance associated with degrees, implications of the SMAs, changes in course deliveries, and shifting student populations—specifically increases in international students. The following online survey responses adequately capture the frustration expressed by Associate Deans/Chairs in response to change currently taking place in the system:

```
Limitation have started to impair the learning process. Academic performance does not seems to be the priority. The message seems to be about student retention and graduation but the actions are opposite to what is mentioned. Provincial funding has reduced the flexibility of the college, the faculty are aging and the cost of higher salary and lower provincial funding is transforming colleges into business unit. The focus is on survival of the institution not on the academic delivery that assure success of the students. Since 2000, there has been initiatives in the name of improving academic performance of student but there is always financial drivers that tend to take precedence. The colleges are in survival mode. We try to apply the same solution to all the programs: Hybrid courses, online courses, Work-integrated Learning, eText, Mobile (bring-your own device), Co-Curricular activity, push for internalization of curriculum,
```
entrepreneurship, degrees, applied research, need to be AODA compliant and have a sustainable component. This did not exist before 2000.

The emergence of degree offerings and the related staffing issues this created. To be blunt: the 50% PhD requirement increases the complexity of hiring in an exponential fashion.

When Deans were asked the same question, 43 of 48 (89.58%) responded. Their perceptions of recent changes in the system only slightly varied from Associate Deans/Chairs with the following themes emerging:

- Competition for new students including growth of international: 12 of 43 (27.01%) Deans expressed concerns around increasing enrolments with 4 directly referencing attracting international students.
- Differentiation: 6 of 43 (13.95%) mention the new differentiation framework with direct reference to the SMAs.
- Quality: 4 of 43 (9.30%) Deans referred to the emphasis the ministry is placing on quality as measured by the new accreditation process that the system is about to embark on.

The greatest difference of opinion between the two groups on what changes are impacting the College system is that Deans placed more importance on attracting and recruiting new students with 27.01% noting this activity while there was negligible response on this topic from Associate Deans/Chairs. Of equal importance, both groups rated fiscal challenges created by reduced funding as the most significant change.

The online survey Question 32 asked Associate Deans/Chairs whether the changes taking place in the system had an effect on their job responsibilities. Once again, the same question was asked of the Deans with results (Table 27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you believe changes have affected job?</th>
<th>Associate Deans/Chairs</th>
<th>Deans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer provided</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The feedback to this survey question generated a similar proportional response to the question before, that is, of the 75 of 116 (64.66%) Associate Deans/Chairs who responded stating they believed that there are significant changes currently taking place in the system, 71 of 116 (61.21%) stated that those changes had an effect on their job. The response rate from Deans was identical to the question before. There is almost unanimous consensus from those who feel there has been change in the system, that those changes have affected the role of the Associate Dean/Chair.

Once again, Associate Deans/Chairs were provided with an open-ended question to add written responses as to whether they felt that changes in the system had affected their jobs. There were 72 of 116 participant responses to this question for a response rate of 62.07%. The dominant theme that emerged was that changes in the system meant more work for Associate Deans/Chairs with exactly 50% of respondents expressing this sentiment. Other themes that emerged to a lesser extent was a reiteration of the frustration over reduced funding with 9 out of 72 (12.50%) expressing concerns over this, and 7 out of 72 respondents (9.72%) making reference to the importance of new program development.

When Deans were posed the same open-ended question, 39 of 48 answered for a response rate of 81.25%. Responses were similar to those from Associate Deans/Chairs. The dominant theme that once again emerged was that change meant more work for Associate Deans/Chairs with 17 of 39 Deans (43.59%) expressing this in some manner. Other themes expressed by Deans similar to those of Associate Deans/Chairs were challenges associated with reduced funding referenced by 6 of 39 respondents (15.38%) and emphasis on degree activity referred to by 4 of 39 respondents (10.26%). A difference in the responses between Deans and Associate Deans/Chairs was the direct reference to the importance of leadership made by Deans with 5 of 39 respondents (12.82%) emphasizing this.

The preceding questions related to changes in the College system confirm that both Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans believe that there are significant changes going on in the system and that those changes have affected the role of the Associate Dean/Chair. There are congruent opinions on the impact change is having on the role of
Associate Deans/Chairs with the dominant themes being: fiscal challenges/reduced funding; increased workload; introduction of degrees; online/hybrid course delivery, and international students. Two areas where the responses were not as unanimous found that Dean’s placed a higher importance on the competition for new students and also made more direct reference to the importance of leadership than Associate Deans/Chairs.

**Impact of degrees.** There are frequent references throughout this study regarding the impact of degrees on the Ontario CAAT system. The next set of online survey Questions 34-39 to Associate Deans/Chairs specifically addressed aspects of change related to the introduction of degrees. When asked, 102 out of 116 respondents (87.93%) reported that their institutions do offer degrees. Only four respondents (3.45%) answered that they do not, and 10 (8.62%) did not answer the question.

When Associate Deans/Chair were asked if they were directly involved in the delivery and/or development of degree programs at their respective institutions, the responses were close to being evenly split between yes (49.14%) and no (42.24%) with (8.62%) not answering the question. This demonstrates that while the proliferation of degree activity in the Ontario college system has been dramatic, only about one half of the Associate Deans/Chairs who responded to this study are actively involved. The next online survey Question 36 probed deeper, and asked Associate Deans/Chairs if the offering of degrees had a direct effect on their job responsibilities? Once again, the results were fairly close to being evenly split, with just over half the respondents (50.86%) or 59 of 116 answering affirmatively.

Associate Deans/Chairs were also provided an open-ended question allowing them to elaborate on how their involvement with degree level activity affected their job responsibilities. There were 61 responses out of 116 participants for a response rate of 52.59%. Following are some key observations:

- There were 24 of 61 responses (39.34%) of a neutral nature. Of these, 19 respondents claimed they were working on degrees but did not state whether they felt positive or negative about it; 4 commented on developing pathways; 6 commented on enhancing university partnerships; and 7 respondents mentioned that they were being encouraged to develop degrees.
• There were 25 of 61 (40.98%) responses that expressed a negative tone, with 11 directly related to the need to hire faculty with an advanced credential and 12 indicating that degree activity had increased their workload.

The following response accurately sums up the overall perception found in reviewing the Associate Deans/Chairs perceptions on being involved in degree level activity:

Managing degrees is more about the imposition added to the Chair responsibility. Professors have to have to Master’s or PhD to teach without considering the impact and the subject been taught. The accreditation through PEQAB is a time consuming exercise that is currently done and overseen by the Chair. The same with degree development. It has created a barrier within our own department. Many Chairs are finding themselves managing two different departments. Professors for the diplomas and professor for the degrees but the collective agreement is the same and does not differentiate.

Table 28 illustrates that 26 of 116 respondents (22.41%) indicated that the offering of degrees at their institution had an effect on their relationships with faculty members.

Table 28. Effect of Degree Offerings on Relationship with Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has degree offerings had an effect on your relationships?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer provided</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Associate Deans Chairs were also provided an open-ended question allowing further commentary on the impact that degrees placed on their relationship with faculty. There were 30 of 116 responses to this question for a response rate of 25.86%. There were 3 positive responses—all based on enhancing relationships between the Associate Dean/Chair and the faculty team. There were 9 relatively neutral responses—some from participants who were new in the role and some stating there were both good and bad aspects resulting from degree activity. There were 18 responses inferring that the delivery of degrees had a negative influence on the relationship between Associate Deans/Chairs and faculty—all related to PEQAB regulations requiring faculty to have an advanced
credential to teach in degree programs. Following are some pertinent responses from the Associate Dean/Chair online survey:

Many resent the "credential creep" that has resulted.
At some point, the requirement to hire faculty for diploma was Master and PhD was preferred. This was creating a lot of resentment from our part-time faculty who had been with us for many years, hoping, one day to have a chance to become full time faculty.

Some resentment from faculty who would like to be able to teach in degree programs, but cannot because of credentialing issues.

Hiring faculty with PhDs or Doctorates in order to meet the PEQAB requirement has caused faculty with lesser credentials to feel threatened professionally. I constantly have to reassure faculty that they are valued.

The preceding section indicates that most Associate Deans/Chairs (87.93%) report some level of degree activity in their respective institutions. Approximately half responded that they were personally involved in degree activity with a similar proportion (50.86%) claiming that degree activity had a direct effect on their job responsibilities. A dominant theme emerged confirming that the PEQAB regulation requiring faculty to have an advanced credential to teach or develop degree level programming was creating new layers of complexity and stress for Associate Deans/Chairs in their relationships with faculty.

**Impact of applied research.** A second major change discussed throughout this paper is the heightened importance Ontario CAATs now place on applied research. In a similar approach to the previous section on degrees, the next set of online survey Questions 40-44 sought to gain a deeper understanding between the heightened importance placed on research and the role of the Associate Dean/Chair. The first online survey related to research (Question 40) asked, “Does your institution place significant importance on applied research?” The majority of respondents, 100 of 116 (86.21%) answered “yes” to this question. Participants were then asked if they had a direct involvement with research activity, with 58 of 116 (50.00%) responding yes. Associate Deans/Chairs were then asked if their involvement in applied research had a direct effect on your job responsibilities, and the results were once again close to half with 55 of 116 (47.41%) responding yes.
Following a similar line of questioning to those related to degrees, the next open-ended question provided Associate Deans/Chairs with an opportunity to further elaborate on how their involvement with applied research affected their jobs. There were 57 of 116 responses for a response rate of 49.14%. Four major themes evolved through review of the response section:

- **Positive about research:** there were 8 of 57 responses (15.79%) that were positive about research with an example as follows:
  
  It was voluntary, but it has been a positive addition and helped elevate some of the activity we do in the degrees. It also helps engage the faculty who are interested in research.

- **Additional work for chairs:** the highest proportion of responses, 19 of 57 (33.33%) expressed concerns about the additional workload placed on them from participating in research.
  
  It is expected that research be incorporated into every program—that requires work on the part of the Chair to implement.

  Significantly increased my workload. The college lacks the infrastructure to carry out research and development.

- **Scheduling release time for faculty:** this was the second highest response with 12 of 57 (21.05%) of respondents finding it difficult to schedule release time for faculty to participate in research with examples as follows:

  Faculty involvement in research necessitates offloads so there is an impact on budget and increased contentious negotiations and more hiring of part-timers for backfill. Special projects are exciting but add work for everyone—managers included.

  Need to review and approve faculty participation in applied research. Need to establish "coverage" for faculty not available to teach. Increased liaison with Research division. Review of agreements, etc. Pressure to participate in research.

- **Expansion of research:** 10 of 57 (17.54%) expressed a need (or desire) to grow research at their institutions.

  The findings demonstrate mixed reviews from Associate Deans/Chairs regarding the heightened emphasis now placed on research at their institutions. There were some positive responses; however, the majority of responses, although often supporting the
concept of research, had negative overtones based on additional workload and issues regarding scheduling full-time faculty to accommodate research activity. The following Associate Dean/Chair online survey response succinctly captures the complexity and workload concerns expressed:

There is an expectation that Applied Research will be available to all our students. As the Chair, I have to make sure that opportunity is incorporated in each program. The Applied Research office wants our students to participate in the projects they identified and this is the ideal situation. But we also have in-class project that everybody expect to be considered applied research project even though they do not get the financial support. This is taking a lot of my time. I personally had to become the industry partner of a few of the student teams to provide them with the experience.

Impact of differentiation. The third major change identified in this paper is the expansion of differentiation in the Ontario CAAT system. Online survey questions were again clustered around this topic. Participants were asked whether their institution had been granted differentiated status such as ITAL or Polytechnic Institute. The results found in Table 29 confirm the confusion surrounding differentiation. Almost one third of respondents (30.17%) were not even sure whether their institutions had been granted differentiated status.

Participants were then asked whether a change in institutional status had a direct effect on their job. These results were more conclusive, with a majority, 73 of 116 (62.93%), stating that it had not. Of note is that 34 of 116 respondents (29.31%) did not answer this question. I interpreted this as further confusion on the part of Associate Deans/Chairs around the topic of differentiation and a lack of understanding regarding what it means to their institutions.

Table 29. Differentiation Status of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has institution been granted differentiated status?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know (not sure)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer provided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing the topic of differentiation, participants were asked if there were any other issues related to institutional status that should be addressed with 27 of 116 (23.28%) responding yes, 66 of 116 (56.90%) responding no, and 23 of 116 (19.83%) not answering the question.

In order to allow for further commentary on institutional status, Associate Dean/Chair survey participants were also provided with an open-ended question to explain how institutional differentiation affected their job. There was a very low response rate to this question with 10 of 116 responding (8.62%). Nothing of significance emerged from a review of the comments unless one were to interpret the low response rate as a lack of comprehension and/or concern regarding differentiation from the context of rebranding the institution. This sentiment was expressed by one of the Associate Dean Chair online survey participants as follows:

I doubt the ITAL designation has had much impact in my institution as we never developed degrees to the extent allowed under the ITAL designation.

In closing this section on recent changes in the Ontario college system, Associate Deans/Chairs were asked in an open-ended question if there were other changes in the system that should be addressed. There was a fairly low response rate to this question as well with 30 of 116 (25.86%) responses. There were no dominant themes that emerged; however 8 of 30 (6.90%) reiterated their concerns over reduced funding and 7 of 30 (6.03%) expressed positive interest in the provincial Ontario Council on Articulation and Transfer (ONCAT) project currently underway. The topic of accreditation was referred to three times and the SMA was referenced twice in the comments, both times in the context of hindrance to new program development.

Summary. The preceding section indicates that Associate Deans/Chairs (64.66%) and to a larger extent, Deans (83.33%), share the view that there are significant changes taking place in the Ontario CAAT system. They expressed like opinions that change is having an impact on the role of Associate Deans/Chairs with the dominant themes being: fiscal challenges/reduced funding; increased workload; introduction of degrees; online/hybrid course delivery; and to a lesser extent, International students.
Approximately half the Associate Deans/Chairs who responded are directly involved with degree activity, and it has directly impacted their relationship with faculty. Many said that requiring faculty to have terminal credentials to work on degree level activity, as imposed by PEQAB, was a concern. Most respondents were generally supportive of research but cited time restrictions and faculty release time as potential barriers. There was confusion in regard to differentiation, specifically around comprehension of what it meant to be branded as an ITAL or a Polytechnic Institute. There were also some concerns raised around implications of the current SMAs.

These findings confirm the premise that change currently occurring in the system is re-defining the role of the Associate Dean/Chair, led primarily by the proliferation of degrees, and to a lesser extent, the heightened importance placed on research, flexible delivery, and international students. Respondents clearly articulated that lack of financial resources and reduced funding was a concern, and were equally adamant that the demands of the job in terms of time and workload were arduous. There did not seem to be much awareness over differentiation in terms of rebranding institutions, that is, ITAL or Polytechnic Institute; however, there were concerns expressed over current and future implications of the recently negotiated SMAs.

1d. Distinctive challenges associated with middle-management. The overarching theme of this paper is how to effectively lead change from the middle. Therefore, this research question focussed specifically on aspects of the role from the perspective of middle-management. Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans were asked to rate the level of importance they placed on typical challenges associated with middle-management as derived from the literature on a 4-point Likert scale that ranked from “not important” to “very important.” Tables 30 and 31 present an overview of the responses from both groups:

Table 30. Challenges Associated with Middle-management: AD/Chair’s Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of respect afforded the position</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>28.70%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>35.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 31. Challenges Associated with Middle-management: Dean’s Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity associated with the role</td>
<td>(N) 4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>27.08%</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of leadership development opportunities provided for middle managers</td>
<td>(N) 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>35.42%</td>
<td>14.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming the sensation of feeling “Caught in the middle”</td>
<td>(N) 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>47.92%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of input into institutional strategic planning</td>
<td>(N) 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
<td>51.06%</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management stresses associated with the role</td>
<td>(N) 0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td>58.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting front line workers to perform in accordance with management’s strategic decisions made at the senior level</td>
<td>(N) 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>45.83%</td>
<td>39.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the online survey multi-dimensional Likert scale question are presented in two formats. First: A descriptive statistics methodology is used to illustrate the mean scores of participant responses to the importance of challenges faced by middle-managers. The second analysis presents an inferential perspective based on a 2-tailed t-test.

First, the survey responses to the Likert question were sorted by mean importance scores to determine a ranking of the importance participants placed on the challenges associated with middle-management. Figures 12 and 13 present the findings of Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans, respectively.

![Figure 12. Challenges associated with middle management: Associate Deans/Chairs](image-url)

*Note.* This figure presents descriptive statistics of the eight items measuring the importance of challenges faced by Associate Deans/Chairs. The graph portrays the responses (Associate Deans/Chairs) when ranked using the mean importance scores for each item.
Figure 13. Challenges associated with middle-management: Deans

Note. This figure presents descriptive statistics of the eight items measuring the importance of challenges faced by chairs/associate deans. The graph portrays the responses (Deans) when ranked using the mean importance scores for each item.

A comparison of the descriptive statistics does not find similar results between the survey respondent groups, Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans, on how they ranked the importance of items related to middle-management challenges. In all cases but one, Associate Deans/Chairs ranked challenges associated with middle-management as more important than Deans. However, there is fair consistency in the ordering of the ranking. The top four challenges identified correspond between both groups. They include:

- Acting as a communications conduit between senior management and front line workers: ranked 1st by Ad/Chairs and 2nd by Deans
- Time management stresses associated with the role: ranked 2nd by Ad/Chairs and 1st by Deans.
- Getting front line workers to perform in accordance with management’s strategic decisions made at the senior level: ranked 3rd by both groups.
- Overcoming the sensation of feeling caught-in-the middle: ranked 4th by both groups.

The preceding results tell an interesting story. The Deans results show “lack of leadership development opportunities” as more important than Associate Deans/Chairs.
One would intuitively assume those results to be reversed. On review of these findings, one could assume that Deans are aware of the lack of leadership development opportunities provided to Associate Deans/Chairs.

The findings for both groups are then presented in Figure 14 that compares the responses of each group.

Figure 14. Challenges associated with middle management: AD/Chairs and Deans

Note. This figure presents descriptive statistics of the eight items measuring the importance of challenges faced by Associate Deans/Chairs. The graph portrays a comparison of responses from Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans when ranked using the mean scores for each item.

Second, a 2-tailed $t$-test was used to test the significance of differences in mean importance scores for the Associate Dean/Chairs and Deans groups when questioned on the importance of challenges faced by middle-mangers.

Table 32 demonstrates the results of the 2 tailed $t$-test demonstrating a significant difference on the mean importance score for two of the items. As defined in the methodology chapter, the probability level is set at .05% or $p < .05$, a standard level of probability in social science studies.
Table 32. Importance of Challenges Associated with Mid-management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance on:</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(t)-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as a communication conduit between senior management and front line workers</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>(.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of input into institutional strategic planning</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>(.385)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the 2-tailed \(t\)-test indicate a significant difference on the mean importance scores between Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans (who participated in the online survey) on the importance they place on the following two middle-management challenges:

Both items are rated as more important by Associate Deans/Chairs.

1. Acting as a communication conduit between senior management and front line workers.
2. Lack of input into institutional strategic planning.

**Challenges with the middle-management: Qualitative responses.** In order to explore their perceptions of the challenges associated with middle-management further, Associate Deans/Chairs were again provided an open-ended question allowing them to elaborate on this topic. There were 46 of 116 responses (39.66\%) that elicited a passionate set of responses expressing a wide range of emotions, often tinged with anger and frustration. A review of the responses revealed the following themes:

- **Workload.** This was the most common challenge expressed by 15 of 46 (32.61\%) respondents. A couple examples follow:

  Associate Deans and Chairs carry a heavy burden. We keep the show going, keep the peace, fill the seats, create new programs, do more with less and do it all with a smile because we can't go back to teaching and we won't move up if we don't show our competence.

  Senior management continually dump work without considering the impact to Chair's workload. Personally, as an uber-organized person, it's a struggle.
• Top-down management. 7 of 46 (15.22%) of respondents made reference to decisions being made without their input, and at times, without considering consequences impacting their role. Responses included:

Lack of information and engagement on major projects until decisions are already made.

The Dean works on a need-to-know basis and makes unilateral decisions that affect departmental operations and accreditation standards.

• Other themes that also emerged to a lesser extent were: having to communicate from the middle, 5 of 46 (10.87%); frustrations over salary, 4 of 46 (8.70%); labour issue challenges, 4 of 46 (8.70%), and the ambiguity associated with the role, 3 of 46 (6.52%).

The following response typifies the passion evoked, and expressed in many of the responses when Associate Deans/Chairs were asked about challenges they face in middle-management:

The sandwich effect is the predominant challenge. The VP and Dean work on the strategic plan and when they require something, it flows down to the Chairs. From there, the Chair has to find a way to do the work within the limit of what is available to them. Faculty and support staff have a very clear boundary that the Chair cannot cross without paying the cost: Overtime, favour, good will, exercising their leadership skills to get things done. Chairs are up against a wall that does not tend to move a lot while the other side applies the pressure.

It should be noted that three of the responses were positive with an example as follows:

At College XX, we are very well-treated by upper management and the executive. We work very collaboratively across schools and management levels. I feel valued and respected. [Note. The name of the college is replaced with XX to protect confidentiality as per REB protocols.]

The Deans were also provided an open-ended question asking if they felt there were other challenges specifically associated with the role of middle-management. There were 18 of 48 responses (37.59%) to this question. The dominant theme that emerged once again was the heavy and complex workload placed on Associate Deans/Chairs with 7 of 18 (38.89%) related comments. The rest of the Dean’s responses were varied: some
focused on labor management issues; some referred to the challenges of having to work in such complex environments; some expressed the challenges of attracting quality Associate Deans/Chairs without adequate compensation; and two challenged the premise of whether there was ambiguity associated the role. The overall sentiment found in responses from Deans was very supportive of the role of Associate Dean/Chair acknowledging the changing landscape they manage in with an example as follows:

The role of the AD is evolving very quickly to maintain pace with the dynamic external environment. Academic leadership expertise and building high performance teams are essential to take advantage of the opportunities afforded in today's environment.

**Summary.** There was not direct agreement between what Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans considered to be challenges specifically associated with middle-management; although there was close alignment between what both groups identified as the top four: acting as a communication conduit between senior management and front line workers; time management stresses associated with the role; getting front line workers to perform in accordance with management’s strategic decisions made at the senior level; and overcoming the sensation of feeling caught-in-the-middle. There were important areas where they were not in agreement; specifically, lack of input into institutional strategic planning, ambiguity associated with the role, and to a lesser extent lack of respect afforded the position.

When viewed through the theoretical framework of organizational role theory (ORT), the difference of opinion on challenges associated with the role might impact behavioral expectations, one of the role dimensions defined by Jahnke (2005). When provided an opportunity for open-ended comment, Associate Deans/Chairs were adamant that the workload they faced was unmanageable (an opinion supported by Deans), and some did not appreciate a top-down management approach. However, the general sentiment expressed by the Dean’s was supportive of the role, and they expressed opinion that Associate Deans/Chairs should be provided with leadership development opportunities supporting the overall premise of this study. It is difficult to clearly align the findings related to challenges faced by middle-managers to the ORT framework previously described, as there are varying degrees of agreement/disagreement on what
Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans view as challenges. It is clear that both groups stated fiscal challenges/reduced funding and overwhelming workloads as major issues to be addressed.

**Research Question 2: Leadership Competencies Required**

The second primary research question seeks to explore what leadership competencies would assist mid-level Ontario CAAT academic administers (Associated Deans or Chairs) to be successful in their roles? The primary question is followed by a series of secondary questions that asks: whether Associate Deans/Chairs think it is important to possess leadership competencies, and if so, what competencies; whether there are competencies that would specifically assist with leading change; and whether developing competency in systems thinking theory would prove beneficial to the role.

The questions related to an exploration of leadership competencies are viewed through the following three theoretical leadership constructs:

- transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978)
- 8-stage process of leading change (Kotter, 1996)
- systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990)

Prior to embarking on an exploration of leadership competencies, it was important to define leadership within the context of this study. To that end, based on his intensive research on the topic, and in an effort ensure that leadership is treated as both a specialized role and as a social influence process, Yukl’s (2002) definition appeared the most plausible. He defines leadership in the following manner, “Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives” (p. 9). Yukl’s definition of leadership was presented to participants of the online survey, as well as to participants of the face-to-face interviews.

Following is a breakdown of responses from Associate Deans/Chairs (and Deans where appropriate) based on the online survey questions that explore leadership competencies deemed important to the role of Associate Deans/Chairs.
2a. Competencies that would help them to be successful. In order to assess “what” competencies would assist mid-level Ontario CAAT managers to be successful, Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans in the online study were presented with a multi-dimensional question allowing them to rate a series of leadership competencies on a 4-point Likert scale from not important to very important. The competencies were adapted from the Chair Leadership Academy and are aligned with the Competencies for Community College Leaders developed by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC), now referred to as Colleges and Institutes Canada (CICan) (AACC, 2005; Chair Academy, 2014). The Chair Academy aspires to develop transformational leadership competencies in participants implying a natural alignment between the leadership competencies presented in the online survey with the four principles of transformational leadership espoused by (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) as presented below:

1. Intellectual Stimulation. Transformational leaders not only challenge the status quo; they also encourage creativity among followers. The leader encourages followers to explore new ways of doing things and new opportunities to learn.

2. Individualized Consideration. Transformational leadership also involves offering support and encouragement to individual followers. In order to foster supportive relationships, transformational leaders keep lines of communication open so that followers feel free to share ideas and so that leaders can offer direct recognition of each follower’s unique contributions.

3. Inspirational Motivation. Transformational leaders have a clear vision that they are able to articulate to followers. These leaders are also able to help followers experience the same passion and motivation to fulfill these goals.

4. Idealized Influence. The transformational leader serves as a role model for followers. Because followers trust and respect the leader, they emulate this individual and internalize his or her ideals.

The data obtained in response to this question are again analyzed and presented in different formats in order to allow for comparison/contrast between of responses from Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans. Tables 33 and 34 present an overview of the responses from both groups:
Table 33. Leadership Competencies Deemed Important: AD/Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance placed on leadership competencies by AD/Chairs</th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Somewhat Important</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in reflective practice and journaling</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.48%</td>
<td>28.97%</td>
<td>44.86%</td>
<td>18.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify values through a personal and professional mission statement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>30.84%</td>
<td>38.32%</td>
<td>27.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore and develop specific constructs and behaviors of transformational leadership</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>25.71%</td>
<td>43.81%</td>
<td>27.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate and employ contemporary research and theory into organizational excellence and best practices in management and leadership</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td>18.69%</td>
<td>52.34%</td>
<td>27.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissect processes and strategies for successfully implementing and managing change</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
<td>45.71%</td>
<td>40.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop inclusive strategic plans for effectively managing and leading part-time staff</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
<td>46.23%</td>
<td>40.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement planning processes for strategic planning, scenario thinking, and disciplined decision making</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.26%</td>
<td>49.06%</td>
<td>38.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate recognition and celebration into the culture of teams and the organization</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>44.34%</td>
<td>46.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop employees and staff through succession planning and professional development opportunities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
<td>51.89%</td>
<td>39.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and utilize clear and effective practices for hiring for excellence</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
<td>29.91%</td>
<td>62.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a studied, strategic, forward-thinking, and innovative leader who creates success through excellence in transformational leadership</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
<td>34.62%</td>
<td>60.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate and develop talent and skill in roles and responsibilities as a leader and manager</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td>43.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively mentor, coach, and develop talent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>35.51%</td>
<td>60.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient and retain employees and staff through effective management</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>37.38%</td>
<td>58.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve and manage conflict productively</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>28.30%</td>
<td>68.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance placed on leadership competencies by AD/Chairs</td>
<td>1. Not Important</td>
<td>2. Somewhat Important</td>
<td>3. Quite Important</td>
<td>4. Very Important</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage individual and team performance by appropriate delegation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a thoughtful and diligent manager of talent who develops, coaches, and mentors others for individual, team, and organizational success</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and effectively lead high performance teams and work groups</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator capable of building and sustaining relationships for individual and organizational success</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build and maintain effective relationships and work teams</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be inclusive by appreciating, respecting, and valuing diversity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 34. Importance Placed on Leadership Competencies: Deans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance placed on leadership competencies by Deans</th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Somewhat Important</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in reflective practice and journaling</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify values through a personal and professional mission statement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore and develop specific constructs and behaviors of transformational leadership</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance placed on leadership competencies by Deans</td>
<td>1. Not Important</td>
<td>2. Somewhat Important</td>
<td>3. Quite Important</td>
<td>4. Very Important</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate and employ contemporary research and theory into organizational excellence and best practices in management and leadership</td>
<td>N: 47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissect processes and strategies for successfully implementing and managing change</td>
<td>N: 47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop inclusive strategic plans for effectively managing and leading part-time staff</td>
<td>N: 45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement planning processes for strategic planning, scenario thinking, and disciplined decision making</td>
<td>N: 47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate recognition and celebration into the culture of teams and the organization</td>
<td>N: 47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop employees and staff through succession planning and professional development opportunities</td>
<td>N: 47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and utilize clear and effective practices for hiring for excellence</td>
<td>N: 46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a studied, strategic, forward-thinking, and innovative leader who creates success through excellence in transformational leadership</td>
<td>N: 47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate and develop talent and skill in roles and responsibilities as a leader and manager</td>
<td>N: 46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively mentor, coach, and develop talent</td>
<td>N: 48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient and retain employees and staff through effective management</td>
<td>N: 48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve and manage conflict productively</td>
<td>N: 47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence</td>
<td>N: 47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership</td>
<td>N: 47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage individual and team performance by appropriate delegation</td>
<td>N: 45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the online survey multi-dimensional Likert scale question are again presented in two formats. First, a descriptive statistics methodology is used to illustrate the mean scores of participant responses on the importance of a framework of leadership competencies to help Associate Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles. The second analysis presents an inferential perspective based on a 2-tailed $t$-test.

First, the survey responses to the Likert question were sorted by mean importance scores to determine a ranking of the importance participants placed on a framework of leadership competencies. Figures 15 and 16 present a graphical representation of the results from the Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans, respectively.
### Figure 15. Competencies deemed important by Associate Deans/Chairs

*Note.* This figure presents descriptive statistics of the 25 items indicating the leadership competencies that respondents believe would help them be successful in their roles. The graph portrays the responses (Associate Deans/Chairs) when ranked using the mean importance scores for each item.
Figure 16. Competencies deemed important by Deans

Note. This figure presents descriptive statistics of the 25 items indicating the leadership competencies that respondents believe would help Associate Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles. The graph portrays the responses (Deans) when ranked using the mean importance scores for each item.

A comparison/contrast of the findings from Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans who participated in the online survey shows similar results on “what” leadership competencies are deemed important by both groups when ranked using the mean importance scores. Nine of the leadership competencies deemed important appear in the top-10 rankings of both groups. They are:

1. Build and maintain effective relationships and work teams: ranked 1st by AD/Chairs and 1st by Deans.
2. Resolve and manage conflict productively: ranked 2\textsuperscript{nd} by AD/Chairs and 10\textsuperscript{th} by Deans

3. Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others: ranked 3\textsuperscript{rd} by AD/Chairs and 6\textsuperscript{th} by Deans

4. Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator capable of building and sustaining relationships for individual and organizational success: ranked 4\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 7\textsuperscript{th} by Deans

5. Be inclusive by appreciating, respecting, and valuing diversity: ranked 5\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 3\textsuperscript{rd} by Deans

6. Be a thoughtful and diligent manager of talent who develops, coaches, and mentors others for individual, team, and organizational success: ranked 6\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 5\textsuperscript{th} by Deans

7. Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership: ranked 7\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 9\textsuperscript{th} by Deans

8. Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence: ranked 9\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 2\textsuperscript{nd} by Deans

9. Effectively mentor, coach and develop talent: ranked 10\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 8\textsuperscript{th} by Deans

An activity that appears in the top-10 list of Associate Deans/Chairs but does not appear in the top-10 list of Deans is:

10. Appreciate, respect value and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles: ranked 8\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 14\textsuperscript{th} by Deans

An activity that appears in the top-10 list of Deans but does not appear in the top-10 list of Associate Deans/Chairs is:

11. Develop and effectively lead high performance teams and workgroups: ranked 4\textsuperscript{th} by Deans and 15\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs

Online survey respondents from both groups also indicated similar results on what they find the least important leadership competencies required by Associate Deans/Chairs as they rank the bottom five in identical descending order, with the least important competency being engage in reflective practice and journaling, when ranked using the importance mean scores.
The findings show similar results between Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans on what leadership competencies they deem important.

Figure 17 presents a comparison/contrast of the importance found by Associate Deans/Chairs on a framework of leadership competencies from the Chair Academy (2014) when ranked using mean importance scores.
Figure 17. Leadership competencies important to the role: Comparative view between AD/Chairs and Deans

Note. This figure presents descriptive statistics of the 25 items indicating the leadership competencies that respondents believe would help them be successful in their roles. The graph portrays the responses (Associate Deans/Chair and Deans) when ranked using the mean importance scores for each item.

Comparison to transformational leadership principles. Table 34 maps the top-10 leadership competencies identified by survey respondents (combined top-10 from both groups) when ranked by the mean importance scores against the four tenets identified with transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).
Table 34. Comparison of Online Survey Responses to Transformational Leadership Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership Principles (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978)</th>
<th>Top-10 leadership competencies identified by Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans as important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation: challenge the status quo</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual consideration: support and encouragement to individual followers</td>
<td>• Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be a compassionate and conscientious Communicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be a thoughtful and diligent manager of talent who develops, coaches, and mentors others for individual, team and organizational success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be inclusive by appreciating, respecting, and valuing diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolve and manage conflict productively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effectively mentor, coach and develop talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation: help followers experience similar passion and motivation as self</td>
<td>• Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build and maintain effective relationships and work teams (this was ranked as number one by both groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and effectively lead high performance teams and workgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence: serve as a role model</td>
<td>• Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the top-10 competencies does not appear in this framework as it refers to managerial skills, as opposed to leadership when viewed through Kotter International’s (2015) framework differentiating leadership and management, that being:

1. Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership

This might bring into question whether all the leadership competencies identified through the Chair Academy (2014) and AACC (2005) have a direct correlation to the tenets of transformational leadership as espoused by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). However, as stated on the Chair Academy website (2014), “Leadership development must be carefully designed to broaden the participant’s knowledge of leadership theories and principles, as well as develop supervisory and managerial skills” (“About the Foundation Academy,” para. 3), implying a leadership competency development framework that is broad and encompasses multiple aspects and activities associated with the role. Also, it is noted that none of the top leadership competencies ranked by respondents as important align with
the principle of intellectual stimulation associated with transformational leadership. This warrants further commentary in the conclusions section of this study.

Second, a 2-tailed $t$-test was used to test the significance of differences in mean importance scores for the Associate Dean/Chairs and Deans groups when questioned on the importance of a framework of leadership competencies designed to assist Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful.

Table 35 demonstrates the results of the 2-tailed $t$-test demonstrating a significant difference on the mean importance score for five of the items. As defined in the methodology chapter, the probability level is set at .05% or $p < .05$, a standard level of probability in social science studies.

Table 35. Leadership Competences Deemed Important to Success in the Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>29.269 .005 -2.855 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>14.079 .012 -2.548 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator capable of building and sustaining relationships</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>24.931 .001 -3.290 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate and employ contemporary research and theory into organizational excellence and best practices</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>2.046 .014 -2.483 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement planning processes for strategic planning, scenario thinking, and disciplined decision making</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.578 .006 -2.760 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the 2-tailed $t$-test indicate a significant difference on the mean importance scores between Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans (who participated in the online survey) on the importance they place on the following five leadership competencies associated with the role.

All items were ranked as more important by Associate Deans:
1. Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others
2. Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles
3. Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator capable of building and sustaining relationships
4. Investigate and employ contemporary research and theory into organizational excellence and best practices
5. Develop and implement planning processes for strategic planning, scenario thinking, and disciplined decision making

**Other competencies?** Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans were then both asked if they felt there were other competencies important to the role of the Associate Dean/Chair that were not captured in the Chair Academy leadership competency framework. Table 36 shows that the majority of Associate Deans/Chairs (51.72%) and Deans (60.42%) felt the framework adequately captured the competencies required while 20.69% of Associate Deans/Chairs and 29.17% of Deans felt it did not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there other leadership competencies?</th>
<th>Chairs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.72%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer provided</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans were presented an open-ended question (Question 54) in the online survey allowing them to expand on the Chair Academy leadership competency framework. There were 23 of 116 (19.83%) responses from Associate Deans/Chairs with six themes that emerged.

Two themes related to management:

1. Management of workload and time: referenced by 4 of 16 (17.39%);
2. Management of finances and resources: referenced by 3 of 26 (13.04%).
Four themes related to transformational leadership:

1. Ability to lead/implement change: referenced by 6 of 26 (26.09%);
2. Possess strong communication skills: referenced by 5 of 26 (21.74%),
3. Build trust and support with faculty: referenced by 5 of 26 (21.74%);
4. Engage in reflective practices: referenced by 3 of 26 (13.04%).

The competencies expressed by participants did not all directly relate to leadership, specifically the two related to management. The leadership competencies that were referenced, did not actually add to the Chair Academy leadership competency framework as they were very similar; however, a review of them allowed me to contextualize the competencies within the day-to-day activities of Associate Deans/Chairs. There were some comments that directly referred to change and the open-ended question allowed Associate Deans/Chairs to provide a personal perspective providing a richer context. Some interesting online survey responses from Associate Deans/Chairs follow:

- Listen carefully to team members and reflect continuously on what is implicit in what they say. Reflect deeply.
- Change management. Effectively communicate need for change, instill a sense of urgency. Identify change agents, build an effective coalition of the willing, plan, execute, observe, review, and refine.
- The essence of leadership is to develop and communicate a clear, correct vision of where the organization is headed and each member's place in that plan.

These responses, in addition to being reflected in the transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) constructs of the Chair Academy leadership framework, also align directly with Kotter’s (1996) 8-stage process of leading change. There were other interesting comments. One of the Associate Dean/Chairs online survey participants suggested that the female perspective should be considered when exploring change:

- Exploring women's perspective on change and interpersonal conflict arising from feeling insecure in the workplace.

Two Associate Dean/Chair online survey respondents asserted that the study should focus on servant leadership as a construct as opposed to transformational leadership as per the following example:
I do not subscribe to the transformational model of leadership. We require servant leadership (Greenleaf) and the practices of Leading Leaders (Salacuse).

There was a slightly higher response rate to the same open-ended question posed to Deans with 14 of 48 (29.17%) responses. A review did not find any dominant themes with the following leadership traits each mentioned twice: ability to develop partnerships; manage workloads; leadership; entrepreneurship; and manage finances. None of the responses from the Deans really focused on leadership competencies, they depicted management qualities and leadership traits.

Of interest is that not all respondents agreed with the concept of leadership from the middle. One of the Dean’s online survey responses was emphatic in this regard:

Develop personal strategies to "manage up": understand your Dean, VPA and President. I find the Chair Academy's leadership competencies assumes that Associate Deans and Chairs are able to make autonomous decisions and manage in a way that suits themselves and their departments. This isn't the case in middle-management roles where someone else is laying out the strategic priorities and others implement the ways of getting there at an operational level.

The findings show that Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans expressed similar views, those being, there are leadership competencies not captured in Chair Academy framework; however, when provided an opportunity to elaborate, there were no new “leadership competencies” that surfaced. There were however some suggestions that actually provide context to the leadership competency framework of the Chair Academy; notably, the importance of exceptional communication skills, the ability to build trust, and the ability to lead change.

2b: Competencies related to leading change. A review of responses from the previous open-ended question related to leadership competencies finds that some Associate Deans/Chairs claim the ability to lead change is critical. Their comments almost directly reflect Kotter’s (1996) 8-stage process of leading change:

1. Establishing a sense of urgency
2. Creating the guiding coalition
3. Developing a vision and strategy
4. Communicating the change vision
5. Empowering broad based action
6. Generating short-term wins
7. Consolidating gains and producing more change
8. Anchoring new approaches in the culture

The next section of online survey questions drills deeper into participant opinions on competencies related to leading change. Associate Deans/Chairs were asked if they believed there were leadership competencies that would specifically help them lead change. Many of them believe that there are with 56 of 116 (48.28%) replying yes, 40 of 116 (34.48%) replying no, and 20 of 116 (17.24%) not answering the question.

Associate Deans/Chairs were then provided with an open-ended question (Question 56) asking them to elaborate on what competencies would specifically help them lead change. There were 52 of 116 (44.83%) responses. For the most part, responses were generic in nature with 13 of 52 (25.00%) referring to change management, but not specifying “what” competencies. There were 5 of 52 (9.62%) responses referring to transformational leadership. An equal number, 5 of 52 (9.62%), expressed an interest in training related to leading change. There were also five responses referencing the importance of communication skills in leading change; however, these responses appeared more passionate than others with examples as follows:

Communication, communication, communication!
Be an effective and conscientious communicator in terms of promoting the importance of quality and advancement.
Managing and communication up? Strategies to do this better.
Clearly communicate impacts of change and develop strategies to be implemented at ALL levels of an organization so that there is buy in and support towards collaborative practice towards success (so we are all on the same page).

Of interest is that in addition to the preceding findings, 4 of 52 (7.69%) of the online survey participants responded that they were not sure what the appropriate leadership competencies to lead change were. This finding, combined with the five
responses that expressed an interest in training related to leading change, suggests a possibility for developmental opportunities in this area.

Closing the loop on change leadership, participants were asked if their institutions provided them with professional development (PD) opportunities specifically focused on leading change. Over half, 62 of 116 (53.34%), responded yes, that their institutions had.

An open-ended question (Question 58) asked Associate Deans/Chairs to elaborate on their PD experience related to leading change. There were 58 of 116 (50.00%) responses. Most, 34 of 58 (58.62%), referred to in-house workshops with some directly referencing a crucial conversations course, 5 of 58 (8.62%). Many of them, 11 of 58 (18.97%), indicated that they had attended the Chair Academy. Four stated they had acquired change leadership skills while pursuing an academic credential (with MBA referenced twice), and three stated they had acquired some of these skills on their own.

Most of the responses from Associate Deans/Chairs were generic in nature (neither negative nor positive) with the exception of the following two which were negative:

Although offered—and made mandatory—they are frankly very basic, and suitable only for new leaders. I covered this stuff in Year 1 of my Master’s program, and many years ago in my work. The program planners develop these courses for very novice individuals but we all are ordered to attend.

Yes, however, it is not systemic, rather one-off type of PD. Change management is not embedded within the enterprise.

The preceding section related to change leadership competencies yields interesting findings. When Associate Deans/Chairs were asked if they believe there were competencies they felt would help them lead change, almost half, 56 of 116 (48.28%) responded yes. When asked to specify “what” competencies would help them lead change, the answers varied often referencing managerial concerns as opposed to change leadership competencies.

Some respondents to the open-ended question (54) did make direct reference to change leadership competencies such as: build a shared vision; communicate the need for change; instill a sense of urgency; identify change agents; build an effective coalition of
the willing; etc. directly aligning with Kotter’s (1996) 8-stage process of leading change earlier referenced. Communications skills evoked the most passionate responses when asked what competencies were most important to leading change.

Most respondents, 62 of 116 (53.45%), claimed that their institutions provided some form of PD directly related to leading change with the majority of it being done in house. There were also 11 participants who claimed that they had attended the Chair Academy that aspires to develop transformational leadership competencies in attendees. Some respondents expressed confusion over what competencies would be most helpful in regards to leading change while others expressed an interest in training suggesting the possibility of an opportunity for education in the area of developing competencies to assist Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs with leading change.

2c: Competencies related to systems thinking theory. This study is situated within change taking place within a system, specifically the Ontario CAAT system. Therefore, the final theoretical leadership construct this study is viewed through is systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990). In laymen’s terms, systems thinking theory is expressed as follows:

1. See the big picture, seeing the forest and the trees
2. Seeing through complexity to the underlying structures generating change
3. A discipline for seeing wholes
4. A framework for seeing interrelationships rather than things
5. Seeing patterns of change rather than static snapshots

When Associated Deans/Chair were asked in the online survey whether they had been exposed to systems thinking theory in their current position, a large majority, 83 of 116 (71.55%), responded that they had not, 22 of 116 (18.97%) said that yes they had, and 11 of 116 (9.48%) did not answer. When asked whether their institutions had provided them with any development opportunities related to systems thinking theory, an even larger proportion, 101 of 116 (87.07%), again responded no.

Associate Deans/Chairs were presented an open-ended question allowing them to elaborate their thoughts on systems thinking theory. The response rate was very low for
this question with only 8 of 116 (8.62%) responding. Of the respondents, four of them claimed that they had studied systems thinking theory as part of their graduate degree work. There were some positive responses:

I studied Peter Senge as part of my MA in Education [Community College Leadership]. Interestingly, my MBA program's treatment of systems thinking was very disappointing. I believe we would benefit from a more sustained treatment of systems thinking as part of our Admin-level internal Pro Dev.

My graduate diploma was in System Science so I use that lens when looking at my role and processes within the College.

There were also other positive responses; however, they questioned the validity of utilizing systems thinking theory as an appropriated tool set for Associate Deans/Chairs:

Senge would be proud, but I doubt many could wrap their head around the idea of personal mastery.

I like systems thinking theory but prefer to reflect upon more post-modern/critical concepts that recognize and remind me to check power and identity dynamics. But the basics of systems thinking theory are a good start.

The low response rate, coupled with mixed reviews, make it difficult to determine whether encouraging Associate Deans/Chairs to acquire competency in systems thinking theory would help them be successful in their roles.

**Summary.** The preceding section exposed an in depth assessment of “what” leadership competencies Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans felt would help them to be successful in their roles. The results show that the Chair Academy leadership competency framework based on transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) adequately captures the competencies deemed important by both groups. The results from the 2-tailed $t$-test indicate a significant difference of opinion between Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans (who participated in the online survey) on the importance they place on five of leadership competencies associated with the role. However, there was great agreement found between both groups, as indicated in the survey, on the most important leadership competencies where they share nine out of the top-10 items when ranked according to the mean importance scores. Associate Deans/Chairs also
commented on the importance of exceptional communication skills, the ability to build trust, and the ability to lead change as very important leadership competencies. Both groups ranked the ability to build and maintain effective relationships and work-teams as most important.

**Research Question 3: Developmental Opportunities**

Research Question 3 seeks to gain a deeper understanding of what leadership development opportunities currently exist for Associate Deans/Chairs in the Ontario CAAT system. The primary question is followed by a series of secondary questions that ask if current leadership development opportunities are deemed effective; whether Associate Deans/Chairs feel their institutions should do more to provide leadership development opportunities; and whether there should be more professional development opportunities focused specifically on leading change.

The results of the findings, where appropriate, shall once again be referenced to the three theoretical leadership constructs used throughout this study:

- transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978)
- 8-stage process of leading change (Kotter, 1996)
- systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990)

Following is a breakdown of responses from Associate Deans/Chairs (and Deans where appropriate) based on the online survey questions that explore current leadership development opportunities, as well as participant’s opinions on their effectiveness.

The first series of online survey questions probed participant’s self-perceptions of their own leadership competencies. They were asked whether they believed they had personally mastered the leadership competencies required to be successful in the role through a 4-point Likert scale that ranked from lacking to fully-mastered. A review of the results (Table 37) found that they believe there is room for improvement. Only 9 of 116 (7.76%) of respondents claim they have fully mastered the leadership competencies required of the role, with the largest percentage, 75 of 116 (64.66%), claiming there is room for improvement. The results find some of them acknowledging they have not yet
mastered the leadership competencies required to be successful in the role possibly signifying that (at least some) Associate Dean/Chairs might be open to developmental opportunities.

Table 37. Have Leadership Competencies for Success Been Mastered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you mastered the leadership competencies required for the role?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully mastered</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly mastered (with room for improvement)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat mastered (but not at the level required of the role)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking (definite need for leadership development)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer provided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study is focused on leadership, not management. There were many references cited earlier claiming that they are different (Bennis as cited in Coutts, 2000; Kotter International, 2015). To that end, in order to ensure that participant responses were based on leadership, not management, the next online survey question asked participant opinions on whether they perceived a difference between the two. The large majority, 99 of 116 (85.34%) indicated that there is a difference between leadership and management, with only 5 of 116 (4.31%) stating no, and 12 of 116 (10.34%) not answering the question.

Probing this issue further, Associate Deans/Chairs were provided an open-ended question allowing them to elaborate on their perceived differences between leadership and management. There was a high response rate, 78 of 116 (67%), to the question that elicited a series of responses. The huge majority (94.87%) of respondents clarified the difference as people related (leadership) opposed to process related (management). The comments also appeared to reflect a higher moral aspect attached to leadership when compared to management. Following are a series of online survey responses from Associate Deans/Chairs articulating differences between leadership and management:

I believe they are strongly related. However, at the risk of sounding lame, leaders do the right thing, managers do things right.
Leadership includes a vision, big picture thinking, long term, relationships, communication, leads change. Management completes checklists, is task focused, supervises, and clocks out at the end of the day.

Perhaps it is more a different level of skills development but the leader certainly requires more competencies than the manager. A leader must manage AND inspire others; create a vision; create a trusting culture; and lead people through it to fulfil the vision.

Respondents also expressed that they felt it was more difficult to master leadership competencies than management competencies:

Management competencies can be learned by anyone; they involve taking action based on data and rules, dollars and cents, feet and inches; Leadership competencies are a deeper set of emotional intelligence traits that are inspirational and move people to action.

Leadership competencies are "soft" skills. They take years to develop. Some people have a superior Emotional Intelligence that supports truly effective and inspirational leaders. Management skills can be learned easily—more definitive.

Four of the respondents express the importance of having both leadership and management skills, combined with the ability to bridge the skillsets:

Leadership is about the people. Management is about the work and process. There is a third area which a bridge between the two which are enabling competencies.

The sentiments from respondents of the Associate Deans/Chairs online survey are congruent with one of the arguments made earlier in this paper, that there is a difference between leadership and management. Many of the responses related to leadership such as: create a shared vision; create a culture of trust; model the way; and provide inspiration directly align with the principles of transformational leadership espoused by (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) confirming it as an appropriate theoretical leadership construct through which to view this study.

The online survey then asked Associate Deans/Chairs how much importance they personally placed on mastering leadership competencies. They were presented a 3-point Likert scale question ranking from not important to very important with results shown in Table 38.
Table 38. Importance of Mastering the Leadership Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much importance do you place on mastering competencies?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer provided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results demonstrated that Associate Deans/Chairs who responded to the survey place importance on mastering appropriate leadership competencies. There was only one of 116 participants indicating that they did not find it important!

**3a: Are there current leadership developmental opportunities?** The next series of online questions probed participant thoughts on whether their respective institutions provided them with effective leadership developmental opportunities. When participants were asked whether they believed their institutions placed importance on possessing leadership competencies, the large majority of them, 99 of 116 (85.34%) responded yes and 5 of 116 (4.31%) responded no.

A follow up question asked participants whether their respective institutions had provided them with any professional development or training directly related to leadership. The results were mixed. A majority of respondents, 69 of 116 (59.48%), indicated that their institutions had provided leadership development opportunities; however, a large proportion, 36 of 116 (31.03%), of them stated they had not, while 11 of 116 (9.48%) did not answer the question.

Associate Deans/Chairs online survey participants were provided an opportunity to comment on the effectiveness of leadership development opportunities provided by their respective institutions. There were 63 of 116 (54.31%) responses with: 31 of 63 (9.21%) referencing in-house seminars and training sessions; 18 of 63 (28.57%) referencing the Chair Academy; and 5 of 53 (7.94%) referred to being sent to corporate training. Of interest is that 6 of 63 (9.52%) did not find in the in-house training beneficial with examples as follows:
Workshops have been offered but they always miss the mark. People leave disappointed.

Yes, but not enough, and most importantly, they have not created the working environment where you can commit time/effort to developing leadership.

It should be noted that were a few positive comments. One college (not to be named due to REB protocols) was mentioned by name four times as having an exceptional internal leadership development program that dealt with issues experienced on the job, and was referenced as follows:

The College XX provided an exceptional leadership multi-layered training program of which I have been fortunate enough to take all three.

I have found that this institution is very willing to work with the employees (admin, faculty, support) to accommodate and address PD requests.

The Chair Academy was also specifically referenced by 18 of 63 (28.57%) of the respondents. Feedback on the Academy was generally positive; however, some participants felt the training at the Academy did not fully prepare Associate Deans/Chairs for their roles as expressed:

The original Chair Academy training involved a lot about leadership, the rest has been on-the-job! For a few years we had Chair retreats, where Chairs would share their experiences and we would learn from each other. Sadly, that hasn't happened for a while.

When participants were asked if they were aware of leadership development programs provided in other colleges that their respective institution did NOT participate in, the large majority, 93 of 116 (80.17%), responded no, only 10 of 116 (8.62%) responded yes, and 13 of 116 (11.21%) did not answer the question. There were only a few responses elaborating on this, and none that referenced anything of note.

The preceding section indicates that institutions are providing leadership development opportunities for Associate Deans/Chairs, much of it in-house. A small percentage of respondents provided negative feedback on the in-house leadership development opportunities; contrarily, one of the institutions is identified four times as having an exemplary in house leadership development program. Many participants
claimed having attended the Chair’s Academy, and the feedback although positive, implies the experience at the Academy does not fully imbue the leadership competencies required to be successful in the role.

**3b: Effectiveness of current leadership development opportunities.** When asked whether the leadership development provided by their institutions had been beneficial, the results as shown in Table 39 were mixed.

**Table 39. Has Leadership Development Been Beneficial?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has leadership development been beneficial?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer provided</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the majority of participants did find the leadership development opportunities beneficial; however, a proportion did not. There were 26 of 116 (22.41%) responses that indicated the leadership development opportunities had only been somewhat beneficial and 17 of 116 (14.66%) found it provided little benefit. This potentially indicates opportunity for improvement in regards of institutions providing leadership development opportunities for Associate Deans/Chairs.

Associate Dean/Chair online survey participants were then provided an open-ended question encouraging suggestions on how to make leadership development opportunities more effective. There were responses from 44 of 116 (37.93%) participants. Responses were passionate and varied: 13 of 44 (29.55%) claimed they wanted more training; 9 of 44 (20.45%) were adamant that they did not have time for any further leadership development opportunities; 7 of 44 (15.91%) expressed a desire to connect and share with peers with some suggesting mentorship as a powerful means to assist new Associate Deans/Chairs; 6 of 44 (13.64%) reiterated their lack of satisfaction with current leadership opportunities provided; and 3 of 44 (6.82%) claiming that leadership development was more effective when it was self-directed.
One of the Associate Dean/Chair online survey participants who had followed a self-directed approach, provided a thoughtful expose on his/her personal leadership development journey:

My own leadership development strategy was self-imposed as part of my own scholarly trajectory and enjoyment of reflective practice approaches to my own professional identity development from industry professional to professor to leader to management. I've always seen it as integral to my professional practice so wish there was more acknowledgement that some of us are already fully on the bus and have a good idea of what specifically we need to maintain identity and currency in our specialized fields as it intersects with our managerial roles of a particular subset of disciplines and industry communities. I do recognize, however, that most people enter management in colleges without this preparation or motivation (often no teaching or experience with education at all), so need that external guidance of entry-level leadership training. I had mine at the doctoral level at OISE, so find the commercial conference training stuff too expensive to be useful to me.

Following is a sampling of Associate Dean/Chair online survey responses related the desire to share and connect more amongst peers:

Our college currently provides an excellent forum to bring Deans, Chairs and Program managers together on a bi-weekly basis to discuss senior management related issues. What it does not provide is a forum that involves only the Chairs to share best practices and/or common challenges. Perhaps that might be an opportunity.

The AD/Chair role needs a voice and a collective opportunity to meet, train and discuss the needs and responsibilities of the role

Some opportunity to discuss, debrief and reflect on leadership challenges with my colleagues would be beneficial.

As mentioned, a community of practice would be beneficial and would complement all the training that is already distributed to the employees.

The time demands experienced by Associate Deans/Chairs resurfaced as an impediment to being able to pursue developmental opportunities:

Time to take PD would be good. Time away from work is almost punishment when you get back for the work and emails that await you on return.
The expectation that we do professional development over and above our work is unreasonable. No one does my work when I go on vacation or take a workshop.

When asked for suggestions on how to make leadership development opportunities more effective, the responses from Associated Dean/Chairs were varied, but passionate. There was a desire expressed for more opportunities to connect with peers in order to network and share experiences. There were some who suggested institutions should implement effective mentoring programs. Finally, there was opinion expressed by some that workload made it next to impossible for Associate Deans/Chairs to participate in leadership development activity.

3c: Should there be more assistance? Participants of the online survey were asked if they felt their institutions should do more to provide them with leadership developmental opportunities. A majority of them, 73 of 116 (62.93%), responded yes they should, 30 of 116 (25.86%) responded no, and 13 of 116 (11.21%) did not answer the question.

When asked in an open-ended question, to elaborate on what more institutions should do to provide leadership development, there were 49 of 116 (42.42%) responses. Once again, comments were varied. There were 8 of 49 (16.33%) who suggested that leadership development opportunities should be tailored specifically to the role of Associate Dean/Chair; 6 of 49 (12.24%) again expressed the desire for greater connection amongst peers, and once again there was a group, 7 of 49 (14.29%) who were adamant that they did not have time to pursue leadership development opportunities. One of the Associate Dean/Chair survey respondents directly questioned the intentions of the study:

I need to slip this in here as it seems like your thesis has already concluded that what Chairs need is more training. No—what we need most is time, that is, some help. We need a smaller span of control and time to be trained and to have the "luxury" of using what we've learned, not just "putting out fires" and giving the Dean a report that means nothing to us, but seems "important".

The preceding section finds that the majority of respondents, 73 of 116 (62.93%), do feel their institutions should do more to provide them with leadership development
opportunities. When asked, “What” more should they do?”, there were suggestions that institutions should tailor leadership development opportunities specifically to the role of Associate Dean/Chair and that they should provide more opportunities for peer-to-peer connections. There were again those who explained that their jobs were too busy to allow for participation in leadership development opportunities.

3d: Should there be a specific focus on leading change. An exploration of participant perceptions regarding the development of leadership competencies directly related to leading change was previously addressed though Research Question 2b. A brief review found 62 of 116 (53.45%) respondents claimed that their institutions did provide professional development opportunities related to leading change with most of it done in house. Perhaps more telling, 43 of 116 (37.07%) respondents claimed their institution did not. There were 56 of 116 (48.28%) of respondents who indicated that there are competencies specifically related to leading change, and that it is important for Associate Deans/Chairs to develop these skills. Some respondents expressed confusion over what competencies would be most helpful in regards to leading change, while others suggested an interest in pursuing training. This might indicate an openness on the part of Associate Deans/Chairs to explore developmental opportunities related to leading change.

Communications skills evoked the most passionate responses when asked what competencies were most important to leading change. Respondents to the open-ended Question 54 did make direct reference to change leadership competencies such as: build a shared vision; communicate the need for change; instill a sense of urgency; identify change agents; build an effective coalition of the willing; etc. directly aligning with Kotter’s (1996) 8-stage process of leading change earlier referenced.

Summary. Associate Deans/Chairs online survey results show they believe it important to possess strong leadership competencies in order to successfully do their jobs, and also indicated that they believe that opinion is shared by most institutions. Many respondents expressed that there is room to improve their own leadership competencies. Results showed almost unanimous consent that mastering leadership is more complex and difficult than mastering management skills.
Respondents of the online survey reported that most institutions (59.48%) do provide leadership development opportunities for Associate Deans/Chairs, most of it done in house. There were mixed perceptions from respondents on the effectiveness of leadership development opportunities with some insinuating it was a waste of time, while others spoke of an exemplary in-house program. There were also many respondents reporting they had attended the Chair Academy and provided positive, yet underwhelming feedback on their experience there. Suggestions to enhance leadership development opportunities focused on more peer to peer connection, effective mentorship programs, and workshops specifically tailored to the role of Associate Dean/Chair. Many stated the significance of having powerful communication skills as the most important competency needed to effectively lead change. Respondents emphatically emphasized that lack of time due to their taxed workload was the largest impediment to pursuing leadership development opportunities.

**Final Comments: Online Survey**

In closing the online survey, Associate Deans/Chairs were provided a final opportunity to provide additional feedback that they believed would be relevant to this study. There were 29 out of 116 (25.00%) responses to this question, and they were as varied as they were zealous. The following examples illustrate this point:

One respondent was positive about the Associate Dean/Chair role:

Middle management, especially the Chair position, is always viewed as the "worst" position in the College. I beg to differ, I think much has to do with the type of person you are and the need to like working and interfacing with people. It is very much a people position as you are having to deal with student issues and finding solutions that are the best interest for the student and yet maintains the integrity of the program.

Another expressed an opposing viewpoint:

I have come to realize that the Chairs position is undervalued and this leads to a lack of respect for those in the position and almost "empathy" for Chairs. The position is extremely underpaid and the amount of pressure is incredible.

There were two respondents who questioned the premise of this study:
I haven't seen a successful attempt to "lead change from the middle.” Leadership and change have to come from the top.

I think you are assuming a deficit mentality by suggesting that Chairs/Associate Deans are somehow not fully developed as leaders. Some may be, but in my experience the senior leaders, if you wish to call them that, need leadership development just as much as some of those a lower levels. You cannot assume that position has anything to do with leadership and that is a flaw I see in your line of questioning.

There were also some who had suggestions for senior management:

In our institution, middle managers are not involved in strategic planning for the College. Nor are we made aware of such planning until it is made public. There exists many, many years of successful leadership and management expertise and experience within the middle management level but it is not accessed or even requested. Inclusion of middle managers in the development of strategic direction for the College would enhance ownership and buy-in and improve the overall effectiveness of the implementation of the vision and mission.

From what I have observed, many middle managers/ADs were Faculty/Instructors then promoted from within. While their background and experiences are very relevant, it can potentially create a homogeneous management cadre. I believe that balanced business acumen (not all academic), external experiences, and general manager/leadership experiences from other sectors could supplement a strong academic team. This diversity of backgrounds may be welcomed and productive for colleges.

In conclusion, the online survey provided an incredibly rich data set. The diversity of the responses confirms the complexity of the role. A review of the data found congruency of opinion (for the most part) between Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans on what they deemed were major activities associated with the role. Both groups also agreed there is major change going on in the system, and that those changes are impacting the role. There was also close agreement between both groups on what are deemed as important leadership competencies that would help Associate Dean/Chairs to be successful.

The next data source to be reviewed are the findings from the face-to-face interviews.
Data Source 3:
Face-to-face Interview Participants

Characteristics of Participants: Face-to-face Interviewees

REB protocols dictate that the identities of face-to-face interview participants remain confidential. Therefore, extra care was demonstrated to not reveal information that might lead to the identification of participants or their respective institutions. To that end, only interviewee characteristics pertinent to this study shall be discussed in this section. Many of those characteristics are further revealed through an analysis of the data.

It did not seem appropriate to reveal which geographical region individual participants were from, other than to state that there was representation from western, central and eastern colleges as defined by Colleges Ontario (2014). There was no representation from a northern college. In order to protect confidentiality, participants will not be referred to by name. For the purpose of analyzing the data, each interview participant was given a unique code identifier, that is, AD/Chair AA, AD/Chair BB…AD/Chair GG. Note-some interview participants were Associate Deans and some were Chairs; therefore in order to further protect their identities, all participants shall be individually referred to by their AD/Chair code identifier.

In selecting participants for the interviews, I was careful to ensure that they represented a purposeful sample (Maxwell, 1997) as defined in Chapter 3. That is to say that in order to meet the criteria previously defined as a purposeful sample, there was a minimum of:

1. One Associate Dean/Chair who was substantially involved in degree activity and/or development, and an Associate Dean/Chair who had no involvement with degree activity.

2. One Associated Dean/Chair who was involved in applied research activity, and an Associate Dean/Chair who had little or no involvement in applied research activity.

3. One Associate Dean/Chair who worked in a college that had obtained differentiated status such as Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (ITAL) or Polytechnic, and an Associate Dean/Chair who worked in a college that had not obtained differentiated status.
4. In addition to the selection criteria above, I ensured that I had at least one Associate Dean/Chair who represented each of the four major programming clusters as defined by Colleges Ontario (2014): Applied Arts, Business, Health, and Technology.

**Research Question 1: Defining the Role**

Research Question 1 explores the background and current responsibilities (Appendix L) associated with the role of Associate Deans/Chairs, in this case the face-to-face interview participants. It also views this phenomenon through the lens of ORT (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978) as previously defined.

**Prior experience and education.** The following section reviews the backgrounds of interview participants prior to accepting their current position:

A review of prior work experiences of interview participants reveals that all but one had teaching experience prior to assuming their current positions; however, the teaching experience varied both in terms of tenure, and whether or not they were full-time faculty or part-time faculty.

All participants were hired from within their current organizations, although not all were full-time at the time they assumed their current roles. One of the participants was appointed to the role, and the rest had to apply and win competitions through an interview process; however, most were encouraged to apply from within their current organizations. Four participants hold a graduate level credential, two are currently enrolled in Master’s programs (one pursuing his/her second graduate degree), and two do not currently have graduate degrees. Of significance, all participants stated there is now expectation of a Master’s credential for the AD/Chair role at their respective institutions. When they assumed the role, participants were provided with job descriptions that most claimed were fairly accurate, with the exception of one who was adamant that it was not. Participants also claimed that although the job descriptions were *fairly accurate*, the description did not capture the full essence or complexity of the positions, and that the role was constantly evolving. This sentiment was expressed by AD/Chair GG who stated:

All the responsibilities were outlined there in the job description. I think what didn’t show up were supports required in the first year to really help
mentor you through getting on board. I look back and I laugh. My first training in the first week was Health and Safety, and it reiterated that you were eligible for a $25,000 fine and this much time in jail if you did not adhere to health and safety regulations. I didn’t get my SWF (standard workload form) training until my third year. I think that we need to have a small course for AD/Chairs prior to them taking the helm.

The lack of clarity in the job descriptions is congruent with the findings of the online surveys.

**Prior leadership development.** All interview participants stated that they had participated in some form of leadership development opportunity prior to assuming their current roles, with the exception of one, who stated that he/she had not. However, almost all of it was informal (other than graduate studies). Three of them referred to course-work related to leadership through pursuit of an academic credential (MBA, MA, and Nursing). Four mentioned workshops and seminars hosted by their institutions. Three of them said they felt they did enjoy leadership development, but for the most part, their pursuit of development opportunities had been self-motivated and self-directed. Five stated they had attended the Chair’s Academy, with four stating that they attended after they had assumed the role. Those who attended the Academy said they found the training beneficial, but were equally clear that the experience did not adequately prepare them for all the challenges associated with the role, with some stating the job could only be learned through hands on experience.

The results from the interviews again align with the findings from the online surveys. Almost all participants had participated in some form of leadership development; however, most were equally clear that the leadership development opportunities they had attended prior to being hired did not entirely prepare them for the role.

**Responsibilities associated with the role.** Interview participants were asked to clarify what they felt were the three most important responsibilities associated with the role, ranking them in order. (This was intentionally similar to a question asked of Associate Deans/Chairs in the online survey.) Some interview participants answered
providing far more detail than others making it difficult to rank their responses; however, the following Table 40 illustrates seven major themes that evolved (using theme analysis as described in Chapter 3).

Table 40. Associate Deans/Chairs: Most Important Responsibilities Associated with the Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Themes</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>2nd Most Important</th>
<th>3rd Most Important</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty: hiring, managing, supporting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: ensuring success</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing strategic plan, future vision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs: new development and renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: building teams, relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs: ensuring quality, reviews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget, managing finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table represents the no. of responses from Associate Deans/Chairs when clustered into themes based on word counts, repetition of phrases, similar comments etc. Note there are 22 responses (one more than one would assume counting (7x3=21) because one of the respondents placed equal importance on faculty relationships and student success, and added a fourth responsibility.

In order to ensure accuracy in ranking the seven responsibilities that interview participants attributed to the role, a weighted ranking methodology was employed and the results demonstrated in Table 41. As revealed, in this case, the weighted analysis only marginally affected the original ranking of themes identified. Only one—the responsibility of leadership—building teams and relationships assumed more importance than previously shown.

Table 41. Associate Deans/Chairs: Most Important Responsibilities Associated with the Role (Weighted Ranking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Themes</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>2nd Most Important</th>
<th>3rd Most Important</th>
<th>Weighted responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty: hiring, managing, supporting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: ensuring success</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing strategic plan, future vision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: building teams, relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs: new development and renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs: ensuring quality, reviews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results demonstrate that interview participants place high importance on their relationships with faculty and about student success. These results found that focus on quality relationships with faculty and ensuring student success are congruent with the themes that evolved from a similar question in the online survey. AD/Chair EE confirmed the importance that he/she placed on hiring and supporting faculty and student success stating:

Ensure that the contract faculty are the best that I can find. Support the contract faculty cohort, how they intersect with the school and everything associated with that. I place priority on all of the other personal relationships—with full time faculty, program teams, coordinators, and the office staff to ensure the success of students.

Two of the respondents commented on how important it was to have a good understanding of the collective agreement in order to maintain positive relationships with faculty. AD/Chair CC stated:

It’s a challenge managing within the collective agreement—and the interface with HR. I thought I knew the collective agreement as a faculty member, but I did not have a clue.

Of interest, there was some importance placed on supporting the strategic direction of the college by interview participants, and some of the comments seem to validate an understanding of Senge’s (1990) systems thinking theory as demonstrated by AD/Chair BB who stated:

Having a good sense of the strategic intent of the college—what’s the big picture, how do we support the big picture, and how do we move toward that? What does it really mean to sit on academic leadership teams? When the VP of Academic comes up with the academic plan, I read it through, what does it mean for us? Also students, mental health, sexual violence policies, what does the student demographic look like, what are some of
the pressures of the faculty, are we in a bargaining year, are we starting new programs, what do the faculty need to be successful, do they need special space or equipment? Supporting faculty and enabling them. If our intent is to support the students for success, we have to support the faculty so they can support the students and in order to do that, we have to keep it in the context of the big picture.

The preceding comments also confirm the complexity of activity associated with the role, a sentiment expressed by all interview participants.

**Challenges associated with middle-management.** All candidates stated that they felt there were distinct challenges associated with the middle-management position. The major theme that evolved, commented on by four respondents, was the sensation of being pulled in many directions, often between senior management (usually the Deans), and those who report to them, faculty. This is illustrated clearly by AD/Chair AA who answered:

Absolutely because you’re pulled in every single direction. You’re trying to build a team with the faculty, you’re pulled with the union issues and you’re pulled with the direction of the college and they don’t always mesh so you’re trying to find ways to work with everybody and satisfy everybody. You play the role of a juggler and then you’ve got the students in the mix.

Other comments varied. Two participants commented on the disconnect between their Dean’s objectives and their own, two spoke of the need to communicate decisions (of which they had little input) up and down, two spoke of being overly busy with one referring to his/her position as a dumping ground, two spoke of the lack of cooperation amongst the AD/Chairs at their institution, and three inferred that they should be shown more trust and allowed to make decisions that impact their respective areas as they have the on-the-ground information required to make local decisions. AD/Chair GG articulated this sentiment in the following way:

I would sum it up in one word, “trust”. There needs to be more trust put into us managers on the front line. We live it day-by-day and we know exactly what we need. I’m the type of manager that doesn’t pad things or sugar-coat them. I say this is what I need to get the job done, nothing more, and nothing less. In the last 10 years, and more so in the last four, I’ve struggled in getting that message across to the Dean and people
outside of the academic area, the enabling areas. Equally important is having your Dean back you up.

AD/Chair DD also felt he/she should be trusted to make local decisions, stating:

Sometimes I think that I would just like to make the decisions. Really. I feel that I have the background. No disrespect to the Dean, but, they don’t have the information they need to make local decisions at the tables they are at, and we are not at those tables. They don’t have the meat, and we have the meat. I know the numbers, I know operations. All the complexities, all the nuances are in the realm of the Associate Dean/Chair, and not in the world of the Dean, and they don’t have the information they need to always make the right decisions.

Summary. The Associated Dean/Chair role is busy and complex as verified by comments from interview participants. Most holding the role are hired locally from faculty positions, and although most have some leadership development, it does not adequately prepare them for challenges that they face in the role. Most found their job descriptions fairly accurate; however, many find the first few years on the job overwhelming and they recommended more support, mentoring and/or training during this time.

They experience similar challenges to those that are expressed in the literature related to middle-management; notably, having to communicate up and down, being pulled in various directions, and not being trusted to make decisions that affect their own area. They prioritize hiring, managing and supporting faculty and ensuring student success as the two most important responsibilities of the job. Many of them also stated the importance of influencing and supporting strategic goals and big picture planning of the institution.

It is difficult to align a review of the role as expressed by interview participants with the principles (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978) and assumptions (Parker & Wickham, 2005) associated with organizational role theory (ORT) as each Associate Dean/Chair has a unique story. The lack of clarity in job descriptions implies a potential violation of one of the ORT principles, that the role has not always been effectively communicated, understood and accepted by those who assume the position. In spite of this potential violation, Associate Deans/Chairs do succeed after a challenging first few
years, and their institutions appear to be thriving as confirmed by Colleges Ontario (2014). This appears to contradict the ORT principle implying that in order for an organization to function effectively, the role has been effectively communicated, understood, and accepted by those that assume the position.

In a similar fashion, ORT (Wickham & Parker, 2007) assumptions state that: the employee takes or accepts the role (role-taking assumption); there is consensus regarding expectations associated with the role (role-consensus assumption); the employee complies with behaviour expected in the (role-compliance assumption); and there is conflict when expectations are not consensual (role-conflict assumption). A review of interview responses from Associate Deans/Chairs does not find them in disagreement with their Deans about expectations associated with the role, in spite of job descriptions that were not wholly accurate. In contrast to the findings from the online surveys, none of the interview participants referred to their performance review in a negative manner. Some referred to the challenge of being stuck in the middle; however, none referenced conflict with senior management. To the contrary, all interview participants were unanimous in their appreciation of the role, and stated that they found the position rewarding. The experiences reported seem to align with the assumptions related to ORT: respondents accept the role; there is consensus of expectations; Associate Deans/Chairs behave in an expected manner; and there is little conflict with senior management.

**Changes to the role as a result of recent system changes.** The next section of interview questions focused on gaining participant perspectives on changes currently going on in the Ontario CAAT system.

**Impact of degrees.** Two of the seven interview participants are heavily involved in degree activity. In addition, another did not manage stand-alone degrees; however, he/she was responsible for managing a number of collaborative degree programs between his/her institution and various universities. Four of the participants were not currently directly involved in degree activity; however, they all acknowledged that the introduction of degrees was changing the college landscape.
The two Associate Deans/Chairs who did manage degree level programming were both emphatic in articulating that it was challenging, and that the expectation of hiring faculty with a terminal credential as imposed by PEQAB requirements affected their relationships with faculty. AD/Chair AA said:

One of the hardest things is to find faculty to teach in one of the degrees that I manage as they are so specialized. Finding anyone with a PhD in one of the degrees I manage is not possible, and you are not going to. We had to figure out new ways to get to that 50%. The individuals (home-grown) with PhDs already working here have no issues at all because they already understand the college system. What I’m finding challenging is the newbies, people with PhDs that are hired from outside the college. It’s very different—the college world they’ve entered. It’s difficult to integrate and build a team because they operate so differently.

AD/Chair CC was equally challenged by PEQAB hiring restrictions:

Nothing in my 14 years as a faculty member–coordinator prepared me for being responsible for two degrees—nothing. I will tell you frankly that I found it very intimidating. I came from programs where having an advanced credential was nice, but not a requirement. Now—in the degrees, there is a requirement that most teachers have a PhD. I’m overwhelmed at the notion of being hamstrung by having to hire PhDs. I should make hiring decisions based on who is going to create the best learning experience for the student. You can’t say that 50% of the hires requiring a PhD are going to provide the best teaching. I’ve had more problems with hires with PhDs where things have gone sideways.

AD/Chair DD also spoke to the complexity of managing collaborative degrees stating that different approval processes, the need to get institutions to agree, additional demands on faculty, and accreditation processes were challenges.

All participants acknowledged the introduction of degrees into the college system as a significant change, and most seemed aware of the hiring challenges associated with degree activity as it was mentioned by six out of seven interviewees with the most emphatic responses coming from those directly referenced above.

The hiring restrictions imposed by PEQAB proved by far the most challenging aspect of managing degree level activity, and it was affecting Associate Deans/Chairs
relationships with faculty. These findings are congruent with the findings from the online surveys.

**Impact of research.** Five out of the seven interview participants claimed their department participated in research, albeit at varying levels of involvement. Two claimed they were not responsible for any applied research projects at this time. All participants seemed supportive of research with two respondents declaring they intend to make it a bigger priority. Two respondents mentioned it created additional work. The other challenge associated with participating in research expressed by participants was resourcing.

AD/Chair FF stated:

HR thought this was a fly by night thing so we’re not putting any FT staff in there. However, to the manager, we said, let’s see what kind of research money is available. All of a sudden the money starting to flow in and we couldn’t respond to these projects because we didn’t have the staffing and faculty.

AD/Chair GG also expressed concerns re the back-filling of faculty that participate in research projects stating:

The biggest challenge is staffing and backfilling people who are doing the research. When full-time professors are doing research projects, it’s hard getting people who can leave their employers and who are also good teachers. They’re getting paid better in industry so that makes it difficult to bring them in so it makes it tough to backfill those teachers on research projects.

The Associate Dean/Chairs who were responsible for degree programs acknowledged the new heightened importance place on research, as faculty associated with degrees are expected by PEQAB to pursue scholarly activity, as confirmed by AD/Chair CC who states:

I need to be able to demonstrate at the next PEQAB renewal that scholarly activity is happening. In the long standing degree, this is happening. For the new degree that I manage, I have made a determined effort to support scholarly activity including hosting an International conference. I am very proud of that.
There was support from interview respondents for applied research. The major concerns raised were additional workloads and challenges with resourcing and staffing, specifically back-filling teaching assignments while full-time faculty worked on research projects. These results are again congruent with findings from the online survey.

**Differentiation (i.e., ITAL or Polytechnic Institution).** One of the interview respondents stated that his/her institution fixated on branding itself as a Polytechnic Institution. The other six respondents stated that their institutions did not; however some respondents claimed that their institution did place high priority on college/university partnerships and collaboration. AD/Chair CC expressed differentiation as seen through the viewpoint of his/her institution in the following way:

> We very much fixate on the term Polytechnic—and focus on differentiating ourselves. However, we don’t want to be a University. I have struggled with the notion of what this means—driven by degrees—but it does cascade out. The focus has been on degrees as the market-place demands them. Skills development manifests itself differently between diplomas and degrees. In degrees it manifests itself as research in the upper years. Diplomas are more applied and hands on. The difference—more theory with degrees combined with research in higher years.

**Differentiation: Strategic Mandate Agreements (SMAs).** All of the Associate Deans/Chairs who participated in interviews were aware of the SMAs. Two had positive things to say about their SMA as expressed by AD/Chair GG:

> The new Strategic Mandate Agreement, it affected us in a good way because we were identified as one of the top-10 areas. Also, when I was looking after aviation as well, that was one of the five top areas for growth. I sensed a change in the force as we got more support in the area of program growth and development and of course it made it easier to get required renovations.

Two other interview respondents were not so positive, as AD/Chair FF who stated:

> The SMA impacted our work in that we really had to sit down and figure out where our niche programs were, and where we wanted to go. In developing our SMA, there were very isolated restricted conversations with people and that’s where we got caught. The new VPA was unfamiliar with the workings of the province. We didn’t have enough flexibility to launch new programs that were really close to being in the hopper. We had to pull back because they weren’t in the SMA. It was difficult because we
are trying to increase enrollment and students are looking for new and exciting programs and practical experience yet we are restricted because of the SMA.

**Other changes in the system.** There were mixed responses from interviewees when asked if they felt there were other changes currently going on in the college system. There was: reference to importance placed on pathways and partnerships with other institutions with reference to the Ontario Council on Articulation and Transfer (ONCAT) project; increases in International students and associated challenges; the impacts of the pending accreditation quality assurance process; reduced funding; changes in laws impacting student placements; and heightened competition to attract new students. None of the above concerns were mentioned by more than two respondents. Of note, online/hybrid delivery was not mentioned by interview participants which is a contraction from results found in the online survey.

The challenge of attracting new students elicited more passionate responses than most as stated by AD/Chair BB:

> What we are seeing right now in how things are changing in the landscape. You’re really looking at your enrollment numbers in a competitive market. We all work well together, but we know that the demographics are shifting. There are less new students from high school and more from non-traditional backgrounds. How do you attract non-direct students in such a competitive market?

AD/Chair EE questions where the entire Ontario CAAT system is heading, as he/she eloquently states:

> It’s a crisis. It has been run as a corporation for a while now. There is a quality agenda that is being overridden by the business agenda, and when we all take off our administrator hat and we put on our taxpayer and parents hat, it calls into question a lot of business efficiencies, not a pleasant conversation. If the college system is going to move along, there is that rolling debt. There is Bernie Sanders in the States calling out tuition costs. It is a matter of time before we do not have a case as to why we are putting the next generation out with massive debt and also preparing them for a labour force that is not there. The bigger question is what is a college education meant to do now? We have 2-year programs in our school. Unless there are pathways with universities, what is a 2-year program going to give a person in the industry other than an experiential learning? I
think we’re going to see more competition from alternative learning. Elementary and secondary schools are a little fractured right now. It’s time for the game changers -- People are doing well in other parts of the world. Why can’t we model this in Canada? For example, like in the Scandinavian countries.

**Summary.** There is agreement from interview participants that there are currently significant changes going on in the Ontario college system, primarily driven by the proliferation of degrees. Those managing degrees state that it has affected their relationships with faculty driven by PEQAB hiring restrictions. Associate Deans/Chairs are fairly supportive of research although they express concerns over yet another increase to their workload and the challenge of backfilling faculty who participate in research. There appears to be minimum implications from the re-branding associated with differentiation, unless you are in an institution attempting to brand itself as a Polytechnic Institute. In that case, the change is significant. It should be noted that the term ITAL seems to have vanished from the vocabulary of Associate Deans/Chairs. It was not mentioned by interview participants, nor was it mentioned in the online survey responses. Respondents are very aware that the SMAs are changing the Ontario CAAT system, some expressing positive sentiments about the SMAs and some negative. The negative connotations associated with the SMAs focus on restrictions placed on new program development.

Interview participants referenced numerous other changes currently taking place in the Ontario college system, with challenges associated with attracting new students in an increasingly competitive environment and funding concerns eliciting the most passionate responses. Interview participants were of consensus that changes in the system were increasing the complexity of the role and adding workload to an already demanding job. These findings are congruent with results from the online survey.

There is no direct reference to increased complexity and long work hours in the principles and assumptions associated with ORT; however, one can make a logical assumption that changes in the system, as confirmed from respondents of the online surveys and interview participants, are having significant impacts on the roles of Ontario CAAT Associate Deans and/or Chairs.
Research Question 2: Leadership Competencies

The second research question explores leadership competencies that would assist mid-level Ontario CAAT academic adminsisters (Associated Deans and/or Chairs) to be successful in their roles, followed by secondary questions that ask: whether Associate Deans/Chairs think it is important to possess leadership competencies, and if so, what competencies; followed by whether there are competencies that would specifically assist with leading change.

The questions related to an exploration of leadership competencies viewed through the following three theoretical leadership constructs:

• transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978)
• 8-stage process of leading change (Kotter, 1996)
• systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990)

Exploration of leadership competencies. All seven interviewees were resolute that having strong leadership competencies is vital to success in the role. One clarified the importance of possessing both leadership and management skills which supports an argument made earlier in this paper as expressed by AD/Chair FF:

Leadership—it’s critical, but there are leaders that would not be good managers. You need both in this role. You need to keep your eye down the road and at the same time manage the day-to-day.

There were varied responses from interview participants when asked what leadership competencies were most important. The major theme dominating responses was the importance of relationships (referred to by all respondents), supplemented by the ability to build trust (mentioned by four respondents) and the importance of giving and commanding respect (mentioned by five respondents). AD/Chair BB finds:

It’s the people skills because you are often aware of tough decisions. To be successful, you need to build trust with those you work with. If you agree or disagree is not relevant to moving an initiative forward. We are in it together, right there in the present.

AD/Chair DD states:
Respect for others and what they are good at. Respect for yourself. They will then respect what I stand for.

Equally important, a theme that emerged, although not a leadership competency per-se, from the findings was the desire to connect, network, share best practices, and just “hang-out” with peers who shared the role. Four of the respondents commented about this as AD/Chair CC states passionately:

Over the last 3 years—as the strategic planning framework changed—no effort was made to allow the AD/Chairs to huddle together, and understand change and develop strategies to implement change. They should meet alone—they never get to do that. It was done a little bit organically. Only once at an academic retreat- the VPA asked for an audience with AD/Chairs, but it was a monolog—and then they were sent packing. He spoke for 25 minutes—and we were not encouraged to ask questions. Part of change is driven by the SMA—this used to be free flowing and super opportunistic. That entrepreneurism is now discouraged. Most of us are trying to reset our thinking as the culture has changed dramatically. There is no opportunity to dialogue amongst the AD/Chairs and it would be so helpful.

Another theme that emerged, to a lesser extent, was the ability to create win-win scenarios expressed by three respondents with an example as follows from AD/Chair EE:

The ability to guide and achieve a situation that is workable and everybody goes away feeling okay. It gives people their respect and their dignity.

Other comments referred to: being collaborative and working as a team (referenced twice); providing support (referenced twice); showing transparency (referenced once); holding oneself accountable (referenced once); demonstrating empathy (referenced twice); and leading by example (referenced twice).

AD/Chair GG’s comment encapsulates many of these sentiments:

The biggest thing I find is leading by example. I’ve seen people manage instead of lead and it’s sort of like pushing the rope instead of pulling the rope. It’s a lot easier to pull a rope. I’ve had good success here in building a team and providing leadership in an open environment, not autocratic and not dictatorial, where you have more cooperation. It’s more collegial. It’s more fun. Being empathetic and compassionate, being flexible, being a good listener and providing support to your team. Providing support is
the biggest thing and that’s the comment I get back, even in the employee survey.

**Comparison to transformational leadership principles.** In a manner similar to the methodology employed to responses from the online surveys, the responses from interview participants related to important leadership competencies is mapped against the tenets of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) as shown in Table 42.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership Principles (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978)</th>
<th>Top-10 leadership competencies identified by Associate Deans/Chairs as very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation: challenge the status quo</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Individual consideration: support and encouragement to individual followers | • Importance of relationships  
• Build trust  
• Give and command respect  
• Provide support  
• Create win-win scenarios |
| Inspirational motivation: help followers experience similar passion and motivation as self | • Demonstrate empathy  
• Collaborate: work as a team |
| Idealized influence: serve as a role model                   | • Lead by example  
• Holding oneself accountable  
• Show transparency |

It should be noted, that none of the leadership competencies referenced as important from the interviewees referenced the principle of “intellectual stimulation—challenge the status quo” associated with transformational leadership. There was a similar finding in the online survey results. This will be further commented on in the next chapter where conclusions are drawn.

**Competencies related to leading change?** All seven respondents stated they believe that there are leadership competencies directly related to leading change, and that they are important for success in the role. AD/Chair AA states that, “If you can’t deal with change, you’re in the wrong job.”

When asked what competencies were most important to lead change, the dominant theme that emerged was the importance of communication skills referenced by
all of the respondents, with one making direct reference to Kotter’s (1996) process for leading change (not prompted by the interviewer) as expressed by AD/Chair CC:

In my current grad work, we are studying John Kotter who says that most institutions fail to implement appropriate change management strategies by a factor of 10. The most important skill related to leading change is communication—not just speaking. Understanding what needs to be communicated—find different ways to communicate that message to different audiences. Most people don’t understand what the changes mean. Most Associate Deans/Chairs have good management skills—but don’t understand how to communicate. I’m floored that sometimes a year later, people still don’t understand what I meant. I think I was poorly prepared for that piece. When I was promoted, I had not comprehended how you have to recraft the message for different people and keep a smile on your face.

AD/Chair GG confirms the importance of possessing excellent communication skills when leading change:

It starts with good training around change management. I think the biggest thing there is communication in leadership. You have to be able to communicate immediately to your team when you hear things that are going to happen. It can be like being at the front of the parade and the people at the back finding things out long after the parade is over.

There was also the skill of being able to communicate a message up-and-down mentioned by two of the respondents as expressed by AD/Chair EE:

I make it a point to reach up and reach down, watch how they communicate, watch how I communicate, and see what is going on. It helps with relationships.

This sentiment is expanded on by AD/Chair DD:

Be the funnel, the middle of the hourglass. Know what senior management is thinking. Be aware of the landscape of the province, and the country, and globally, and be able to communicate that. Know where you are going, and where you want to be. Have visions—the manager is managing what we are, the leader is creating what we can become. The biggest thing is to let people know what drove the change before the change. You cultivate people to understand why this change is happening and you have better buy-in.
Other comments related to competencies required to lead change expressed by participants were: the need to be adaptable, being strategic; being accountable for decisions; and ensuring change was being implemented for the right reasons (each mentioned once).

**Systems thinking theory.** One of the theoretical leadership constructs through which this study is viewed is systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990). Interview participants were asked whether they were familiar with the terms “systems theory” or “systems thinking”. Six out of seven stated that they were, and they all associated it with seeing the big picture, which they stated was important. One of them mentioned Senge by name. There were lukewarm responses as to whether they thought that training in systems thinking theory would be beneficial. Most were not sure what the training would entail, although the overall sentiment was positive. However, one of the respondents was convinced that it would be helpful as expressed by AD/Chair CC:

Yes—absolutely. In my CMU program, we did a course focussed on the 5th discipline. In the previous regime, it was not valued at the time. However, now with SEM [strategic enrolment management]—it is really about systems thinking. Now, you have to think of how decisions you make affect other areas of the college. In the past we could spend our way out of every problem. In the past we were good at making things happen in the short term, but created all kinds of problems for the rest of the institution. Systems thinking would help Associate Deans/Chairs to understand why integrated planning is so important. Being told you have to argue your case in front of a committee that appears to have a bunch of people from the support areas seems like a pain in the ass, and it seems demeaning. However, some training in systems thinking would allow you to be empathetic to what’s going in student services, library capacity, what’s going on in the registrar’s office, what’s going on in the residences, what’s not going on in those areas, what are the facilities implications?”

**Summary.** Associate Deans/Chairs who participated in the face-to-face interviews are of unanimous opinion that possessing strong leadership competencies are crucial to success in the role. The importance of developing strong relationships was the dominant theme that evolved when exploring what competencies were deemed most important, supplemented by the ability to build trust as well as demonstrating and commanding respect. Other competencies referenced to a lesser extent were: being
collaborative and working as a team; providing support; showing transparency; holding oneself accountable; demonstrating empathy; and leading by example.

As a reminder, the top-10 leadership competencies identified as “very important” by Associate Deans/Chairs in the online survey were:

1. Build and maintain effective relationships and work teams (this was ranked as number one by both groups)
2. Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others
3. Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator
4. Be inclusive by appreciating, respecting, and valuing diversity
5. Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership
6. Be a thoughtful and diligent manager of talent who develops, coaches, and mentors others for individual, team, and organizational success
7. Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles
8. Resolve and manage conflict productively
9. Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence
10. Understand and utilize clear and effective practices for hiring for excellence

A comparison of the results between the interviews and online survey, while not identical, convey similar sentiments. The themes of building strong relationships, demonstrating and commanding respect, and showing value for others is apparent in both sets of responses. Of great importance to respondents in both groups, although not a leadership competency per se, is the ability to connect, network and share best practices amongst peers. The one theme not reflected in the competencies identified in the online survey, but identified by interview participants is the importance placed on the ability to build trust. This difference is noted between the two findings.

The leadership competencies identified as important by interview participants support the theoretical leadership construct of Transformational Leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) as previously defined.
Interview participants also unanimously agreed that the ability to lead change is vital to the role, and that there are unique leadership competencies associated with leading change. When asked what competencies were most important to lead change, the dominant theme that emerged was the importance of communication skills, with one making direct reference to Kotter’s (1996) change management process. Some respondents expressed the need to be able to communicate messages up and down—from the middle. Other competencies related to leading change, as expressed by participants were: the need to be adaptable, being strategic; being accountable for decisions; and ensuring change was being implemented for the right reasons (each mentioned once).

Communication skills also evoked the most passionate responses when asked what competencies were most deemed most important to leading change in the online survey. Although not identical, there is general alignment between findings from the face-to-face interviews and the online surveys in regards to what competencies are deemed important to lead change, dominated by the ability to effectively communicate.

The competencies related to leading change, as expressed by participants, are reflected in Kotter’s (1996) 8-stage process for leading change; however, only one participant emphasized the importance of viewing change leadership as a process, although one could weave that assumption into all interview responses. In my opinion, these results demonstrate that there is room for improvement in the ability of Associate Deans/Chairs to lead change when viewed through Kotter’s 8-stage process.

**Research Question 3: Leadership Developmental Opportunities**

Research Question 3 seeks to gain a deeper understanding of what leadership development opportunities currently exist for Associate Deans/Chairs in the Ontario CAAT system and whether they are adequate and/or effective.

The results of the findings, where appropriate, shall once again be referenced to the three theoretical leadership constructs used throughout this study:

- transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978)
- 8-stage process of leading change (Kotter, 1996)
Current leadership development opportunities. All interview participants claimed that their respective institutions provided some form of leadership development. They also all agreed that it was the responsibility of the institution to provide leadership development opportunities, with four respondents adding that the responsibility should be shared. AD/Chair DD clarifies this point:

I think it goes hand in hand between you and your supervisor. If I came up with a program or course that I wanted to take, I should pursue it. For instance, there is a lot out there right now on student retention, there is a lot on faculty development, and there is a lot of online learning. I think that if it’s something you feel passionate about and you think it’s going to make a difference to your job, then you need to go to your supervisor, your Dean, your VPÂ—and they should support you. They talk about PD in our performance reviews—right? There has to be some kind of reciprocal agreement that it’s going to happen.

Three of the interviewees spoke extremely highly of their respective institutions in regard to professional development opportunities related to leadership. AD/Chair EE stated:

This institution has been wonderful. College XX has always been extremely supportive of its people. They have supported me through my own personal development which is something I have been working on.

AD/Chair CC echoed these sentiments stating:

I was given significant support to pursue my second graduate degree, and it directly relates to leadership. I was given financial support and encouraged—although I have not finished on time. I am very grateful for all the support—it is substantial and transferable should I decide to leave.

AD/Chair GG provided the most positive feedback on a developmental opportunity had he/she participated in related specifically to leading change stating:

I use the example from my Change and Transition training. I had to move an entire school into a brand new building, a year-long project. I implemented all the things I learned in that training and it worked exactly the way it should. The training was a two part workshop, four hours and four hours. We used my project as a live example in the training. I set up a transition team here, I had representation from apprenticeship, faculty,
support persons, both unions, everyone involved. So we met as a team and we decided, what are the things we can control internally? We also decided on the things we could not control that were external—and on what things I had to take to the VPA at the time. We solved all the problems before the move even started. It was textbook. We ended up with some happy folks here.

Other responses were not as positive. One of the responses claimed that their institution had reduced professional development opportunities, claiming it was the first thing cut when there were budget challenges. Three expressed wishes that internal developmental opportunities were more tailored to specific needs associated with the role with AD/Chair AA stating:

All managers attended the 3-day session but it wasn’t necessarily tailored to what we needed. We weren’t asked. Some interviewing should have been done with us beforehand. They should have asked, “What are our issues in communication” and tailored it to what we needed.

Attendance at the Chair Academy was mentioned again by four of the respondents. Comments referencing experiences at the Academy were positive, yet I sensed an underlying current (hard to express in words) that it lacked for something or that it could be better. The ability to network with other Associate Deans/Chairs, both with people from inside and outside of their own organization was one of the best outcomes attributed to the Chair Academy experience. AD/Chair AA states:

In the past year, I had the opportunity to go to the advanced Chair Academy and it was very good. The college approached me to go and paid for it. One of the big advantages was that we could network with each other, from people that worked here, and externally. There were four of us from here. After that, we could pick up the phone and discuss things because of the great relationships that we built.

One of the participants expressed that leadership development opportunities need to be ongoing. AD/Chair CC stated:

It is important that leadership development is ongoing as the environment is constantly changing, I’m changing and so are the cast of characters that I work with. Leadership training is about structured deep self-reflection. There are new tools; however, in some ways leadership is as old as the world itself. You can’t rely—on what you took in the past. Whatever ah ha moments I had were about connecting the dots back then might be
different now. Maybe what I learned back then went straight over my head—when if the same set of tools were presented to me now I might go—wow, that’s brilliant. That’s how I’m going to manage that person or situation.

Five of the seven participants commented that the early years in the job were the most difficult. Four respondents were emphatic about the importance of providing exceptional mentors for new Associate Deans/Chairs. This is expressed powerfully by AD/Chair FF who states:

I think having a mentor who is a seasoned experienced Associate Dean/Chair is critical. I think it would be tremendous for new folks. They need to know that they are not the only one dealing with issues. Just to have someone help you with questions like, “the collective agreement, they are asking me this and that, what does it mean?” No-one wants to run to HR and act like they don’t know what they are doing. It would have been tremendous for me. I mean we do it for our faculty—we wouldn’t even think of not hooking them up with a mentor, why don’t we do it for us?

**Importance of leadership.** In order to drill deeper into an understanding of the importance of leadership to interview participants, they were each asked to share a story where having strong leadership led to a positive outcome in their current role. The stories that emerged were passionate and powerful. Two of the stories are shared. AD/Chair DD spoke of her leadership ability to build trust, to collaborate, and to communicate:

It was our third or fourth year of the [X] program and when I came on board, we had just lost a Coordinator. We were also looking for a home. We were going into the second year and needed a lab which we didn’t have. I thought it was great because it allowed us to step back and be creative. We could move from the confines of the programs delivered here. Because my strengths include trust and working well with people, we partnered with the people at the [X] campus to say do you have space? There may be potential synergies, there’s resources we can share. The success was that we found a home. However, the students were disgruntled and we met with them often. My supervisor needed to be aware of what was happening and together we went into the classroom and explained to them what we were going to do. Was it ideal? No. The space was too noisy so we found another space for them. It strengthened our relationship with the [X] campus. The program grew so we were able to get budget dollars to find a permanent home. It’s a successful program
now. I would say that the competencies I used were my ability to build trust, to collaborate, and to communicate.

AD/Chair GG also shared a powerful story related to managing change and crucial conversations:

I wanted to change the positioning of the fuel injection lab and put it in the farm lab, which also helped by creating an electrical lab down by the truck stop that they don’t have. The farm guys are likely the biggest users of fuel injection. They had their office tucked away in this little room in the farm lab, and I wanted them closer to here. So I had this dynamic that I wanted to clean up. It was tough trying to lead them through that process and the pushback that I got. They said, “Well we don’t want you to move that lab here and why are you doing that”? It comes back to managing change and crucial conversations. You sit them down in a safe environment and tell them this is what you propose and these are the benefits. Then you listen to their proposed negative views on it. Then you say well, here’s a positive for you, you won’t have to go there… It took some time to get these guys on board. It’s about managing that relationship, leading them through change. It resulted in a positive outcome. It required a lot of work.

Alternatively, interview participants were asked to share stories where having lack of leadership competency created a negative outcome. AD/Chair AA spoke of relationship challenges he/she faced when he/she first transitioned to the role from faculty:

When you have worked with people for 20 years, and all of a sudden they report to you, for me that was a very difficult transition, I could have used help. One of the ways I handled it was to tell them, “The department had to go to somebody.” They actually respected that.

AD/Chair CC spoke of the difficulty he/she faced in dealing with conflict:

One of the international projects is confusing—the individuals associated with it are not always clear about its objective. The college lacks a clear vision of what the intention of the project is. There is great factionalism within that team that needs to be addressed. Weakness—I am not well suited to having difficult conversations. I dislike confrontation immensely—I do almost anything to avoid confrontation. One of the leadership competencies I HAVE to develop is how to hold difficult conversations. We don’t do anything here about that.

The above stories validate the premise of this study. When asked, interview participants found it easy to tell stories where having strong leadership competencies
directly impacted their ability to be successful in their role. The ability to build trust, collaborate, and communicate effectively re-surfaced as competencies required to be successful. The stories connected to a positive outcome all related to leading change in some manner. They told opposing stories of where lack of having leadership competencies made their jobs more difficult. Transitioning to the role from faculty, and lack of confidence to engage in crucial conversations surfaced as challenges. These themes are present throughout the literature, and confirm the need for Associate Deans/Chairs to possess strong leadership competencies, particularly around leading change, in order to be successful in their roles.

**Summary.** Interview participants confirmed that possessing strong leadership competencies is extremely important to success in the role. Respondent’s perceptions of current leadership developmental opportunities provided by their respective institutions found mixed results, which for the most part, were positive. All participants acknowledged that their respective institutions do provide leadership development opportunities; however, there was not unanimous agreement as to whether the development opportunities provided were adequate or effective. They all agreed that it was the responsibility of the institution to provide leadership development opportunities, with four respondents adding that the responsibility should be shared.

There was positive feedback from respondents who had participated in leadership development sessions when it directly applied to the role of Associate Dean/Chair. Alternatively, there was negative feedback from respondents who attended leadership development sessions that were not tailored to the role. There was strong opinion that an effective mentorship program would be extremely useful for new Associate Deans/Chairs as participants found the role most challenging during the early years. Two participants indicated their appreciation for the support they received from their institutions while pursuing a graduate credential. One respondent directly referenced an extremely positive outcome resulting from skills he/she had acquired in house related to leading change.

The comments from participants related to leadership development opportunities did not directly reference the theoretical leadership constructs earlier defined. However,
five respondents had previously attended the Chair Academy whose leadership competency framework is based on enhancing transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) skills. Additionally, one of the respondents also spoke of the success he/she enjoyed when following a change leadership process, aligning with the 8-stage change leadership process espoused by Kotter (1996). Finally, all but one of the respondents felt it was important to view the role from a systems perspective and to see the big picture, with one convinced that knowledge of systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990) was imperative to success in the role. That would indicate that transformational leadership theory, systems thinking theory, and Kotter’s 8-stage change leadership process are valid constructs through which to view leadership development opportunities for Ontario/Chair Associate Deans/Chairs.

The next section will review institutional documentation obtained from Human Resource departments in Ontario colleges.

Data Source 4: Institutional Documentation

Responses from Institutions

The institutional documentation gathered focuses on answering primary Research Questions 1 and 3: defining the role of the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair and a review of leadership development opportunities currently available to Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs. To a lesser extent, a review of leadership associated with the role as found in job postings/descriptions provided by institutions also provides impetus to answering primary Research Question 2: leadership competences required by Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs.

Institution documentation associated with the role was gathered through two sources. First, most college websites contain a link to employment opportunities. A search of the CAAT websites provided some job postings for Associate Deans/Chairs, and a review of the postings addressed many of the criteria. Second, an email requesting
pertinent information, including an example of a job posting and/or description related to an Associate Dean and/or a Chair and an overview of professional development opportunities related to leadership for Associate Deans/Chairs, was sent to the heads of HR of all 22 English language CAATs. (See Appendix K for a sample of the letter that was sent to the heads of HR across the Ontario CAAT system.)

Some institutions responded immediately, some over a couple of months (through reminders), and some did not respond at all. As a follow up strategy in an effort to solicit higher response rates, I enlisted the help of the Senior-Manager, Organizational Development and Learning at Fanshawe College, and she graciously contacted her colleagues across the Ontario college system encouraging them to participate in the study. I am very grateful for this additional assistance.

There was never intention to analyze the data obtained from HR departments through a specific discipline perspective. As someone now personally responsible for these positions in my own organization, I am aware that there are always discipline specific characteristics associated with each unique Associate Dean/Chair position. These discipline specific characteristics are broad based and diversified. For example, the discipline specific characteristics of an Associate Dean/Chair responsible for Nursing is completely different from someone responsible for Aviation or Apprenticeship. Also, it was never the intention of this study to analyze different expectations associated with the role based on region or size of institution. The purpose of the study is broad based and intended to explore leadership competencies to help all Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs be successful. To that end, a review of institutional documentation will focus on core functions of the role as opposed to discipline specific characteristics, region where the institution is located, or size of the institution.

There were responses from 13 of 22 English language colleges contacted for a response rate of 59.09%. There were mixed levels of participation. Certain institutions were forthcoming, and provided job postings related to the role, job fact sheets (referred to as JFSs) that are internal documents detailing all aspects of the role, as well as an inventory of all leadership developmental opportunities they make available to their
Associate Deans/Chairs. Others sent only certain aspects of the aforementioned information.

Table 43 presents a review of the institutional data that was provided from each of the respondents. As a reminder, REB protocols prohibit me from identifying the colleges by name. Therefore, each college is represented by a unique code identifier with the true identity known only to me.

### Table 43. HR Documentation Responses from Ontario English-language Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Position title: Reporting structure</th>
<th>Institutional documentation provided</th>
<th>Credential expected of role (i.e., Master’s degree, PhD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College 17</td>
<td>Chair: Reports to the Dean</td>
<td>• Job posting • JFS description • PD opportunities provided</td>
<td>• Master’s degree (is now expected, this is recent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 18</td>
<td>Associate Dean: Reports to the Dean</td>
<td>• Only PD opportunities provided</td>
<td>• Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 4</td>
<td>Chair: Reports to the Dean</td>
<td>• Only PD opportunities provided</td>
<td>• Master’s degree (is now expected, this is recent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 22</td>
<td>Chair: Reports to the Associate President</td>
<td>• JFS • Job Posting • PD opportunities provided</td>
<td>• A post-secondary credential in related field, with 5 years of managerial experience • Work at the Masters or Doctorate level is an asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 8</td>
<td>Associate Dean: Reports to the Dean</td>
<td>• Only PD opportunities provided</td>
<td>• Undergrad degree required: Master’s degree preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 9</td>
<td>Associate Dean: Reports to the Dean</td>
<td>• JFS • Job Posting • PD opportunities provided</td>
<td>• Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 13</td>
<td>Chair: Reports to the Dean</td>
<td>• JFS • Job Posting • PD opportunities provided</td>
<td>• 4-year Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 7</td>
<td>Academic Manager: (considered equivalent to a Chair by their HR): Reports to the Director</td>
<td>• JFS • Job Posting • PD Information provided</td>
<td>• 3-year diploma or degree in related field or education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 2</td>
<td>Chair: Reports to Executive Dean</td>
<td>• JFS • Job Posting</td>
<td>• Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 10</td>
<td>Chair: Reports to the Dean</td>
<td>• JFS • Job Posting • No PD information provided</td>
<td>• Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 5</td>
<td>Chair: Reports to Dean</td>
<td>• JFS • Job Posting • PD information provided</td>
<td>• Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A review of the information obtained from HR departments finds that 9 of 13 colleges require their Associate Deans/Chairs to have a Master’s degree. Of the four institutions who reported that the role does not require a graduate credential, two of them state that it is preferred. The expectation of a graduate level credential for Associate Deans/Chairs found in the institutional documentation is similar to the findings of the online surveys and the face-to-face interviews.

**Research Question 1: Background and Role**

The next section of the analysis focuses on core functions associated with the role. For the purpose of analysing the characteristics associated with the role, I focussed more on the job postings rather than the Job Fact Sheet (JFS) descriptions. JFSs are very long, internal documents that all HR departments in Ontario colleges keep for all positions, and detail all aspects of the position (personal conversation, Senior-Manager of HR, Fanshawe College). This includes minutia type details such as amount of time sitting, amount of time keyboarding, health and safety expectations etc.—much of this information is not pertinent to the study. The job postings provided information related to core responsibilities associated with the role, and also defined expectations of candidates prior to their assuming the role. Consequently, information found in job postings was the primary source used to analyze the findings in regard to core responsibilities associated with the role, supplemented with information found in the JFSs as appropriate.

The core job responsibilities as found in the job postings provided by institutions were categorized using theme analysis methodology. I also attempted to separate what appeared to be managerial functions from leadership functions when viewed through
Kotter International’s (2015) framework. A review of responsibilities associated with the role as provided by HR departments from each institution is presented in Table 44.

Table 44. Activities Associated with the Ontario College Associate Dean/Chair Role as Identified in HR Job Postings/Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Credential Expected</th>
<th>Management functions associated the job</th>
<th>Leadership aspects associated the job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College 17</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>Students related:</td>
<td>Leadership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Progressive</td>
<td>• Students: ensuring success and retention</td>
<td>• Faculty: mentoring, support, and PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leadership experience</td>
<td>• Students: dealing with issues, appeals etc.</td>
<td>• Leadership: building teams, relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students: enhancing enrollment and recruitment</td>
<td>• Strategic planning, future vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty related:</td>
<td>• Quality: ensuring teaching and learning excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty: scheduling/workload, performance reviews</td>
<td>• Build department culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty: hiring, recruitment, onboarding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program related:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Programs: new development and renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Curriculum: renewal, maintain relevancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Programs: ensuring quality, reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operations Management:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Budget, managing finances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Management: identified as admin functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Attend and participate in program advisory committee meetings to ensure program relevancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Participate on college and provincial committees as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Network, and form partnerships with community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 18</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>Did not provide job related information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 4</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>Did not provide job related information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Management functions associated the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **College 22**      | • Post-secondary credential in related field  
• Work at the Masters or Doctorate level is an asset  
• 5 years managerial experience | | Faculty:  
• Effective recruiting, selecting, orienting, developing, motivating and evaluating staff  
• Direct and administer teaching and non-teaching assignments to faculty  
Students:  
• Conducts 1st level investigations  
• Approves student timetables  
• Supports creativity in teaching and learning  
Program related:  
• Facilitates and implements the development of new programs  
• Oversees the ongoing review of existing programs  
• Ensures the objectives of programs are attained through oversight of teaching and learning processes  
• Participate in program and curriculum review process  
• Establish learning outcomes for programs  
Operations/Management:  
• Develops, monitors and directs the budget  
• Ensures the effective use of human, physical and financial resources  
• Participate in program marketing initiatives  
Relationships:  
• Maintains relationships with advisory committees  
• Represent the sector on community and/or college committees  
• Promote and participate in partnership arrangements with the community | Leadership:  
• Provides academic leadership and direction for Academic program services  
• Promote and monitor ongoing PD for staff  
• Facilitates effective communication plan to encourage participation to support academic initiatives  
• Initiates problem solving process for disputes involving faculty, staff and students  
• Ensure a college wide team approach |
<p>| <strong>College 8</strong>       | • Undergrad required, Master's degree preferred | Did not provide job related information. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Credential</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Management functions associated the job</th>
<th>Leadership aspects associated the job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| College 9           | Master's degree | Significant academic experience in teaching and coordinating | Faculty:  
• Recruiting, hiring and evaluating all faculty and academic support staff  
• Providing input into the determination of work assignments for full-time and part-time staff  
Students:  
• Enhance the student experience  
• Increase enrollment  
Operations/Management:  
• Contribute to the development of, and leading, implementation of the strategic plan  
• Directing budget activity for the school  
• Assisting as necessary with the implementation of special projects across the portfolio  
Program related:  
• Initiating, facilitating and actively participating in the development and implementation of new academic programs  
• Ensuring program outcomes are achieved  
• Understanding Key Performance Indicators (KPI) data and developing a process for continuous improvement of programs  
• Identifying opportunities to develop new programs  
Relationships:  
• Attending Advisory Committee meetings, facilitating and / or chairing committees that involve college-wide and / or campus initiatives  
• Interact, network, and form partnerships with diverse stakeholders | Leadership:  
• Ability to lead effectively in organizational change management  
• Establishing positive relationships with internal (faculty, staff and students) and external (industry / sector representatives, professional associations) stakeholders  
• Working collaboratively in the development and implementation of the academic area's operational plan in alignment with the academic direction and strategic plan  
• Communication (written and oral) and interpersonal skills in order to build and cultivate relationships and manage difficult situations with diplomacy and tact  
• Identify, address and resolve problems or conflicts in an efficient, diplomatic manner |
| College 13          | 4 year Bachelor's degree | Real-world management experience | Faculty:  
• Recruitment, Orientation, supervision, and direction to all full-time and contract faculty  
• Hiring, managing and developing faculty  
• Developing and managing workload assignments  
Students:  
• Ensure student success  
Operations/Management:  
• Develop/Implementation of school's strategic plan  
Program related:  
• focus on program vitality and quality  
• Oversee curriculum revision processes  
• Oversee program review, curriculum renewal, and budget development. | Leadership:  
• Development of high performing individuals and teams  
• Faculty: mentoring, support, and PD  
• Strategic planning, future vision  
• Providing leadership in academic processes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Management functions associated the job</th>
<th>Leadership aspects associated the job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College 7</td>
<td>Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruiting and Orientating academic staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explores and facilitates opportunities for student laddering and articulation both internally and externally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure effective teaching and learning processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations/Management:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oversee budgeting financial and physical resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitates the development and implementation of new initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program related:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promotion of the programs and the College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managerial role in the program and curriculum review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participates in the development of new programs and delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development and implementation of alternative learning and delivery strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure the objectives of the programs and courses are attained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audits learning outcomes for programs in the departments/schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensures implementation and follow up of all academic delivery related assessments (e.g. KPI, student surveys, program surveys, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work collaboratively in the development and implementation of the department/school program plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain close contact with business/industry and ongoing committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participates in a number of school/program and/or cross academic committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
<td>Management functions associated the job</td>
<td>Leadership aspects associated the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 2</td>
<td>• Master’s degree</td>
<td>• Provide academic leadership for all credentials, specifically the degree programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 7 years progressive experience</td>
<td>• Develop staff through coaching, acknowledging contributions to teams and completing performance appraisals, as per college requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruit, hire and appraise faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinate faculty and teaching assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete faculty loading requirements and Standard Workload Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete part-time contracts each semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Students:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Actively contribute strategies to increase enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support student success and retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor issues, trends and opportunities with respect to recruitment of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Act as a catalyst for a culture focused on student success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manage the review and approval of grade submissions and student progression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program related:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management of program offerings and learning materials to maintain quality and relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan and manage program/curriculum development/revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribute to the evaluation and enhancement of existing programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor and approve annual curriculum changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lead the APR and MPR to ensure program relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribute to the creation and monitoring/assessing of new program offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determine areas for growth, both internationally and domestically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operational/management:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure audit, accreditation and quality assurance protocols are in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Relationships:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaise with the Registrar’s staff on issues related to enrollment, student admissions and retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribute to the annual marketing for assigned programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 10</td>
<td>Management functions associated the job</td>
<td>Leadership aspects associated the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Master’s degree  
• 9 years related, progressive work experience in post-secondary education, preferably in related discipline. | Faculty:  
• Assigns faculty and staff workloads in accordance with College policy and collective agreements.  
• Oversees faculty/support staff—work direction, supervision, conflict resolution and information sharing  
Students:  
• Sets student enrollment targets  
• Mediates first-level disputes involving faculty, staff or students.  
Program related:  
• Determines the positioning of program to match labour market trends.  
• Evaluates and recommends modifications of courses/programs  
• Introduces new courses/programs to reflect market needs/student demand  
Operational/Management:  
• Develops, monitors, and directs the budget activity of the program areas.  
Relationships:  
• Facilitates linkages between program areas/schools/departments, other Faculties, other College departments, and other Institutions.  
• Serves on College and provincial committees, as appropriate.  
• Leads and/or supports program advisory committees.  
• Establishes and maintains close contact with business/industry.  
• Forecasts future and current workforce needs. | Leadership:  
• Provides project leadership on program evolution, partnerships, marketing, and promotions  
• Provides leadership, research and innovation to support students, business and industry, and community development.  
• Provides leadership and development to facilitate the achievement of student success.  
• Provides leadership in overseeing physical and fiscal operations to ensure an infrastructure that will support excellence in teaching and research.  
• Champions and demonstrates behavior consistent with values  
• Supports, coaches and mentors staff  
• Facilitates the development and implementation of new initiatives  
• Seeks and promotes new initiatives  
• Establishes working environment that encourages creativity  
• Effectively communicates within the department/school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Management functions associated the job</th>
<th>Leadership aspects associated the job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty:</td>
<td>Leadership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective recruitment, development,</td>
<td>• Provides leadership to and manages,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation and training of full-time</td>
<td>all assigned full and non-full-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and non-full-time faculty</td>
<td>time faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oversees the academic administrative</td>
<td>• Demonstrated commitment to values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>processes associated with faculty</td>
<td>and principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>workload, scheduling, grade</td>
<td>• Provides leadership to divisional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>submissions and timetables</td>
<td>projects that focus on student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Solid teaching and curriculum</td>
<td>success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development, inter-professional</td>
<td>• Excellent communication, team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education/collaboration (at the</td>
<td>building, interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post-secondary level) and in the</td>
<td>• Effective conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area of simulation.</td>
<td>• Strong leadership skills to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inspire support and create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities for faculty to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creative and innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>• Commitment to collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commitment to student success and</td>
<td>decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>essential employability skills.</td>
<td>• Strong advocacy, negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective management of the</td>
<td>skills, relationship building and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching and learning processes</td>
<td>promoting effective partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administers the College’s academic</td>
<td>and agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policies and appeals process</td>
<td>• Ability to demonstrate leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oversees student advising model</td>
<td>in a unionized academic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolve program related student</td>
<td>• Strong change management, project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issues.</td>
<td>management, analytical and problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develops recommendations for short-</td>
<td>solving skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>term and long-term enrollment targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program related:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development and implementation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programming and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensures academic program development,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning and review is on-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsible for new program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development and implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participates in program review/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>curriculum review processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations/Management:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contributes to the development and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>business plan and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proactively seeks to attract new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sources of revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitors budget activity and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>budget data to the Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participates in other program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>related projects and/or committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as assigned and oversees Schools'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Advisory Committees (PACs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintains relationships with relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>external partners and organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>such as universities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
<td>Management functions associated the job</td>
<td>Leadership aspects associated the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 12</td>
<td>Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruiting and Orientating faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct staff performance and evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administer faculty workload assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student Concerns/Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program related:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managing assigned program delivery for scheduling and staffing, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overseeing new program development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations/Management:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oversee significant capital purchases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementing health and safety practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Budget and capital purchases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnership opportunities and agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
<td>Management functions associated the job</td>
<td>Leadership aspects associated the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 15</td>
<td>• 7 years experience</td>
<td>Leadership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership experience</td>
<td>• Provide guidance and support to students and staff in order to promote the success of all involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expertise within the portfolio</td>
<td>• Commitment to College’s mission and values: track record of consultation and respect for all team members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assisting with SWF’s, budgets and scheduling of classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing and facilitating faculty and school timetables for each semester of the academic year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overseeing the work of the Student Liaison, and Program Coordinators in regards to all student-related issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Respond to student academic problems at request of the School’s Student Liaison.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with appropriate college units to plan recruitment and retention efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assist in the future development of programs and partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program enrollment management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing and facilitating the program of studies and scheduling for new programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring of program-specific and academic policies and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting the implementation of KPI and PQPR recommendations and actions plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting program reviews and program mapping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations/Management:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management of support staff,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning, recruiting, selecting and evaluating all contract staff;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managing the day-to-day academic activities within the School;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assisting in the planning and coordination of all School marketing activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overseeing the planning and coordination of all school specific orientation activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working with Manager, Academic Operations regarding faculty office space, program space requirements and associated equipment needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation in advisory committees representing the School at on-campus or off-campus events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Representing the School at on-campus or off-campus events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kotter International’s (2015) framework was used as a lens through which to filter the responsibilities contrasting management functions from leadership aspects. The framework is included here again as a reminder.*

**Management defined as:** planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, measuring, problem solving, doing what we know how to do exceptionally well, producing reliable dependable results constantly.

**Leadership defined as:** establishing direction, aligning people, motivating, inspiring, mobilizing people to achieve astonishing results, propelling us into the future.
Five themes evolved through an analysis of management responsibilities associated with role, those being:

- Faculty: recruiting/hiring, assigning and managing workload, mentoring and support, providing professional development opportunities
- Students: ensuring success, providing excellent teaching and learning, dealing with student issues in the appropriate ways, enrollment management (includes recruitment/enrollment predictions), timetable scheduling
- Programs: overseeing program and curriculum renewal, developing new programs, ensuring programs meet industry and government requirements
- Operations/Management: responsible for development and management of budget, capital planning for school, hiring managing support persons, providing health and safety oversight, assisting with marketing related to student recruitment
- Relationships: collaborate with Program Advisory Committees (PACs), communicate with industry and community partners, collaborate within and outside institution as required, serve on committees as appropriate

These themes appear very similar to those expressed by respondents to the online survey and participants of the face-to-face interviews. One area that did surface as different is the importance placed on relationships with program advisory committees commonly referred to as PACs. This was referenced six times in the institutional documentation yet did not surface as very important with online survey respondents or face-to-face interview participants indicating a potential difference of opinion on the level of importance placed on this item.

It is not feasible to assess these findings against the principles associated with ORT (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978) as the responsibilities reviewed are those reflected in job postings and descriptions, and have not yet been experienced by those who assume the role. The summary section to follow (in Chapter 5) will compare/contrast these findings with those from the online surveys and face-to-face interviews. That will also allow for perspective to review these findings in relationship to the principles of ORT.
Research Question 2: Leadership Competencies

A review of the job postings and JFSs provided by institutions found aspects of leadership referenced in the job descriptions. Using a theme analysis approach, the following categories evolved:

- Strategic planning: referenced five times, often in the context of getting the department to align with the institution’s strategic plan
- Build strong relationships: referenced four times, with both internal (faculty and students) and external partners (industry, government etc.)
- Possessing excellent communication skills: referenced four times
- Building teams: referenced three times
- Mentorship: referenced three times
- Support, facilitate, develop new initiatives: referenced twice
- Demonstrate, model behaviour consistent with values: referenced twice
- Conflict resolution skills: referenced twice
- Change management skills: referenced twice
- Support, encourage creativity: referenced twice
- Three items related to transformational leadership each referenced once:
  - Inspire: once
  - Culture: once
  - Values: once

A review of these findings does find connection to the three theoretical leadership constructs through which this study is viewed: Transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978); 8-stage process of change management (Kotter, 1996); and systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990).

Table 45 presents a visual view of the leadership competencies identified through institutional documentation when mapped against the principles associated with transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).
Table 45. Comparison of Institutional Documentation Responses to Transformational Leadership Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership Principles (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation: challenge the status quo</td>
<td>• Support, facilitate, develop new initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support, encourage creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual consideration: support and encouragement to individual followers</td>
<td>• Build strong relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation: help followers experience similar passion and motivation as self</td>
<td>• Possessing excellent communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build and lead teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lead change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence: serve as a role model</td>
<td>• Demonstrate, model behaviour consistent with values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inspire, model values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There will be further comparison/contrast of leadership attributes defined as desirable in institutional job postings/descriptions to competencies identified as important to online survey respondents and interview participants in the summary section to follow (in Chapter 5).

Research Question 3: Leadership Developmental Opportunities.

Institutions were asked to provide information related to leadership development opportunities available to their Associate Deans/Chairs. As in other institutional responses, some were forthcoming, and some chose not to disclose any information in this regard. I did not interpret lack of response as an attempt at concealment on the part of the institutions; however, the response rate, or lack of, must be considered as a limitation of the study.

Table 46 provides a summary of leadership development opportunities available to Associate Deans/Chairs as identified by HR departments who responded to the study.
Table 46. Professional Leadership Developmental Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professional Development Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chairs Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house leadership development:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crucial conversations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managing conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 360 leadership review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chairs Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Niagara Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Executive Leadership Institute for Potential Vice-Presidents (VP NELI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In house Leadership development, still in the infancy stages:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not necessarily specific to academics vs non-academic leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiered program consisting of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An emerging leader program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A leadership essentials or foundations program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cohort based Leadership Excellence program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership essentials programing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leading Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coaching for Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In house leadership development program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nine workshops completed over the course of a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase knowledge, skills and tools to be successful in Managing People, Managing Budget, Curriculum, College Environment, and Student Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase knowledge of effective practices that are being implemented across the College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop more tools to support, motivate and hold your staff/teams accountable in order to improve employee engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase your knowledge regarding the resources available to you to ensure ongoing support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No professional development in house currently specifically for this role—however, they are looking into creating a leadership development program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Institution
Professional Development Opportunities

College 8
External:
• College and Institutes Canada
• Chair Academy
• The Ontario Management Academy
• A local, year-long program called Leadership Niagara
• Conference Board of Canada’s Niagara Institute
• OISE post-grad certificate in Higher Ed
• Centre for Higher Education Research and Development at the University of Manitoba
• Systems Leadership in Higher Education at Royal Roads University

College 9
Internal:
3-day leadership development program:
• HR: managing academics
• Leadership communications, conversations
• Coaching for results
• Financial management training
• Managing time and strategic priorities
• HR: managing support staff

Associate Deans have also attended the following internally:
• Managing Mental Health in the Workplace
• Harnessing the Power of Diversity
• Strategic Career Management
• Career Coaching Conservations
• The Leadership Contract
• Strategic Influence and Collaboration

External:
• Chair Academy
• CICan: Leadership Development Institute
• Ontario College Management Academy

College 13
In-house Leadership Development:
• In the process of developing a comprehensive orientation framework for new Chairs—still a work-in-progress

College 7
No formal Leadership Development Opportunities at this time; however, that initiative is underway.
Institution

Professional Development Opportunities

College 2
Institution engages Chairs in three primary ways in an ongoing basis.

• Once a semester:
  - Chairs meetings (2.5 hours in duration). At the Chairs meetings, facilitated discussion and presentations from college service providers, senior leaders, etc, Chairs are consulted/informed of initiatives at the college and share best practices/challenges/opportunities
• Twice a year:
  - Chairs Roundtables (1.5 hours in duration). Using case studies, we explore common HR situations that Chairs encounter (e.g. introducing change; providing feedback; resolving student complaints)
  - Reading Circles (1 hour in duration). Each year OD leads monthly reading circles for administrative employees on a variety of leadership topics.
• On a less regular basis:
  - Chairs Think Tanks: One hour facilitated brainstorming and practice-sharing discussions on specific topics
  - Webinars: On a variety of HR topics
  - Workshops: On other project-specific initiatives

College 10
No PD information provided

College 5
External opportunities:
  • VP NELI (CICan)
  • Leadership Development Institute
  • Chair Academy
In-house Opportunities:
  • Coaching for High Performance: a 2-day program
  • 360 Performance Feedback Pilot: raters view leadership competencies for our senior team
  • StrengthsFinder: included about 10 Chairs/Directors but also leadership for across the college
  • Guest Speakers (i.e., Ken Steeles)
  • Investigations Training: offered to all Chairs and Directors

College 12
In-house Opportunities such as:
  • Interest free tuition loans
  • Tuition reimbursement
  • College courses at $20.00
  • Time off for school
  • PD leave

College 15
External:
  • Chair Academy
Internal:
  • Do not have any leadership development that is specific to the Associate Dean group
  • The Associate Deans meet twice a month under the leadership of the Associate VP Academic to share best practices, learn from one another, and address common issues.

A review of the preceding findings presents a wide range of professional leadership development opportunities available for Associate Deans/Chairs as provided
by respondents to the study. It is difficult to determine an assessment of these findings as the information provided is likely not exhaustive. There is probably more going on at each institution than the information provided; however, I acknowledge this to be an assumption.

Many of the institutions make reference to external programs, the most popular being:

- The Chairs Academy (2014): already discussed extensively in this paper.
- National Executive Leadership Institute for Potential Vice-Presidents (VP NELI): a program delivered through Colleges and Institutes Canada (CICan). An intensive, week-long residential program, designed to enable participants to explore whether a vice-president’s position is one they wish to pursue in the future. (CICan, 2015, para. 2)
- Niagara Institute, the Conference Board of Canada: offers a Leadership Development Program (5 days) that focuses on:
  - Skill at bridging the gap between senior leadership and the front line
  - Improved organizational impact
  - Capacity to leverage your experience gained from multiple life roles
  - Insight into yourself and your development opportunities
  - Heightened leadership resiliency
  - Ability to collaborate better across your organization
  - Renewed confidence in your leadership
    (Conference Board of Canada, 2015, para. 3)
- Niagara Institute, the Conference Board of Canada: also offers a Building Leadership Essentials Program (3 days) that focuses on:
  - Insight into your own leadership style and its impact on others
  - Better ways of learning that help you meet new challenges as they arise
  - Knowledge of tools and processes that improve leadership ability
  - Personalized organizational and individual goals
  - Renewed confidence in your leadership skills
    (Conference Board of Canada, 2015, para. 3)

It is not realistic to determine the effectiveness of the leadership development opportunities available to Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs as per the information provided from HR departments. Any discussion of an analysis of that nature provides
impetus for a separate study unto itself, and in order to be effective, would involve focussing on one leadership development program at a time as per Brian Bechtel’s (2010) study on an in-house leadership development program at a large American multi-campus metropolitan community college.

However, it is reasonable to reference the review of the HR documentation in the summary section that follows (in Chapter 5) in order to assess online survey respondents and face-to-face interview participant perceptions on the effectiveness of professional leadership development opportunities experienced by them at their respective institutions.

The next chapter will present a triangulated summary of the findings, conclusions of the study based on a comparison/contrast of the findings and the literature, and a series of recommendations derived from the aforementioned conclusions. The chapter will also contain my personal perspectives as stated in the onset of the study.
CHAPTER 5.

Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Background of the Study

This study reviewed the role of the Associate/Dean against a backdrop of change currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system. The focus was to explore leadership competencies that would Associate Deans/Chairs navigate, and hopefully lead that change in order to be successful in their roles.

Importance of the Role

Associate Deans/Chairs are critical to the success of their institutions (Edwards, 2006; Filan, 1997; Seagren et al., 1993). They are the primary link between senior management and faculty and students (Sirkis, 2011; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011) and they are essential for the success of day-to-day campus activity (Filan 1999; Inman; 2009; Lindholm, 1999). They play critical roles in a prodigious college system vital to the economic health of Ontario (Colleges Ontario, 2015a).

This study was based on the premise that the role of the Associate Dean/Chair is challenging and complex as widely acknowledged in the literature (Edwards, 2006; Filan & Seagren, 2003; Gillett-Karam, 2002; Sirkis, 2011). They experience the unenviable sensation of feeling stuck in the middle between the faculty teams that report to them, and senior management to whom they report (Boyko, 2009; Edwards, 2006; Gillett-Karam, 2002; Gmelch & Gates, 1995). This sensation of feeling stuck in the middle, although not unique to academic middle-managers, is one of the greatest challenges faced by Associate Dean/Chairs as explained by Boyko (2009), “It is a position between a rock and a hard place—the meat in the middle of a sandwich” (p. 40).
Changes in the Ontario CAAT System

The study took place against a backdrop of change taking place in the Ontario college system (Clark et al., 2009; HEQCO, 2013; MTCU, 2013a). One of the most significant changes is the expansion of degree programming in Ontario colleges. The Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act (2000) granted Ontario colleges the authority to offer degree programming. Before this, the right to grant degrees was the exclusive privy of universities (Clark et al., 2009). The new Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act (2002) enhanced the ability of certain colleges to offer degrees, and granted some the right to differentiate themselves and change their names from community college of applied arts and technology (CAAT) to institute of technology and advanced learning (ITAL). The implication of the ITAL designation indicates that 15% of the programming offered at that institution could now be at the degree level.

With the advent of degrees came further changes with many colleges now referring to themselves as Polytechnic Institutes. Polytechnics Canada (2015) describe the organization as, “the voice of leading research-intensive, publicly funded colleges and institutes of technology. We are dedicated to helping colleges and industry create jobs for tomorrow” (para. 1). There are six institutions that identify themselves as Polytechnic in Ontario. They are: Algonquin College, Conestoga College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, George Brown College, Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, Seneca College, and Sheridan College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning. The advancement of degrees heightened the importance of applied research within Polytechnic institutions; however, there is now considerable movement in all colleges to grow research activity, particularly applied research (Hicks et al., 2013).

Compounding the changes associated with the expansion of degrees, the first wave of differentiation, and the heightened importance now placed on research, the Ontario government recently introduced a Differentiation Policy Framework for Postsecondary Education (MTCU, 2013a) designed to create even further differentiation between Ontario colleges. Colleges were required to negotiate a SMA with the Ontario government forcing them to identify existing areas of programming strength as well as areas of potential growth. A review of the SMAs finds some colleges aspiring to become
universities, many expanding their degree programming, most enhancing their research capacity, some increasing their international student population, most increasing their online course delivery, and almost all feverishly competing for new students (MTCU, 2015a).

Impact on the Role

One of the greatest challenges that Associate Deans/Chairs now face is leading the change previously described. These changes have added a new layer of complexity to an already challenging role and are re-defining relationships between Associate Deans/Chairs and the faculty who report to them. There is an abundance of literature related to the competency of managing change, with much of it directly relating to academic leadership (Filan & Seagren, 2003; Foote, 1999; Fullan, 2004; Lucas, 2000; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011). However, as Gmelch and Miskin (1993) convey, “Change is inevitable but the critical question is, how well chairs and departments prepare for it and position themselves to survive and succeed” (p. 1).

Theoretical Framework

As stated in Chapter 1, this paper is framed by a constructivist worldview as I attempt to understand, comprehend, and construct meaning of the experiences and perceptions of persons, in this case Ontario college Associate Dean/Chairs, in their own workplace (Creswell, 2009); however, there are other worldviews present including advocacy and postpositivism. This constructivist worldview influenced components of the qualitative methodology employed in the study as constructivists seek to understand context by gathering information personally, or by actually visiting participants, and shape interpretations of what they find based on their own personal experiences and background (Crotty, 1998). It also contains aspects of advocacy as I advocate on behalf of Chairs and/or Associate Deans to be provided leadership development opportunities. Finally, there are postpositivist elements present as I intend to frame the argument based on a review of both hard quantitative data gathered through online surveys in addition to qualitative data.
The study examined the role of the Associate Dean/Chair against the backdrop of change taking place within the Ontario CAAT system. Tavallaei and Talib (2010) find that theory or theoretical frameworks alone cannot provide a comprehensive explanation of the issue being studied. To that end, there did not appear to be a single leadership construct or change management theory that would be applicable to this entire study; therefore, I determined that a reasonable approach would be to situate this study within a theoretical framework of existing social theories and leadership practices, those being:

1. organizational role theory (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978)
2. transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978)
3. 8-stage process of leading change (Kotter, 1996)
4. systems thinking theory (Senge, 1990).

**Summary**

This brief review on the importance of Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs to their respective institutions and to the economic health of Ontario warranted a full investigation of their role. The unprecedented amount of change currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system added layers of complexity to an already demanding role. These issues, validated through my own personal experiences while I occupied the role, led me to undertake this study to explore the current role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean and/or Chair, and to specifically focus on an exploration of leadership competencies that would help them to be successful as they navigate, and hopefully lead the change currently taking place in the system.

The following section will articulate conclusions made based on a review of the findings of this study in relation to the literature. I also stated at the outset of this paper that based on my past experience in the role, I felt it appropriate to assert my personal opinions, which I will do in the recommendations section of this chapter.
Findings and Conclusions

Methodological Underpinnings

The study followed a sequential mixed methodology approach as described by Creswell (2009). Data were collected through online surveys distributed to all Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans in the English language Ontario colleges, followed by face-to-face interviews with a smaller number of participants allowing for deeper exploration of the phenomenon being explored. In addition, institutional data such as job postings/descriptions and leadership development opportunities were collected from HR departments from all English speaking Ontario colleges.

The data were gathered sequentially, other than HR documentation which was gathered in a more ad hoc manner. Quantitative data were gathered through online surveys and from institutional documentation. It was augmented with qualitative data gathered through open-ended questions provided in the online surveys as well as from face-to-face interviews. The qualitative data allowed participants to expand on information obtained through the quantitative data. More importantly, it allowed participants to provide context, to share their stories, and to provide real-life meaning to their experiences aligning aspects of the study to a phenomenological approach (Creswell, 2009).

The four data sources included:

1. Online surveys to Associate Deans/Chairs
2. Online surveys to the Deans
3. Face-to-face interviews with a small group of Associate Deans/Chairs

Triangulation was used to compare/contrast the findings from the data sources. Jick (1979) claims that, “Triangulation can be something other than scaling, reliability and convergent validation. It can also capture a more complete, holistic, and contextual portrayal of the unit(s) under study” (p. 603). The summary of the findings was generated by looking for congruency or discrepancies between data sources; however, I also
attempted to provide a more complete, holistic perspective to the summary of the findings in accordance with Jick’s interpretation of triangulation.

Conclusions of the study are made based on a comparison/contrast of the findings between the four data sources and the literature as appropriate.

**Research Question 1: Defining the Role**

**Overview of the role.** A review of activities currently associated with the role (as illustrated in Chapter 4) showed that a higher proportion of their time is spent addressing managerial issues as opposed to leadership challenges; however, both online survey respondents (including Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans) and face-to-face interview participants all confirm that possessing exceptional leadership competency is vital to success in the role of Associate Dean/Chair. Institutional documentation also identifies that a higher proportion of time is related to managerial issues as opposed to leadership, but the importance of leadership is acknowledged as evidenced in 8 of the 13 job postings/descriptions reviewed.

Online survey results showed a high percentage (34.48%) of Associate Dean/Chairs have occupied the position for less than 1 year, and a very small percentage (4.31%) have had the job for more than 6 years indicating a disproportionately high turnover rate for this position. One of the responses to the Associate Deans/Chairs on-line survey indicates:

The College seems to have adapted the attitude that it's cheaper to replace a Chair, than support and keep one. It's a "revolving door" here with about a 25% yearly turnover rate and an average Chair having been in the role for 3 years. This lack of continuity harms departments.

The role of the Ontario CAAT Associate Dean is demanding and complex as confirmed by participants in the study as well as the literature (Edwards, 2006; Filan, 1999; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; McMahon 2008), yet many find it also rewarding as explained by participants in the face-to-face interviews. They prioritize ensuring student success, managing and supporting faculty, and administrative functions such as budget responsibilities and resource allocation. The literature confirms that there are rewards
associated with the Associate Dean/Chair role as they are crucial to institution success (Seagren, Creswell & Wheeler, 1993), are the primary link between senior management and faculty and students (Filan, 1997; Sirkis, 2011; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011) and are essential for the success of day-to-day campus activity (Filan 1999; Inman; 2009; Lindholm, 1999).

1a. Who is hired into these roles? Questions 1ai and 1aii. Background, education, previous work experience, and prior leadership development. Very few of the online survey respondents (3.45%) reported being younger than age 35, and an equal percentage (3.45%) reported being over 65. The findings results suggest that most Associate Deans/Chairs have likely enjoyed substantial work and/or life experience prior to assuming the role.

A large majority of online survey respondents hold graduate level credentials (Master’s 62.93% and Doctorate 15.52%). There were similar responses from face-to-face interview participants where 4 of 7 hold graduate credentials, with one currently pursuing a Master’s degree and another who already has a Master’s pursuing a second graduate degree. The requirement of a graduate credential was also found in 9 of 13 job postings provided by HR departments with an additional 2 stating it was preferred. The expectation of a graduate level credential for most Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs appears consistent across all data sets.

Most online survey participants indicated they were hired into the role from within their respective institutions, with many of them transitioning from faculty (39.66%). All but one of the seven face-to-face interviewees had previous teaching experience prior to assuming their current role confirming that that many Associate Deans/Chairs, who participated in the study, assumed these roles by transitioning from faculty positions.

The literature (Edwards, 2006; Filan, 1997; Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006) confirms that many Associate Deans/Chairs are promoted into the role from faculty positions and that the transition is challenging; however, they go on to state that they are
seldom provided with leadership developmental opportunities that adequately prepare them for the role.

A cursory review of the findings from the online survey appears to contradict the literature in this regard as almost all participants (92.24%) claimed that they had prior leadership experience and many (68.10%) claimed they had participated in formal leadership development opportunities. All job postings from the institutional documentation identified prior leadership experience as mandatory. One might interpret this to indicate that Associate Deans/Chairs do possess the appropriate leadership competency required prior to assuming the role.

A deeper investigation tells a different story. The high level of turnover during the first year might imply that many who assumed the role were not adequately prepared to be successful. A review of face-to-face interviewee’s comments provided a deeper perspective on this aspect confirming that the first few years were indeed the most challenging. Associate Dean/Chair GG stated:

I look back and I laugh. My first training in the first week was Health and Safety, and it reiterated that you were eligible for a $25,000 fine and this much time in jail if you did not adhere to health and safety regulations. I didn’t get my SWF (standard workload form) training until my third year. I think that we need to have a small course for AD/Chairs prior to them taking the helm.

Associate Dean/Chair CC also claims:

It’s a challenge managing within the collective agreement—and the interface with HR. I thought I knew the collective agreement as a faculty member, but I did not have a clue.

Stones and Coussons-Read (2011) compare the experience of transitioning from faculty to an Associate Dean role as moving to the dark side. As previously stated, many studies related to the role of Associate Dean/Chair (Berdrow, 2010; Filan, 1999; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011), find they receive little training and support when they begin the job. A review of the institutional documentation from Ontario colleges did not find any unique training/support programs in place specifically designed to help new Associate Deans/Chairs acclimate to the role.
This led me to conclude that current leadership development opportunities experienced by Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs prior to their assuming the role do not adequately prepare them for success.

*Question 1aiii. Has the role been effectively communicated, understood, and accepted?* Participants in the online survey expressed that their jobs are demanding. Many reported that they are responsible for over 800 students (56.03%). A large percentage (25.86%) manage more than 30 full-time faculty, and an even higher percentage (50.00%) reported more than 30 part-time faculty in their departments. However, most (55.17%) have only between one-five support persons reporting to them possibly indicating that the level of support is not proportionate to the level needed to adequately manage the high volume of faculty and students. This might answer why so many (80.18%) reported that they worked more than 46 hours in a typical week, and even more startling, why 46 of 116 respondents (39.66%) claimed they work more than 50 hours in a week. The face-to-face interview participants confirmed that the role was demanding with one referring to it as a dumping ground.

Workload was the most common challenge expressed by 15 of 46 (32.61%) Associate Dean/Chair online survey respondents when provided an open-ended question allowing them to expand on challenges associated with the role. A couple responses were as follows:

- Associate Deans and Chairs carry a heavy burden. We keep the show going, keep the peace, fill the seats, create new programs, do more with less and do it all with a smile because we can't go back to teaching and we won't move up if we don't show our competence.
- The Chair or Associate Dean position is one of the most challenging positions in the college system. We get to deal with every-one. As a result, the person is stressed out due to pressure he gets from everywhere.

Gmelch and Burns (1993) identified having too heavy a workload as one of the top factors causing stress for Associate Deans/Chairs. Almost all literature related to the role of Associate Dean/Chair acknowledges the long hours of work associated with the role (Berdrow, 2010; Bowman 2002; Creswell et al., 1990; Edwards, 2006; Filan, 1999; Seagren et al., 1993). One of the factors contributing to the challenges of the role is the
fatigue associated with working long hours and lack of control over managing one’s own time (Parris et al., 2010; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011).

There is congruency between responses from online survey respondents, comments from face-to-face interview participants, and the literature regarding the demanding work-load and long hours associated with the role of Associated Dean/Chair.

A review of institutional documentation reveals a different finding. A typical job posting or description found in the HR documentation claims a 37.5 hour work-week for the position. Clearly, there appears to be disconnect between hours participants claim they work, and what is found in the institutional documentation.

Many (41.38%) online survey respondents claimed the job descriptions they received at the time of their hiring did not adequately reflect challenges associated with the role, and although most interview participants found their job descriptions to be fairly accurate, they were equally adamant that the job description did not capture the complexity of the role. The long hours associated with the role is compounded by the issue that most online survey respondents, 61 of 116 (52.95%), reported that the performance appraisal process is not accurate and when provided an opportunity for further commentary, 29 of 65 (44.62%) claimed the performance review did not accurately reflect the jobs they actually performed.

**Relevance to Organizational Role Theory (ORT).** A comparison of findings from the study to the principles (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978) and assumptions (Parker & Wickham, 2005) associated with ORT shows both alignment and misalignment to the theory.

Some aspects of the performance review process did support certain elements of ORT as some respondents (27.59%) claimed there were incentives to conform to organizational norms and culture while others (13.79%) claimed there were consequences for not. This aligns with the first principle of ORT, that role expectations are reflective of the organization’s culture and norms of behaviour, as defined by Biddle (1986).

However, 61 of 116 (52.59%) respondents reported that the performance review process was not accurate, and when provided an opportunity for further commentary, 29
of 65 (44.62%) claimed the performance review was not an accurate reflection of the jobs they actually performed. The negative connotations associated with the performance review process, compounded by the lack of full disclosure found in job postings, likely creates confusion between Associated Deans/Chairs and their managers (usually Deans) regarding expectations associated with the role thus violating the second principle associated with role theory, that in order for an organizations to function effectively, roles are effectively communicated, understood and accepted by those assuming the position (Biddle, 1986). The assumption that role-conflict will arise if expectations are not consensual (Parker & Wickham, 2005) would imply that conflict between Associate Deans/Chairs and those who they report to is likely to occur due to unclear job expectations combined with negative perceptions of performance reviews.

The long hours associated with the role, incongruences found between job postings/descriptions and realities of the job, and dissatisfaction expressed over the performance review process led to the conclusion that the work load of the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair is overly demanding, and that performance reviews should accurately reflect the activity of those holding the position.

1b. Primary responsibilities associated with the role. Both online respondents and interview participants identified high importance on ensuring student success, managing and supporting faculty, and administrative functions such as budget responsibilities and resource allocation. A review of HR documentation from across the province affirms these qualities as important as they are found in all job descriptions associated with the role.

A review of the top 14 activities associated with the role as determined through the online survey results finds them fairly congruent with findings from previous studies (Berdrow, 2010; Bowman, 2002; Boyko, 2009; Edwards, 2006; Hecht et al., 1999; Seagren et al., 1993).

Table 47 provides a visual comparison of the results from this study to other recent studies identifying typical management and leadership activities associated with the role of Associate Dean/Chair.
The findings led to the conclusion that many core activities associated with the role have remained consistent over time, and are primarily focused on ensuring student success, managing and supporting faculty, and administrative functions such as budget responsibilities and resource allocation.

Table 47. Comparison of Recent Studies of Management and Leadership Responsibilities Associated with the Role of Associate Dean and/or Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Publication)</th>
<th>Management responsibilities</th>
<th>Leadership responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwards (2006)</td>
<td>• Supervisor</td>
<td>• Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trouble-shooter Scheduler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information Disseminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluator</td>
<td>• Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resource Allocator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruiter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyko (2009) (Doctoral thesis)</td>
<td>Top-10 Chair’s responsibilities:</td>
<td>• Maintaining morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participating in department meetings</td>
<td>• Encouraging good teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruiting faculty and other staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementing department plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Championing the unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing departmental plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remaining current in the discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managing faculty tenure, promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dealing with serious performance issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berdrow (2010)</td>
<td>Faculty development:</td>
<td>Faculty development:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support scholarship</td>
<td>• Mentor faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support teaching</td>
<td>Catalyst/innovation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student development:</td>
<td>• Lead department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advising</td>
<td>implementation of college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflict mediation</td>
<td>mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outreach</td>
<td>• Mobilize departmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication and representation:</td>
<td>resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication link between department and others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Represent department in college and beyond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manage flow of information in department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations and administration:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Budget</td>
<td>• Stimulate curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation</td>
<td>Climate enhancement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruitment</td>
<td>• Build department culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports</td>
<td>• Crisis and conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resource allocation/scheduling</td>
<td>• management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student administration</td>
<td>• Monitor daily life of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff management</td>
<td>department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Author (Publication) | Management responsibilities | Leadership responsibilities
---|---|---
Lima (2015) | Top 14 responsibilities as identified by Associate Deans/Chairs:  
- Students related:  
  - Ensuring success and retention  
  - Dealing with issues, appeals etc.  
  - Enhancing enrollment and recruitment  
- Faculty related:  
  - Scheduling/workload, performance reviews  
  - Hiring, recruitment, onboarding  
- Program related:  
  - New development and renewal  
- Curriculum renewal, maintain relevancy  
- Ensuring quality, reviews  
- Operations Management:  
  - Budget, managing finances  
  - Management: admin functions
Leadership:  
- Faculty mentoring, support, and PD  
- Building teams, relationships  
- Strategic planning, future vision  
- Quality: ensuring teaching and learning excellence

a Where the author of the study referenced did not differentiate between management and leadership characteristics, Kotter International’s (2015) framework was used as a lens through which to filter the responsibilities. The framework is included here again as a reminder.
b Management defined as: planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, measuring, problem solving, doing what we know how to do exceptionally well, producing reliable dependable results constantly.
c Leadership defined as: establishing direction, aligning people, motivating, inspiring, mobilizing people to achieve astonishing results, propelling us into the future.

1c. Have changes in the system affected the role? The incredible amount of change taking place in the Ontario college system has already been extensively discussed in this chapter (Clark et al., 2009; HEQCO, 2013; MTCU, 2013a).

The online survey results found that Associate Deans/Chairs (64.66%) and to a larger extent Deans (83.33%), agree that there are significant changes taking place in the Ontario CAAT system with the dominant themes being: fiscal challenges/reduced funding; increased workload; expansion of degrees; heightened emphasis on research; online/hybrid course delivery; competition for new students; increase of International students, and expansion of differentiation through the SMAs.

Associate Deans/Chairs who are directly involved with degree activity claimed it directly impacts their relationships with faculty primarily because of the PEQAB rules requiring faculty who teach in degree programs to have terminal credentials, thus creating a 2-tier faculty dynamic. This sentiment was also shared by the two interview participants who had responsibility for degree level programing. One of the job postings provided by HR departments directly referenced managing degree level programming as a unique
skill set. There appears conformity across all data sets on the significant impact of the expansion of degrees.

Most respondents expressed support for the expansion of research but cited additional work-load and faculty release time as potential barriers. There did not seem to be much awareness over differentiation in terms of rebranding institutions, that is, ITAL or Polytechnic Institute; however, there were concerns expressed over current and future implications of the recently negotiated SMAs, primarily focused on restrictions imposed on new program development. Respondents articulated that lack of financial resources and reduced funding were concerning, and they were equally adamant that the demands of the job in terms of time and workload were arduous.

Responses from face-to-face interview participants were compatible with those found in the online surveys regarding the high level of change going on in the Ontario CAAT system and the subsequent impact on the role of Associate Deans/Chairs. Four of the job postings from the institutional documentation referenced the ability to lead change as important, confirming the importance of change and its impact on the role across all data sources.

This led to the conclusion that change currently occurring in the system is re-defining the role of the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair, led primarily by the proliferation of degrees, and to a lesser extent, the heightened importance placed on research, expansion of flexible delivery, increases in international students, and effects of the SMAs. These changes are exacerbated by budget constraints/reduced funding and all contribute to an ever increasing workload for the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair.

1d. Distinctive challenges associated with middle management. Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans both indicated that specific challenges associated with these middle-management roles are: communicating messages up-and-down from the middle; time management issues; getting front line workers to perform in agreement with management’s strategic direction; and lack of input into decision making and strategic planning. An example was articulated in one of the Associate Dean/Chair online survey responses:
I wish senior management's wishes were more frequently communicated directly to faculty instead of having Chairs responsible to communicate the information. This would ensure timeliness and greater clarity.

These sentiments were also confirmed by interview participants with Associate Dean/Chair DD stating:

All the complexities, all the nuances, are in the realm of the Associate Dean/Chair and not in the world of the Dean, and they don’t have the information they need to always make the right decisions.

Study participants expressed that the stuck in the middle phenomenon manifests itself through lack of respect, lack of trust, and ambiguity associated with the role. A review of the HR documentation also confirms that colleges place importance on this role being able to effectively communicate senior management’s strategic objectives effectively across the institution.

The sensation of feeling caught-in-the-middle prevails throughout the literature when describing the role of Associate Dean/Chair (Boyko, 2009; Edwards, 2006; Seagren et al., 1993; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011; Wilson 1999). Wilson (1999) refers to this as being caught between a rock and hard place, and says it is one of the leading causes of stress, particularly for new Chairs. Gmelch and Burns (1993) refer to the role of the Chair in the following manner, “In effect, the position is like that of the Roman god Janus, with faces oriented in opposite directions, or what others have referred to as a "swivel" effect, not knowing which way to turn” (p. 260).

This led to the conclusion that there are unique challenges associated with the middle-management position leading to the unenviable sensation of Associate Deans/Chairs feeling stuck in the middle.

**Research Question 2: Leadership Competencies Required**

2a. **Leadership competencies that would help Associate Deans/Chairs.** All participants (except one) in the online survey indicated that possessing strong leadership competencies are essential to the role. Both groups, Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans expressed similar results. When asked “what” leadership
competencies they deem important, the following seven competencies were identified by both groups in the online study as most important when ranked using the mean importance scores on a multi-dimension question employing a 4-point Likert scale:

1. Build and maintain effective relationships and work teams (this was ranked as number one by both groups)
2. Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others
3. Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator
4. Be inclusive by appreciating, respecting, and valuing diversity
5. Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership
6. Be a thoughtful and diligent manager of talent who develops, coaches, and mentors others for individual, team, and organizational success
7. Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence

There were also three competencies that appeared in the top-10 list ranked as very important by Associate Deans that did not appear in the Dean’s top-10:

1. Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles
2. Resolve and manage conflict productively
3. Understand and utilize clear and effective practices for hiring for excellence

The competencies above, adapted from the leadership competency framework of the Chair Academy (2014) and the AACC (2005) have a direct correlation to the principles of transformational leadership espoused by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985), with the exception of two that make direct reference to management duties as opposed to leadership.

When asked to expand on what other competencies they deemed important, online respondents referenced the ability to lead/implement change, possess strong communication skills, build trust and support with faculty, and engage in reflective practices.
Participants from the face-to-face interviews made similar comments as they referenced: the importance of relationships; building trust; giving and commanding respect; providing support; creating win-win scenarios; demonstrating empathy; collaboration and working as a team; leading by example; holding oneself accountable; and showing transparency as very important leadership competencies needed to be successful in the role.

Table 48 provides a visual comparison of the results from this study to other studies exploring leadership competencies deemed beneficial to academic leaders referenced earlier in the literature review section.

Table 48. Comparisons of Recent Studies of Leadership Competencies Helpful to Academic Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Publication)</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Leadership qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knight & Trowler (2001) | Seven traits required of academic leaders. Adapted from their book, Departmental Leadership in Higher Education. Based on a study of leading change at the department level (the Chair) rather than at the faculty level (the Dean) in the United States. | • Control knowledge: identified as self-knowledge gained by various means of reflection.  
• Knowledge of people: “people wisdom” requiring interpersonal intelligence.  
• Knowledge of educational practice.  
• Conceptual knowledge: knowing about management and leadership concepts and research.  
• Process knowledge: processes of leadership and management  
• Situational knowledge: understanding contingencies that have made faculty what it is and affect what it might be.  
• Tacit knowledge that integrates the other six forms in expert practice |
| Filan & Seagren (2003) | Based on an extensive review of the literature and a major study done on the role of the Chair in U.S. Colleges. They identified six traits as critical components of leadership required by mid-management college administrators: | • Understanding self  
• Understanding transformational leadership  
• Establishing and maintaining relationships  
• Leading teams  
• Leading strategic planning and change  
• Connecting through community |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Publication)</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Leadership qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AACC (2005)          | Report that defined six essential leadership competencies required by college administrators. Based on a major project initiated by the AACC 2003–2005 in order to develop a framework of leadership competencies required by college administrators. The project involved an intense collaborative effort with 95 American institutions. | • Organizational Strategy  
• Resource Management  
• Communication  
• Collaboration  
• Community College Advocacy  
• Professionalism |
| Bryman (2007)        | Study based on a review the literature referenced in journals for the period 1985-2005, and found these to be the most prevalent mentioned aspects of leadership (in higher education) behaviors that were found to be associated with effectiveness at the department level. | • Clear sense of direction/strategic vision  
• Preparing department arrangements to facilitate direction  
• Being considerate  
• Treating academic staff fairly and with integrity  
• Being trustworthy and having personal integrity  
• Allowing the opportunity to participate in key decisions/encouraging open communication  
• Communicating well about the direction the department is going in  
• Acting as a role model/having credibility  
• Creating a positive/collegial work atmosphere in the department  
• Advancing the department’s cause with respect to constituencies internal and external to the university and being proactive in doing so  
• Providing feedback on performance  
• Providing resources for and adjusting workloads to stimulate scholarship and research  
• Making academic appointments that enhance the department’s reputation |
| Fullan (2004)        | Accomplished author’s work defining five components of change leadership, much of it related to academic leadership. Adapted from his book, *Leading in a Culture of Change*. Michael Fullan is a Canadian educational researcher and former Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education | • Moral purpose  
• Understanding change  
• Building relationships  
• Creating and sharing knowledge  
• Making coherence |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Publication)</th>
<th>Nature of study</th>
<th>Leadership qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Berdrow (2010)       | Identifies desirable leadership skills of academic leaders. Based on a local study at a private university in the northeast region of the U.S., Berdrow (2010) examined the roles of the 21 department chairs and the leadership competencies that would assist them in their roles. In addition to interviewing the chairs, her team used a 360 survey tool to solicit feedback from other stakeholders. | • Personal management  
• Communicating  
• Managing people and tasks  
• Leading peers  
• Boundary spanning  
• Mobilizing innovation and change |
| Lima, 2015           | Results of doctoral thesis research, 2015. The following leadership traits emerged as very important from a review of online survey comments combined with interview participant feedback from the study. | • Importance of relationships  
• Build trust and support  
• Give and command respect  
• Provide support  
• Create win-win scenarios  
• Demonstrate empathy  
• Collaborate: work as a team  
• Lead by example  
• Holding oneself accountable  
• Show transparency  
• Engage in reflective practices  
• Possess exceptional communication skills  
• Lead/Implement change |

A review of the leadership traits deemed important demonstrates some commonality between findings from this study and the literature: reference to leading changes is mentioned 4 times; communication skills are referenced 3 times; holding oneself accountable is referenced 3 times; the importance of trust is mentioned twice; and respect is mentioned twice. All the aforementioned leadership traits emerged as very important when combining results from the online survey and face-to-face interviews.

**Relevance to Transformational Leadership Theory.** The literature finds that transformational leaders build relationships with employees based on trust, loyalty, and respect (Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Yukl, 2002) confirming that the leadership competencies identified as important by online respondents and interview participants are reflected in the principles of transformational leadership theory. Quinn (2007) relates transformational leadership specifically to the role of the college chair claiming, “For the purpose of transforming the climate and culture of an academic department, a chair can
encourage active participation by faculty, staff, and students to create a democratic community that values the voice of every member, not just the senior members” (p. 8). The above findings appear to confirm transformational leadership theory as a valid framework through which to explore leadership competencies that would assist Associate Deans/Chairs to lead change in the current Ontario CAAT system.

Contrasting that viewpoint, one of the most predominant themes associated with transformational leadership is the ability to inspire action around a shared theme or vision (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Roueche et al., 1989; Yukl, 1998). There was some mention of building a shared vision in the comments of the online surveys, and by one of the face-to-face interview participants, Associate Dean/Chair BB, who stated:

Have visions—the manager is managing what we are, the leader is creating what we can become.

However, the concept of creating a shared vision was not a predominant theme that emerged when reviewing feedback from any of the participant groups.

Additionally, a review of the leadership competency framework from the Chair Academy and the top-10 list (when ranked using the mean importance scores) identified as most important by Associate Deans/Chairs, finds that not all leadership competencies identified directly align with the principles of transformational leadership. Finally, it is noted that none of the leadership competencies that ranked in the top-10 most important by Associate Deans/Chairs or Deans reflect the transformational leadership principle of intellectual stimulation—challenge the status quo.

A review of job descriptions in the institutional documentation also identified many leadership competencies that are congruent with the principles of transformational leadership, most of them directly aligning with the findings from the online survey respondents and the face-to-face interview participants. Conversely, the ability to develop and facilitate new initiatives was referenced as an important leadership competency in some of the institution documentation, but as previously noted, was not identified as a priority leadership competency from online survey respondents or face-to-face interview.
participants. Developing and facilitating new initiatives appears to align with the transformational leadership principle of Intellectual stimulation—challenge the status quo possibly indicating that institutions place higher importance on this principle than Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs.

Transformational leadership theory is the basis for many existing competency based leadership development programs used to develop mid-level college managers and Chairs in the United States (AACC, 2005; Bechtel, 2010; Chair Academy 2014; Quinn, 2007). Transformational leadership theory is also one of the most prevalent leadership theories referenced in popular literature (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Roueche et al., 1989; Yukl, 1998).

The evidence in the literature combined with findings from the study led to the conclusions that: (a) transformational leadership theory is a valid construct through which to build a leadership competency framework that would assist Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles; however, it is not all encompassing; (b) Supplemental leadership theories and practices should be considered to complement the principles defined in transformational leadership theory as appropriate.

2b. Relevance to Kotter’s 8-Stage process of leading change. Approximately half (48.28%) of Associate Deans/Chairs respondents to the online survey and all face-to-face interview participants indicated that there are unique leadership competencies related to leading change, and that they are important to success in the role. Chu (2010) agrees, stating “The power of the chair to create change within the college and university is vastly underrated” (p. 2) furthering that “department chairs have the power to lead significant change because they ‘have their hands on the tiller’” (p. 1).

Many job descriptions found in the institutional documentation also referenced the ability to manage change, and almost all referred to the need for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs to possess exceptional communication skills.

When asked to specify “what” competencies would help them lead change, many of the online survey responses referred to managerial skills as opposed to leadership competencies; however, some did make direct reference to change leadership
competencies such as: communicate the need for change; instill a sense of urgency; identify change agents; build an effective coalition of the willing; directly aligning with Kotter’s (1996) 8-stage process of leading change referenced earlier. Much of the literature confirms that the ability to lead change is an essential leadership competency required of academic leaders (Filan & Seagren, 2003; Foote, 1999; Fullan, 2004; Lucas, 2000; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011, Buller, 2015).

Communications skills evoked the most passionate responses from online respondents when asked what competencies were most important to leading change. Face-to-face interview participants affirmed the importance of exceptional communication skills in discussion of leading change. Effective communication also appeared as one of the most common leadership competencies referenced in the literature, both in context of academic leadership and mid-management leadership (Bryman, 2007; Craig, 2005; Inman 2009; Osterman, 2008).

One of the interview participants directly referenced Kotter’s (1999) 8-stage process for leading change. Ann Lucas (2000) champions the use of Kotter’s process as highly effective in an academic environment. However, there were not many other responses from any of the participant groups that referred to leading change as a process. Many respondents were not sure how to articulate competencies related to leading change while others acknowledged they might be open to training in this area suggesting that knowledge of Kotter’s 8-stage process for leading change might prove beneficial.

The importance placed on the two leadership competencies: (a) ability to lead change; and (b) exceptional communication skills; appears consistent across all data groups and in the literature. These findings led me to make the following two conclusions: (a) The ability to lead change is an essential leadership competency required of Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs; (b) Possessing exceptional communication skills and practice of Kotter’s (1999) 8-stage process for leading change would augment the leadership competencies required to successfully lead change for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs.

2c. Relevance to systems thinking theory.
This study was situated in the Ontario CAAT system. Peter Senge (1990) describes systems thinking as “the art of seeing the forest and the trees” (p. 127). Bowman (2002) states:

the real work of chairs as managers is to create systems around people, not design systems and attempt to splice colleagues into them. In concert, the real work of academic chairs as leaders is to make colleagues’ strengths effective and their weaknesses irrelevant. (p. 161)

O’Connor and McDermott (1997) explain that, “the parts of a system are all connected directly or indirectly, therefore a change in one part ripples out to affect all the other parts” (p. 26).

Following this line of thought, one would assume that the performance of Associate Deans/Chairs impacts the entire Ontario CAAT system, the backdrop of this study. The literature appears to endorse the practice of systems thinking theory as a leadership construct that would assist Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful.

The findings from the study indicate otherwise. Most online survey respondents (71.55%) claim to have never been exposed to systems thinking theory, and an even higher percentage (87.07%) state they have never received any training in systems thinking theory. There were comments from a few respondents who referenced studying systems thinking theory in graduate programs; however, there were no endorsements to provide Associate Deans/Chairs with developmental opportunities in this subject area. One Associate Dean/Chair on-line survey participant responds:

Senge would be proud, but I doubt many could wrap their head around the idea of personal mastery.

Face-to-face interview participants were equally vague regarding the appropriateness of practicing systems thinking theory in their role with the exception of one.

A review of institutional documentation did not find any direct references to systems thinking theory; however, there was high importance placed on strategic planning as this was one of the competencies most referenced in job descriptions. This
led me to believe that institutions do place importance on the ability of Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs to think strategically; however, they do not reference this competency within the framework of systems thinking theory as defined by Senge (1990).

It is possible that the demands and day-to-day activities of the job prevent Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs from embracing systems thinking as explained by Antonioni (2000) who says, “Engaging in firefighting and focusing on operational details prevents middle- managers from taking on leadership roles; they fail to see the big picture or the system in which they operate” (p. 28).

These findings led to the conclusion that it would require greater exposure of Senge’s (1999) systems thinking theory to Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs in order to determine whether a practice of systems thinking would prove beneficial to their roles.

**Research Question 3: Leadership Development Opportunities**

3a and 3b. Review and effectiveness of current leadership development opportunities. Respondents of the online survey reported that most institutions (59.48%) do provide leadership development opportunities for Associate Deans/Chairs, most of it done in-house. Institutional documentation confirms that there are numerous leadership development opportunities available to Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs. There was congruence (for the most part) between all data sets that there are leadership development opportunities available for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs.

There were mixed perceptions from respondents on the effectiveness of leadership development opportunities experienced. Many online respondents indicated that they did find the leadership development opportunities beneficial; however, a proportion did not. There were 26 of 116 (22.41%) responses that indicated the leadership development opportunities had only been somewhat beneficial and 17 of 116 (14.66%) found it provided little benefit. Some claimed it missed the mark completely and there were
comments claiming that the heavy time commitments associated with the job prevented them from pursuing leadership development opportunities.

The Chair Academy was also specifically referenced by 18 of 63 (28.57%) of the online survey respondents. There were 5 of 7 interview participants also indicated that they had attended the Chair’s Academy, with four stating that they attended after they had assumed the role. Those who attended the Academy said they found the training beneficial, but were equally clear that the experience did not adequately prepare them for all the challenges associated with the role, with some stating the job could only be learned through hands on experience.

It is noted that there were also positive comments regarding certain leadership developmental opportunities. One college (not to be named due to REB protocols) was mentioned by name four times as having an exceptional internal leadership development program that dealt with issues experienced on the job. One of the interview participants spoke very highly of skills learned in a change leadership course that he/she felt resulted in direct positive implications on his/her job.

There were responses from 44 of 116 (37.93%) online survey participants when provided an open-ended question requesting ideas on how to make leadership development opportunities more effective. Suggestions varied: 13 of 44 (29.55%) indicated they wanted more training; 9 of 44 (20.45%) were adamant that they did not have time for any further leadership development opportunities; 7 of 44 (15.91%) expressed a desire to connect and share with peers with some suggesting mentorship as a powerful means to assist new Associate Deans/Chairs; 6 of 44 (13.64%) reiterated their lack of satisfaction with current leadership opportunities provided; and 3 of 44 (6.82%) stated that leadership development was more effective when it was self-directed.

Three face to face interview participants expressed wishes for internal developmental opportunities to be more tailored to specific needs associated with the role with an example stated by AD/Chair AA:

Some interviewing should have been done with us beforehand. They should have asked, “What are our issues in communication” and tailored it to what we needed.
Many of the suggestions made by respondents in the study related to enhancing leadership competency development were also found in the literature, specifically, the over-arching need for effective leadership development programs for Associate Deans/Chairs (Bechtel, 2010; Filan, 1999; Inman, 2009; Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006). Strategies suggested to enhance leadership competency, as identified in the literature include: structured networking opportunities and peer-to-peer connection (Fitzgerald, 2009; Herzig & Jimmieson, 2006; Oshrey, 1996); effective mentoring programs (Craig, 2005; Inman, 2009; Knight & Trowler, 2001; Buller, 2012); and training opportunities that specifically address the unique attributes of the role (Filan, 1999; Inman 2009).

The preceding findings led to the conclusion that current leadership development opportunities available to Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs are not always well received, and are most effective when they focus on real-life application that addresses the uniqueness and importance of their role.

3c. Should more assistance be provided? Associate Deans/Chairs responses to the online survey indicate that almost all (99.65%) respondents believe it is important to possess strong leadership competencies in order to successfully do their jobs, with 75.86% indicating that is very important. Most (85.34%) claimed they believe this opinion is shared by their institutions. Many respondents (64.66%) identified that there was room to improve their leadership competencies with some respondents (15.52%) indicating they had not yet mastered the competencies required of the role and a small number (1.72%) indicating they were lacking and had a definite need to acquire these skills. All face-to-face interview respondents shared the opinion that possessing strong leadership competencies are crucial to success in the role, and that they would benefit from enhancing these competencies.

These findings led to the conclusion that a substantial number of Ontario college Associate Dean/Chairs would benefit from enhancing their leadership competencies in order to help them be successful in their roles.

Management vs. leadership: Relevance to transformational leadership theory. Online survey responses indicated almost unanimously that leadership is more complex
and difficult to master in comparison to management skills. I found it inspiring that face-
to-face interview participants appeared to attach a higher sense of morality to leadership
skills when compared to management. Kouzes and Posner (2007) say that,
“transformational leadership occurs when, in their interactions, people raise one another
to higher levels of morality” (p. 153). One Associate Dean/Chair online survey
participant directly referenced Benis (1997) in response to an open-ended question:

At the risk of sounding lame, leaders do the right thing, managers do
things right.

The majority (94.87%) of online respondents clarified the difference between
leadership and management as people related (leadership) opposed to process related
(management) confirming an earlier position taken in this study supported by Kotter
International (2015) and Bennis (as cited in Coutts, 2000). Survey respondents referred to
leadership competencies as: create a shared vision; create a culture of trust; model the
way; and provide inspiration. These attributes directly align with the principles of
transformational leadership espoused by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). I found it of
interest that the concept of creating a shared vision was more predominant in the
discussion of leadership vs. management than in an earlier discussion that explored
“what” leadership competencies were most appropriate. This further validates
transformational leadership theory as a theoretical leadership construct through which to
view this study.

3d. Developmental opportunities with a focus on leading change?

As previously stated, approximately half (48.28%) of Associate Deans/Chairs
respondents to the online survey and all face-to-face interview participants indicated that
there are unique leadership competencies related to leading change, and that they are
important to success in the role. Many job descriptions found in the institutional
documentation also referenced the ability to manage change.

Face-to-face interview participants confirmed the importance of the ability to lead
change. One of them spoke of great success he/she had experienced while leading a
major change initiative and credits much of the success directly to an in-house training
program he had experienced. This demonstrates that in-house leadership development programs can be successful.

There is also an abundance of literature related to the competency of managing change, with much of it directly relating to academic leadership (Filan & Seagren, 2003; Foote, 1999; Fullan, 2004; Lucas, 2000; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011).

There is congruency between all data sets and the literature on the importance for Associate Deans/Chairs to possess skills related to leading change validating the conclusion previously made associated with Research Question 2b: (a) The ability to lead change is an essential leadership competency required of Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs; (b) Possessing exceptional communication skills and practice of Kotter’s (1999) 8-stage process for leading change would augment the leadership competencies required to successfully lead change for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs.

Summary of Conclusions

In summary, I feel it germane to point out that a review of the online survey findings shows that only two Associate Deans/Chairs (out of 116) and one Dean (out of 48) questioned the premise of this study, that being the implication that Associate Deans/Chairs can lead change from the middle. All face-to-face interview participants asserted the importance of leadership in their roles. The importance of the role Associate Dean/Chair to the success of colleges, and the ability to lead change from the position is common in the literature (Chu, 2010; Lucas, 2000; Stone & Coussons-Read, 2011). This led to the final conclusion that it is indeed possible for Ontario Associate Deans/Chairs to lead change from the middle-management positions they hold.

Following is a summary of the conclusions based on a comparison/contrast (through triangulation) of the findings from four data sets, and a comparison/contrast to the literature as appropriate.

Defining the role.
1. The workload of the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair is overly demanding, and performance reviews should accurately reflect the activity of those holding the position.

2. Many core activities associated with the role have remained consistent over time and are primarily focused on ensuring student success, managing and supporting faculty, and administrative functions such as budget responsibilities and resource allocation.

3. There are unique challenges associated with the middle management position leading to the unenviable sensation of Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs feeling stuck in the middle.

4. Change currently occurring in the system is re-defining the role of the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair, led primarily by the proliferation of degrees, and to a lesser extent, the heightened importance placed on research, expansion of flexible delivery, increases in international students, and effects of the SMAs. These changes are exacerbated by budget constraints/reduced funding and all contribute to an ever increasing workload for the Ontario college Associate Dean/Chair.

Leadership competencies.

1. a. Transformational Leadership theory is a valid construct through which to build a leadership competency framework that would assist Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles; however, it is not all encompassing and
   b. Supplemental leadership theories and practices should be considered to complement the principles defined in transformational leadership theory as appropriate.

2. a. The ability to lead change is an essential leadership competency required of Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs, and
   b. Possessing exceptional communication skills and practice of Kotter’s (1999) 8-stage process for leading change would augment the leadership competencies required to successfully lead change for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs.

3. It would require greater exposure of Senge’s (1990) systems thinking theory to Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs in order to determine whether a practice of systems thinking would prove beneficial to their roles.

Developmental opportunities.

1. Current leadership development opportunities that Associate Deans/Chairs experience prior to assuming the role do not adequately prepare them for success.
2. A substantial number of Ontario college Associate Dean/Chairs would benefit from enhancing their leadership competencies in order to help them be successful in their roles.

3. Current leadership development opportunities available to Associate Deans/Chairs are not always well received, and are most effective when they focus on real-life application that addresses the uniqueness and importance of their role.

**Overriding conclusion.**

1. It is indeed possible for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chair to lead change from the middle-management positions they hold.

**Dean’s Responses compared with Associate Deans/Chair’s Responses**

It seems appropriate to quickly review the online survey responses from Deans in comparison/contrast to Associate Deans/Chairs prior to presenting the recommendation section of this study. The Dean’s responses were sought, primarily to ensure there were not significant differences between how they rated the importance of certain items associated with the role in comparisons to the importance placed on these items by Associate Deans/Chairs.

A review of the findings finds fairly congruent results when comparing the mean importance scores between Deans and Associate Deans/Chairs on three multi-dimensional questions (that each contained a 4-point Likert-scale ranked from not important to very important) addressing major components of this study, those being: typical activities associated with the role; challenges associated with middle management; and leadership competencies deemed important to success in the role. Identical versions of the three multi-dimensional questions were presented to both Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans in the online surveys. A short review comparing/contrasting findings from both sample groups follows.

**Activities associated with the role.** Eight of the top-10 activities identified as being important to Associate Deans/Chairs when ranked using mean importance scores also appeared in the top-10 list of Deans when ranked using the same method. They were:
1. Dealing with serious performance issues: ranked 1\textsuperscript{st} by AD/Chairs and 2\textsuperscript{nd} by Deans
2. Providing professional leadership, setting example: ranked 3\textsuperscript{rd} by AD/Chairs and 7\textsuperscript{th} by Deans
3. Encouraging good teaching: ranked 4\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 1\textsuperscript{st} by Deans
4. Implementing department plans: ranked 5\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 3\textsuperscript{rd} by Deans
5. Teambuilding in the department: ranked 6\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 8\textsuperscript{th} by Deans
6. Evaluating faculty and staff performance: ranked 7\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 4\textsuperscript{th} by Deans
7. Recruiting faculty and other staff: ranked 8\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 6\textsuperscript{th} by Deans
8. Reviewing existing programs and curriculum: ranked 9\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 5\textsuperscript{th} by Deans

Two activities that appear in the top-10 list for Associate Deans/Chairs that do not appear in the top-10 list for Deans are:

1. Maintaining morale: ranked 2\textsuperscript{nd} by AD/Chairs and 14\textsuperscript{th} by Deans
2. Developing departmental plans: ranked 10\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs and 13\textsuperscript{th} by Deans

Two activities that appear in the top-10 list for Deans that do not appear in the top-10 list for Associate Deans/Chair are:

1. Developing new programs and curriculum: ranked 9\textsuperscript{th} by Deans and 12\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chairs
2. Involvement with student recruitment activities: ranked 10\textsuperscript{th} by Deans and 30\textsuperscript{th} by AD/Chair

The results from a 2-tailed \( t \)-test indicate a significant difference on the mean importance scores between Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans (who participated in the online survey) on the importance they place on the following six activities associated with the role.

Rated more important by Associate Deans/Chairs:

1. Championing your unit within the college
2. Evaluating faculty and staff

Rated more important by Deans:

3. Implementing departmental plans
4. Review existing programs and curriculum
5. Participating in external audits of programs and curricula
6. Encouraging good teaching

**Challenges associated with middle-management.** When rated using the mean importance scores, in all cases but one, Associate Deans/Chairs ranked challenges associated with middle-management as more important than Deans. However, there is fair consistency in the ordering of the ranking. The top four challenges identified correspond between both groups. They include:

1. Acting as a communications conduit between senior management and front line workers: ranked 1st by AD/Chairs and 2nd by Deans
2. Time management stresses associated with the role: ranked 2nd by AD/Chairs and 1st by Deans.
3. Getting front line workers to perform in accordance with management’s strategic decisions made at the senior level: ranked 3rd by both groups.
4. Overcoming the sensation of feeling caught-in-the middle: ranked 4th by both groups.

The results from a 2-tailed $t$-test indicate a significant difference on the mean importance scores between Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans (who participated in the online survey) on the importance they place on the following two middle-management challenges:

Both items are rated as more important by Associate Deans/Chairs.

1. Acting as a communication conduit between senior management and front line workers.
2. Lack of input into institutional strategic planning.

**Leadership competencies required.** A comparison/contrast of the findings from Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans who participated in the online survey shows similar
results on “what” leadership competencies are deemed important by both groups when ranked using the mean importance scores. Nine of the leadership competencies deemed important appear in the top-10 rankings of both groups. They include:

1. Build and maintain effective relationships and work teams: ranked 1st by AD/Chairs and 1st by Deans.
2. Resolve and manage conflict productively: ranked 2nd by AD/Chairs and 10th by Deans.
3. Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others: ranked 3rd by AD/Chairs and 6th by Deans.
4. Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator capable of building and sustaining relationships for individual and organizational success: ranked 4th by AD/Chairs and 7th by Deans.
5. Be inclusive by appreciating, respecting, and valuing diversity: ranked 5th by AD/Chairs and 3rd by Deans.
6. Be a thoughtful and diligent manager of talent who develops, coaches, and mentors others for individual, team, and organizational success: ranked 6th by AD/Chairs and 5th by Deans.
7. Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership: ranked 7th by AD/Chairs and 9th by Deans.
8. Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence: ranked 9th by AD/Chairs and 2nd by Deans.
9. Effectively mentor, coach and develop talent: ranked 10th by AD/Chairs and 8th by Deans.

An activity that appears in the top-10 list of Associate Deans/Chairs but does not appear in the top-10 list of Deans is:

10. Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles: ranked 8th by AD/Chairs and 14th by Deans.

An activity that appears in the top-10 list of Deans but does not appear in the top-10 list of Associate Deans/Chairs is:

11. Develop and effectively lead high performance teams and workgroups: ranked 4th by Deans and 15th by AD/Chairs.
The results from a 2-tailed *t*-test indicate a significant difference on the mean importance scores between Associate Deans/Chairs and Deans (who participated in the online survey) on the importance they place on the following five leadership competencies associated with the role.

All items were rated as more important by Associate Deans:

1. Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others
2. Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles
3. Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator capable of building and sustaining relationships
4. Investigate and employ contemporary research and theory into organizational excellence and best practices
5. Develop and implement planning processes for strategic planning, scenario thinking, and disciplined decision making

A review of the preceding comparison/contrast between Dean’s and Associate Deans/Chairs findings on the importance placed on items related to typical activities associated with the role, challenges faced by middle managers, and leadership competencies deemed important to the role, finds more commonality than significant differences.

**Recommendations**

The following section provides a series of recommendations that are intended to help Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles based on the conclusions of the study. The recommendations are made to groups of individuals, institutions, and various organizations as appropriate with rationale provided.

Upon reviewing the findings and conclusions, I do not advocate making recommendations for policy change at the system level as they would likely neither be well received or implemented. Indeed, if institutions, or governments for that matter, could create policy that dictated the enhancement of leadership competency in
individuals, they would likely have done it long ago. In my opinion, recommendations should be more focussed on shifting a mindset, and presenting practical solutions that actually can be implemented by the appropriate bodies.

To that end, I make the following recommendations. As stated at the outset, I feel it appropriate that I also insert my own sentiments into the recommendation section based on personal experience.

**Recommendation to Colleges Ontario**

1. Develop and promote a policy paper advocating for the enhancement of leadership development opportunities for Ontario college administrators, with a focus on building leadership capacity in Ontario college mid-level academic managers.

Colleges Ontario is the advocacy organization for Ontario colleges. They, “advance policies and awareness campaigns to ensure Ontario produces the highly skilled workforce that is essential to our province’s prosperity” (Colleges Ontario, n.d, para. 2). Colleges Ontario is a powerful advocacy organization, led by the direction of Ontario college presidents. They regularly release policy position papers that advocate for the health of the Ontario college system. Their vested interest in the success of Ontario colleges, combined with the importance that Associate Deans/Chairs contribute to the success of colleges, makes Colleges Ontario the ideal body to develop and promote a policy paper advocating for the enhancement of leadership development opportunities for Ontario college mid-level academic managers.

**Recommendation to Colleges and Institutes Canada (CICan)**

2. a. Develop and promote a leadership competency framework that would serve as the foundation for a development program that would enhance leadership competencies in mid-level academic administrators in colleges

and

b. Develop and deliver a leadership competency development program designed specifically for Associate Deans/Chairs across Canada (in much the same way you currently deliver VP NELI).
CICan, previously known as the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC), “is the national, voluntary membership organization representing publicly supported colleges, institutes, cegeps and polytechnics in Canada and internationally” (CICan, 2015, para. 2). As mentioned earlier in this paper, they currently offer leadership development programs such as the National Executive Leadership Institute for Potential Vice-Presidents, commonly referred to VP NELI. The program provides opportunity for senior college administrators to explore whether a vice-president’s position is one they wish to pursue in the future. The program is well recognized and enjoys positive feedback across Canada.

In addition, CICan enjoys status in Canada very similar to the AACC in the United States. As previously discussed in this paper, the AACC (2005) developed a leadership competency framework for college mid-management academic administrators that has been widely adopted by colleges in the United States.

Based on the positive reputation they already enjoy in the arena of providing exceptional leadership development opportunities for senior college administrators, combined with the similarities between CICan and AACC, it seems appropriate that CICan would be the organization to initiate a project of this nature for Canada.

I also recommend that CICan actively consult with the Ontario College Administrative Staff Association (OCASA), as well as similar organizations in other provinces, in both the development of a leadership competency development framework, and the delivery and promotion of a leadership competency development program designed specifically for college Associate Deans/Chairs.

OCASA is a voluntary, professional association that supports and advocates for Ontario’s community college administrators, while building and promoting administrative excellence for the betterment of the college system (OCASA, 2015). They strive to identify leadership development opportunities and support, encourage and develop opportunities for personal growth as described in two of their strategic priorities. OCASA also provides 5% tuition reimbursement for people taking the Central Michigan University Masters of Arts degree in Education and actively supports and promotes a
mentor program confirming their commitment to supporting personal development opportunities for college administrators.

Their active support of Ontario college administrators and advocacy for leadership development opportunities appear to make OCASA an ideal partner.

If there is no desire on the part of CICan and/or OCASA to develop a leadership competency based program, then I direct the recommendation to Colleges Ontario and/or directly to individual colleges in Ontario.

A successful leadership competency framework and development program designed specifically for Associate Deans/Chairs would likely be the most complex (and challenging) recommendation from this study to implement.

There has already been much discussion in this chapter about utilizing the four principles associated with transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) as a suitable construct upon which to build a suitable program. Transformational leadership theory is the basis for many existing competency based leadership development programs used to develop mid-level college managers and Chairs in the United States (AACC, 2005; Bechtel, 2010; Chair Academy, 2010; Quinn, 2007). However, as previously discussed, supplemental leadership theories and practices should also be considered to complement the powerful tenets of transformational leadership.

Participants of the study affirmed the importance of mastering the ability to lead change, with some suggesting Kotter’s (1996) 8-stage process for leading change as an effective model upon which to base a change leadership program. Finally, participants placed high importance on mastering enhanced communication skills, with some directly referencing the need for a course in crucial conversations.

It is not within the scope of this study to develop such a program, but a review of the findings does appear to support the need. When asked if they had mastered the leadership competencies required to be successful, most online survey participants acknowledged room for improvement (64.66%), some responded not at the level required of the role (15.52%) and others expressed a definite need for improvement (1.72%). A majority of them (62.93%) indicated that their institutions should do more to provide
developmental opportunities and about one third of them (31.03%) indicated that their institution did not provide any leadership development training at all.

There were many comments from both online survey respondents and interview participants expressing dissatisfaction with the results of current professional leadership development opportunities in which they had participated. One of the interview participants, Associate Dean/Chair AA claimed:

All managers attended the 3-day session but it wasn’t necessarily tailored to what we needed. We weren’t asked.

There were also contrasting opinions expressed to this view. Some online respondents spoke of exemplary leadership development programs delivered through their own institution. One of the interview participants shared a powerful story of how training he/she had taken related to leading change worked perfectly when put into real life practice. Associate Dean/Chair GG explained:

I implemented all the things I learned in that training and it worked exactly the way it should.

This indicates that certain leadership development opportunities are successful. They appear to be more effective and beneficial when they directly reflect the real-world experiences of those who participate as affirmed by three of the face-to-face interview participants.

The aforementioned concept of utilizing the four principles associated with transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978), combined with Kotter’s (1996) 8-stage process for leading change along with courses designed to enhance communication skills in participants appears a reasonable foundation upon which to build an effective leadership competency development program for Associate Deans/Chairs. In order to be most effective, the program should also include real-life challenges experienced by Associate Deans/Chairs.

Personal perspective: To develop a leadership competency framework and leadership development program for Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs (and even more so, across Canada should CICan take on the initiative) would be onerous, and
would require collaboration between colleges across the nation and/or the Ontario college system. However, I believe the benefits would warrant the effort. I have personally experienced many of the leadership development opportunities discussed in the study and I hold the belief that they are not at the level of depth, nor are they directly related to the role enough, to be as beneficial as they could be. This sentiment appears confirmed by participants of the study.

**Recommendations to Institutions (Ontario Colleges).**

3. Implement an effective onboarding program specifically designed for new Associate Deans/Chairs.

There was unanimous opinion expressed from interview participants of the study that the early years for those assuming the role proved the most challenging. Responses from the online survey indicating a disproportionately high turnover rate for this position, specifically during the first year, appear to validate this finding. This is compounded by the issue that many Associate Deans/Chairs transition into the role from faculty, yet as confirmed through the literature, they have not been provided with the training/development to successfully acclimate to the role (Edwards, 2006; Filan, 1997; Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006). As face-to-face interview participant Associate Dean/Chair AA stated:

> When you have worked with people for 20 years, and all of a sudden they report to you, for me that was a very difficult transition, I could have used help.

I suggest an effective onboarding program that engages new Associate Deans/Chairs in the five major themes related to activities associated with the role as identified in the findings of the study. Suggested topics for an onboarding program based on the five themes include:

**Faculty related.**

- Recruitment, onboarding, support, providing PD opportunities
- Managing and assigning faculty workloads utilizing the standard workload formula (SWF)
Student related.
- A review of academic policies
- Scheduling classes: timetabling
- Involvement in student awards: connecting students with industry partners

Program related.
- Explanation of program review and renewal processes
- MTCU program related policies: approval processes, renewal, reviews
- PEQAB regulations: for those who are responsible for degrees

Operational/managerial.
- An overview of operational/management functions: budgeting, responsibilities associated with health and safety, purchasing procedures
- A review of intuition planning processes: divisional plans, strategic planning, future thinking, environmental scans

Relationships.
- Introductions to people where essential relationships are expected, that is, working colleagues at the institution, Program Advisory Committee members (PACs), program coordinator groups, and school/college/industry/provincial committees

In addition to the five activity clusters identified in the findings as important to the role of Associate Dean/Chair, I also recommend that the onboarding program reflect elements of change and change leadership.

Change.
- A review of the institutions Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA), and the impacts of the SMA on their role
- A preliminary exploration of the competencies required to lead change

The preceding list is by no means exhaustive, and is created based on a combination of sentiments expressed by participants of the study and personal opinion. Buller’s (2012) work details a plethora of practical advice for department chairs addressing many of the aforementioned items and would likely prove beneficial in developing an onboarding program. I recommend that institutions craft their own onboarding programs for
Associate Deans/Chairs, and determine relevant topics based on a collaborative process between HR departments, Associate Deans/Chairs, and those to whom they report (likely Deans).

Personal reflection: Ontario colleges provide in-depth orientation programs of this nature for new faculty. It seems reasonable institutions should do the same for our Associate Deans/Chairs considering the importance of their roles. Also, I feel it important institutions make new Associate Deans/Chairs aware of the importance of change taking place in the system, and specifically focus on how it impacts their role.

4. Create an effective mentoring program for Associate Deans/Chairs (with possible support from OCASA).

Many of the online survey respondents and some of the face-to-face interview participants referenced the need for a strong mentorship program, some referring to it as a buddy program, particularly for new Associate Deans/Chairs. Face-to-face interview participant Associate Dean/Chair FF says:

I think having a mentor who is a seasoned experienced Associate Dean/Chair is critical. I think it would be tremendous for new folks. Confirming the importance of mentorship, Associate Dean/Chair GG claims:

I think what didn’t show up were supports required in the first year to really help mentor you through getting on board. I look back and I laugh.

As previously mentioned, OCASA has a mentoring program available to members, but it is not specifically designed for Associate Deans/Chairs. The concept of mentorship as an effective practice to enhance leadership competency for new academic leaders is prevalent in the literature (Buller, 2012; Inman, 2009; Knight & Trowler, 2001). Craig (2005) claims that “For people in such pivotal positions to the organization, training, mentoring, and other leadership developmental activities are imperative” (p. 86). Stones and Coussons-Read (2011) advise new Associate Deans, “it is crucial to find someone you can vent with when you feel frustrated” (p. 32) with Buller (2012) furthering this sentiment stating, “Find someone you can talk to, even vent to, when necessary” (p. 19). Some of the interview participants who had participated in mentorship programs stated that they were partially effective, but did not go far enough. One
participant was adamant that Deans should be involved in the process and that the selection of appropriate mentors should be given thoughtful consideration.

Personal reflection: I support the concept of a structured mentorship program where careful consideration in given to pairing new Associate Deans/Chairs with the right mentors, and ensuring they are provided with adequate time in their schedule to connect with their mentors. This is a practice I have not personally experienced; however, it would have proved incredibly beneficial, particularly during my early tenure in the role, to have someone I could have leaned on for help.

5. Create structured opportunities for Associate Deans/Chairs to network amongst themselves (with possible support from OCASA).

There was strong correlation between responses from the online surveys and sentiments expressed by interview participants over the desire of Associate Deans/Chairs to connect with each other to network, share best practice, and develop relationships. One of the interview participants was adamant about the importance of this, with Associate Dean/Chair CC stating:

Over the last 3 years—as the strategic planning framework changed—no effort was made to allow the AD/Chairs to huddle together, and understand change and develop strategies to implement change. They should meet alone—they never get to do that.

The importance of seeking support and networking amongst peers is a sound strategy recommended to middle managers in order to develop effective leadership competency (Fitzgerald, 2009; Herzig & Jimmieson, 2006). Oshrey (1996) encourages middle managers to “support one another in pursuing personal goals” and to “create regular mechanisms for sharing information, supporting one another, and coaching one another” (p. 161). Institutions should provide opportunities for Associate Deans/Chairs to connect with their peers in order to network, develop relationships and share best practices. There should be time allotted for networking amongst peers by institutions, and the structure of networking opportunities should be left to the discretion of those participating.
Personal reflection: I was not personally afforded the opportunity to connect with my peer group in any type of structured way during my tenure in the role, and I personally believe it would have proved tremendously beneficial.

6. Conduct a review of institutional policy and HR practices associated with the role of Associate Dean/Chair, with a focus on improving the performance appraisal process.

Over half, 61 of 116 (52.59%), of the Associate Deans/Chairs responding to the online survey reported that the performance review process was not accurate, and when provided an opportunity for further commentary, 29 of 65 (44.62%) claimed the performance review was not an accurate reflection of the jobs they actually performed. This compounded by the lack of clarity participants associate with job descriptions provides impetus for a change in HR practices. As previously stated, the ORT assumption that role-conflict will arise if expectations are not consensual (Parker & Wickham, 2005) implies that conflict between Associate Deans/Chairs and their supervisors is likely to occur due to unclear job expectations accentuated through negative perceptions associated with performance reviews.

Effort should be dedicated to clarifying performance expectations between Associate Deans/Chairs and their immediate supervisors (for the most part, Deans), and performance appraisals should reflect those expectations. Attempts should also be made to ensure that job postings/descriptions accurately capture activity associated with the role.

Personal reflection: I feel that the benefits associated with the aforementioned recommendation are self-evident. I mentioned at the outset of this paper that I did not feel the performance appraisals I experienced while I held the role reflected aspects of leadership. I would have appreciated a more fulsome appraisal process, facilitated through respectful dialogue.

Recommendations to Deans, VPAs, and College Senior Management

7. Empower Associate Deans/Chairs to make local decisions where reasonable.
The concept of middle-managers feeling stuck in the middle is a predominant theme of this study and in the literature (Boyko, 2009; Edwards, 2006; Gillett-Karam, 2002; Gmelch & Gates, 1995). One of the challenges middle-managers associate with the position is the lack of authority to make decisions that directly affect their own department, often interpreted as a lack of trust and/or respect. Participants from both online surveys and face-to-face interviews expressed frustrations in this regard. A review of quotes from face-to-face interview participants captures this sentiment. Associate Dean/Chair FF says:

I would sum it up in one word, “trust”. There needs to be more trust put into us managers on the front line. We live it day-by-day and we know exactly what we need.

Associate Dean/Chair GG concurs stating:

Sometimes I think that I would just like to make the decisions. Really. I feel that I have the background. No disrespect to the Dean, but, they don’t have the information they need to make local decisions at the tables they are at, and we are not at those tables. They don’t have the meat, and we have the meat.

As a follow up to a review of the performance appraisal process that seeks to clarify responsibilities associated with the role, Ontario colleges should review practices that prevent Associate Deans/Chairs from making local decisions that affect their own departments. They should be empowered to make decisions, where reasonable. Empowering them to make decisions would likely help build trust and heighten respect between Associate Deans/Chairs and those to whom they report (usually Deans). Accompanying this recommendation is the need for senior management to keep Associate Deans/Chairs informed of strategic goals and objectives of the institution, and to include them in strategic planning initiatives where possible.

Personal perspective: when I held this role, there was nothing I found more frustrating than having to convince (beg) my direct supervisor or senior management to allow me to make local decisions. I was all too aware of strategic, budget, resource, and HR implications. I did not feel that I needed sanction to act responsibly, and I found the experience of having to seek approval to make local decisions demoralizing and
demotivating. In my opinion, if Associate Deans/Chairs are hired with expectation that they will lead their departments, then let them lead.

8. Model exemplary leadership based on the principles associated with transformational leadership.

Personal perspective: this recommendation is not based on findings from the study per se, yet it is made based on personal observation. Face-to-face interview participant, Associate Dean/Chair GG stated:

The biggest thing I find is leading by example. I’ve seen people manage instead of lead and it’s sort of like pushing the rope instead of pulling the rope. It’s a lot easier to pull a rope.

If as Konorti (2008) states, “Transformational leadership is about inspiration, intellect, charisma, and individualized consideration. Scholars and researchers refer to this new leader as a change agent” (p. 11), then in my opinion, it would be hypocritical of senior management to expect exemplary leadership of Associate Deans/Chairs if we did not model this behaviour ourselves.

**Recommendation to Vice Presidents Academic (VPA)**

9. Create opportunities to connect, on a personal level, with the Associate Dean/Chairs in your respective institutions.

The Associate Deans/Chairs in the study indicated mutual respect and trust as essential components of leadership. They also place high value on relationships. They work incredibly long hours, and are committed to the success of students. As stated by Seagren et al. (1993), “An institution can run for a long time with an inept president, but not for long with inept chairpersons” (p. 19).

To a person, face-to-face interview participants told me that they felt this study was important and long overdue. More importantly (in my opinion), they appreciated being heard and being provided opportunity for a candid, heart-to-heart conversation about their world with a VPA. There were many comments woven throughout the online survey that also demonstrated support for this study, and many respondents asked that I
forward results of the findings when the study is complete. Being heard, respected and trusted was vital to face-to-face interview participants, and the conversations teemed with emotion. To that end, I strongly recommend to my Vice President Academics colleagues across the Ontario college system, find ways to personally connect with Associate Deans/Chairs in your respective institutions.

Summary

1. To Colleges Ontario: Develop and promote a policy paper advocating for the enhancement of leadership competency development opportunities for Ontario college administrators, with a focus on building leadership capacity in Ontario college mid-level academic managers.

2. To CICan:
   a. Develop and promote a leadership competency framework that would serve as the foundation for a development program that would enhance leadership competencies in mid-level academic administrators in colleges and
   b. Develop and deliver a leadership competency development program designed specifically for Associate Deans/Chairs across Canada (in much the same way you currently deliver VP NELI). Note – consider the possibility of making this program available to existing employees, notably faculty, who have been identified as potential future Associate Deans and/or Chairs.

3. To Ontario colleges: Develop and implement an effective onboarding program specifically designed for new Associate Deans/Chairs.

4. To Ontario colleges (with possible support from OCASA): Create an effective mentoring program for Associate Deans/Chairs.

5. To Ontario colleges (with possible support from OCASA): Create structured opportunities for Associate Deans/Chairs to network amongst themselves.

6. To Ontario colleges: Conduct a review of institutional policy and HR practices associated with the role of Associate Dean/Chair, with a focus on improving the performance appraisal process.

7. To Ontario colleges: Empower Associate Deans/Chairs to make local decisions where reasonable.

8. To Deans, VPAs, and college Senior Management: Model exemplary leadership based on the principles associated with transformational leadership.
9. To College Ontario Vice Presidents Academic: Create opportunities to connect, on a personal level, with the Associate Dean/Chairs in your respective institutions.

**Limitations of the Study**

It was never the objective of this project to confirm a specific theory or to validate a certain hypothesis. The study was always intended to be exploratory in nature, and set out to view a phenomenon from the perspective of those who lived it—in this case, Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs. I was inspired by the approach taken by Boyko (2009), to undertake a scholarly endeavour to contribute to a small body of Canadian literature. A desired outcome is that the recommendations that evolved through a review of the findings serve Ontario colleges, Deans, and most importantly Associate Deans and Chairs by providing them with knowledge derived from an empirical research study that is supported by the literature and is anchored in a valid theoretical framework.

There are limitations associated with any academic inquiry, and this one is no exception. Limitations acknowledged include:

- Email lists were compiled based on information received from Vice President Academic offices across the English language CAAT system and it is not possible to verify whether the lists were 100% accurate.
- The invitation to the online survey stated that it might take up to one hour to complete the Associate Dean/Chair survey; therefore, considering their busy jobs, this might have been a mitigating factor to participation.
- There were limited participation rates, specifically:
  - Lack of representation from all geographical locations from Associate Deans/Chairs responses to the online surveys or participation in the face-to-face interviews—with minimum participation from northern colleges as previously identified;
  - The limited number of interview participants;
  - The limited responses from HR departments—with some choosing not to disclose all requested information.
- There were restrictions on analysis of the findings on certain dimensions such as comparisons of results based on the size of the institutions, and comparison of results between individual institutions due to stringent REB restraints necessitating the need to wholly protect the identities of participating institutions. This precluded a cross-tab analysis.
• There was no separation of gender in analysis of the data as has been done in certain studies of this nature.

• There is the possibility that Associate Deans/Chairs were influenced through peer pressure while responding to the online questionnaire.

• The changes taking place within the Ontario college system are taking place at such a rapid pace that it is difficult to accurately determine an exact starting point and end point for the study.

As stated in Chapter 3, I also acknowledges that there were assumptions made to the methodology applied to this project:

1. There was the assumption the quantitative tools and corresponding data analysis employed by Boyko (2009) in her examination of the Chair in Canadian Universities were sound as one the quantitative tools used in this study is an adaptation of Boyko’s work. (Boyko’s work had already been successfully approved by a U of T PhD review. Also, my personal opinion is that the quality and rigor of Boyko’s work is exceptional).

2. There was the assumption that surveys and interviews were answered honestly.

3. There was the assumption that there would not be significant differences to the findings if the data were analyzed by region, by institution size, or by academic discipline.

It was never within the scope of the project to break down an analysis of the data by region, size of institution or by academic discipline as the intention of the project was always broad based and focussed on an exploration of leadership competencies that would help all Ontario Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles. I do not claim that the online survey respondents or face-to-face interview participants are representative of other Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs or Deans. However, it is hoped that the issues explored in conjunction with the conclusions and recommendations will contribute to an understanding of leadership required by Ontario college mid-management academic leaders.

As stated, I aspire to contribute to a small body of Canadian literature. I would prefer to have any of the conclusions and recommendations from the study contribute to the health of Ontario’s higher education system, particularly Ontario colleges, than be
acknowledged as a purely scientific undertaking. The intent was always practical in nature, with an aim to helping all Ontario Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful.

Upon further reflection, it is hopeful that the findings from the study prove advantageous in jurisdictions outside of Ontario. The majority of the literature review focussed on studies conducted primarily in the United States. Also, the findings concluded that although this study was situated in Ontario, the primary duties, responsibilities and challenges associated with the role have remained fairly congruent over time. Finally, although the study only references change occurring in Ontario, a cursory review of current events leads one to reasonably assume that change is taking place in higher education across Canada, in the United States and in many other countries. To that end, it is strongly hoped that the findings from this study might prove beneficial to any higher education system that employs mid-level academic managers, although it is focussed within the context of change taking place within higher education system of Ontario.

**Implications and Suggestions for Future Research**

This paper attempted to capture a moment in time, “a picture” of the world of the Ontario college Associate/Dean Chair while surrounded by a whirlwind of change. The study explored their role, leadership competencies that would help them be successful, and reviewed the state of, and their opinion on the effectiveness of current leadership development opportunities they experienced. The sentiments expressed by Associate Deans/Chairs were augmented through findings from Deans (their direct supervisors) when asked the same questions, and through a review of relevant institutional documentation.

The very concept of trying to capture a picture in the midst of a whirlwind of change illustrates one of the major limitations of the study. One of the greatest challenges experienced was to determine a start and end date for the study. As previously stated, change is occurring at a rapid rate within the Ontario college system, making it difficult to describe. Much has transpired in the system since this study began.
Following are suggestions for future research projects that would potentially augment the efforts of this paper.

One of the major changes referenced in the paper is the (relatively) recent introduction of degree level programming offered in Ontario colleges introduced through the *Post-Secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act* (2000) and expanded on through the *Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act* (2002). There was ample discussion on of the proliferation of degrees within the Ontario college system, and the subsequent implications on the role of the Associate Dean/Chair and their relationship with faculty due to PEQAB hiring regulations. One suggestion for future research would be a deeper exploration of this phenomenon. Otte Rosenkrantz (2013) recently conducted a study of a similar nature exploring how the role of Ontario college faculty has evolved with a focus on the recent heightened importance of research possibly indicating Rosenkrantz’s work as an excellent reference from which to inaugurate such a study.

Similar studies could also conducted on any of other major catalysts of change discussed previously in this paper, including, the expansion of online delivery, the influx of international students, and impacts of the recently negotiated SMAs. All of these issues bear significant relevance to the success of the Ontario college system and appear to warrant further investigation as stand-alone items.

There was reference made throughout this paper to the Chair Academy (2015), a leadership development training program for Associate Deans/Chairs that is well respected across North America. The findings identified that many Ontario colleges sent Associate Deans/Chairs to the Chair’s Academy for leadership development. One suggestion for further research might be a deep investigation (using a case study methodology) exploring the effectiveness of the program on an individual cohort of Ontario Associate Deans/Chairs. Brian Bechtel (2010) conducted a study of this nature on the effectiveness of on an in-house leadership development program at a large multi-campus metropolitan community college in the United States indicating his paper might serve as an excellent reference.
Finally, this study did not explore activities, responsibilities, and characteristics of the role with a focus on exploring possible differences based on discipline specific characteristics of the respondents. It also did not separate responses according to gender. Neither did it compare results based on region, or the size of the institution. For example, this study had very limited response from northern colleges, with only two Deans responding to the online survey and no responses from Associate Deans/Chairs. It is likely that Associate Deans/Chairs experience their worlds differently based on any of the aforementioned items. Ongoing research could be conducted to specifically examine the effects of change in the system or characteristics associated with the role through the lens of any of the aforementioned items. Lydia Boyko’s (2009) work examining the role of Chairs in Canadian Universities would provide an excellent starting-place for a study of that nature.

The preceding suggestions for future research likely only capture a snippet of potential future research possibilities. The complexity of the role of the Ontario Associate Dean/Chair and the magnitude of change taking place in the Ontario college system create a plethora of opportunity for further study. The fact that this study was broad based, with intention of serving all Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs, provides ample opportunity for deeper investigation into many of the topics explored.

**Closing Personal Thoughts**

This paper represents a 4-year journey. Ironically, as the paper is situated in the context of change taking place in the Ontario college system, so too has my world changed throughout the course of this study. This journey involved many stops and starts due to job changes and associated physical moves, compounded by the fact that there was constant new change going on in the system even as I attempted to describe it.

At the onset of the project, I held the role of Associate Dean, subsequently moving to a Dean role, and currently hold the role of Senior Vice President Academic at Fanshawe College. I would have never predicted such personal change for myself at the
onset of the study, but find it anomalous that I now control certain decisions that I initially sought to influence.

I reflect on this journey and conclude that my original intentions for engaging in the study have not changed. I believe that Ontario college Associate Deans/Chairs are critical to the success of Ontario’s college system, and consequently to the economic success of our province and our nation. I also hold fast to the belief that Ontario colleges should do more to enhance Associate Deans/Chairs leadership competencies in order to help them be more successful in their roles.

What is not captured in the analysis of the data is the passion Associate Deans/Chairs exude for the success of students. This passion was almost palpable during the face-to-face interviews. During my tenure as Dean, I marvelled at how the Chairs who reported directly to me relentlessly advocated for resources, always with the intention of enhancing student success. They recruited and managed faculty, championed causes, developed powerful relationships with advisory boards and community partners, directed the development and updating of programs, tolerated institutional and ministry bureaucracy, monitored and recruited enrollments, developed and managed budgets, and worked incredibly long hours all within an incredibly complex environment complicated through institutional and government policy. Through this, they remained upbeat, powerful and determined to make our province better by providing exemplary educational experiences for Ontario college students. Truly, they have my admiration.

Buller (2012) states, “The job of chairing a department is probably the most important, least appreciated, and toughest administrative position in higher education” (p. 3), as eloquently confirmed in a response by one of the Associate Dean/Chair online survey participants:

I have heard the role described in the past by a previous President and VPA as the "most difficult role in the college," and very commonly by staff at all levels as "the worst job in the college." That should be a "call to arms" to do something about it.
References


Chu, D. (2010). *Change and the chair: Can chairs be more powerful than chancellors?* The Department Chair, 21(2), 3-5. Retrieved from http://www2.acenet.edu/resources/boards/docs/Chu_Change%20Chair.pdf


Dylan, R. (1964). The times they are a changin’. *The times they are a changing* [CD]. New York, NY: Columbia Records.


Appendix A.

Total Number of Degrees in Ontario Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of college</th>
<th>No. of degree programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algonquin College</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collège Boréal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambrian College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadore College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial College</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conestoga College</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanshawe College</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Brown College</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian College</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber College</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Cité</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalist College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sault College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca College</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan College</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no. of degrees in Ontario colleges</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Ontario Colleges website (Ontario Colleges, 2015c) includes collaborative degrees (those between colleges and Universities) as well as bridging degrees in their degree counts which are factored into the preceding totals.
Appendix B.
Fanshawe College Job Posting
FANSHAWE COLLEGE
Chair, Language and Liberal Arts
“Leadership Opportunity—Serving all Programs, all Students”

The School of Language and Liberal Arts
The School of Language and Liberal Studies is a diverse operation with a unifying focus in the delivery of foundational academic and workplace skills. Its programs (GAP/GAS and ESL) are designed to equip students with foundational skills needed for progression to vocationally-specific diploma programs or university transfer. This focus conforms to the Board’s emphasis on access education and supports the Student Enrolment Management (SEM) objective to increase regional post-secondary participation rates for direct, mature learner, and international persona groups. The School’s service areas (General Education/Communications) are designed to provide support to vocationally-specific diploma programs in both essential employability skills (EES) and general socio-cultural literacy (GE), both of which are mandates of the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU). The faculty of the School of Language and Liberal Studies seeks to increase the average educational attainment of all students in all programs by strengthening communication competence, critical thinking, and cultural literacy. This School services every College post-secondary program at least once during the program’s duration!

Chair, Language and Liberal Arts
In addition to the exciting and ambitious goals of enrollment growth, program optimization, enhancing students’ experience at Fanshawe, and promoting a positive cultural environment, the new Chair will work closely with the school’s coordinators, faculty and support staff to inspire and strengthen teamwork and cross-school collaboration. Also, the Chair will work closely with the Faculty of Arts, Media and Design’s Dean, Chairs, and Program Managers as a valued and contributing team member.

To qualify, candidates should meet the following criteria:
- Post-secondary Master’s degree (ideally, English Literature background); four year undergraduate degree required;
- Progressive administrative/leadership experience;
- Teaching experience at post-secondary level;
- Demonstrated ability to lead and inspire a large, diverse and talented team, working together to achieve planned goals;
- Demonstrated ability to cultivate and foster a collegial, collaborative work environment;
- Learner-centred approach to teaching and learning process;
- Proven ability to establish strong working relationships, partnerships, alliances with related stakeholder groups/community;
- Strong knowledge of program/curriculum design and development; program planning; and budget management;
- Demonstrated experience planning and delivering language and liberal arts programs that support all programs, and advance the mandate of this position;
- Effective leadership and team building skills (integrity/credibility; foresight/vision; ability to rally others around a shared vision; and ability to deliver results);
- Political savvy and strong negotiating and conflict-resolution skills;
- Excellent interpersonal and communication skills;
- Collegial and collaborative management approach;
- Passion for student success.
Appendix C.

Online Survey Questionnaire: Associate Deans/Chairs

RESEARCH FOR A DOCTORAL THESIS

ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE to ASSOCIATE DEANS/CHAIRS

RESEARCHER – Gary Lima
Doctoral Student, OISE, University of Toronto

Title of study - Leading change from the middle: An exploration of leadership competencies to help Ontario CAAT Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles.

Note – this survey is an adaptation of the work formerly completed by Dr. Lydia Boyko (2009) through her Doctorate dissertation for the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

Acknowledgement of invitation to participate and consent:

I acknowledge that I have read the invitation to participate in the online survey. I have been provided the opportunity to ask questions or seek further clarification through direct contact with the researcher. I have also been provided contact information to the University of Toronto’s Office of Research ethics, as well as contact information to the researcher and the researcher’s thesis supervisor. This contact information can also be found at the end of this survey.

My understanding is that:

The findings of this study will be made available publicly in the form of a doctoral thesis. In no way will I be personally identified in any of the findings. There are no harms or consequences expected as a result of participating in the survey. Participation is completely voluntary and that I am free to not respond to any question(s) that I do not wish to answer and may withdraw from the survey at any time without explanation or consequence. In the event I withdraw from the study, all responses will be shredded and/or permanently deleted and destroyed. I can notify the researcher of my desire to withdraw through email, written letter, or phone message.

All data collected in the survey will be digitally stored and protected through encryption. All data will be kept in confidence and secured as required by OISE University of Toronto and will be destroyed upon completion of the study. None of the participants will be identifiable in any way in reporting of the findings.

I have read the invitation to participate in this survey and freely consent:

☑ YES
☑ NO [Go to END]
DEFINING THE ROLE – Research Question 1

Who is hired into these roles? (References research question 1a)

1. College name: ________________________________

2. School name or program cluster you manage: ________________

3. Your age:
   - ☐ Less than 35
   - ☐ 36 – 45
   - ☐ 46 – 55
   - ☐ 56 – 65
   - ☐ Over 65

4. Number of years in your current position as an Associate Dean or Chair:
   - ☐ Less than 1 year
   - ☐ 1 - 2 years
   - ☐ 3 - 4 years
   - ☐ 5 - 6 years
   - ☐ More than 6 years

5. Please name your last earned:
   a. Academic degree ________________________________
   b. Field of study ________________________________
   c. Institution ________________________________

6. Prior to assuming this role you were:
   - ☐ Working at this college in an admin role
   - ☐ Working at this college in a support role
   - ☐ Working at this college as faculty
   - ☐ Working external to your current college

7. Former employment experience if external to the college: (Please specify your most recent experience)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

8. When you assumed the role of Associate Dean/Chair, you were:
   - ☐ Appointed from within the college
   - ☐ Interviewed then hired - working at another position within the college
   - ☐ Interviewed and hired - working at another position external to the college
   - ☐ Interviewed and hired – you were unemployed at the time
In the questions that follow, leadership is defined as, “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives” (Yukl, 2002, p. 7).

9. Prior to assuming your current role you have:
   □ Worked in a role that required leadership
   □ Worked in a role that did not require leadership

10. Prior to assuming your current role you have:
    □ Participated in leadership development training
    □ Not participated in any leadership development training

11. Please briefly describe any formal leadership development you have participated in prior to assuming your current role:

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

12. When you were hired in your current role, were you provided with a job description:
    □ Yes
    □ No

13. When you were hired in your current role, were you provided with a clear explanation regarding expectations associated with the position?
    □ Yes
    □ No

14. What is the title of the individual to whom you report directly?
    □ Your faculty Dean
    □ Other (please specify title)

15. Do you participate in an annual performance review?
    □ Yes
    □ No

16. If yes - please specify how your performance is assessed:
    □ Annually, by the individual to whom you report, through an informal review/interview
    □ Annually, by the individual to whom you report, through a formal review/interview, based on a performance agreement established at the start of the year
    □ Other
    Please explain:

   __________________________________________________________
17. Is your salary or remuneration linked to your performance review?
   - Yes
   - No

18. During your performance review is there (please check where appropriate):
   - Opportunity for dialogue
   - Clear reference to your original job posting
   - Review of personal goals and objectives
   - Review of departmental goals and objectives
   - Discussion of leadership
   - Incentive to conform to institutional norms and culture
   - Consequences for not conforming to institutional norms and cultures

19. Do you believe the performance review process accurately captures your contributions to the organization?
   - Yes
   - No

20. Please state any opinions related to the performance review process you wish to elaborate on:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Primary Responsibilities Associated with the Role (addresses Research Question 1b)

21. Number of full-time faculty members in your department:
   - 1 – 5
   - 6 – 10
   - 11 – 20
   - 21 – 30
   - More than 30 (please specify number) _____________________

22. Number of partial-load/part-time faculty members in your department:
   - 1 – 5
   - 6 – 10
   - 11 – 20
   - 21 – 30
   - More than 30 (please specify) number _____________________

23. Number of support staff in your department (that report to you):
   - 1 – 5
   - 6 – 10
   - 11 – 20
   - 21 – 30
   - More than 30 (please specify number) _____________________
24. Number of students in your department:
   - 1 - 100
   - 101 - 300
   - 301 - 500
   - 500 - 800
   - More than 800 (please specify) ________________________

25. Do you have an administrative assistant?
   - Yes
   - No

26. If yes, is this a full-time position that reports to you directly?
   - Yes
   - No

27. How many hours do you work on average per 7 day week?
   - 31 - 40 hours
   - 41 - 45 hours
   - 46 - 50 hours
   - More than 50 hours (please specify number) ________________________

28. Listed below are 36 typical activities of Associate Deans and/or department chairs. What level of importance would you place on each activity as it relates to your own role?

Note – the following list of activities was gathered through a combination of the activities listed in Lydia Boyko’s (2009) survey tool as well as activities referenced in the literature review of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing departmental plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementing departmental plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involvement in student recruitment activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involvement in student retention strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Implementing institutional policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teambuilding in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reviewing existing programs and curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Developing new programs and curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participating in external audits of departmental programs and curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Maintaining relations with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note – the following list of activities was gathered through a combination of the activities listed in Lydia Boyko’s (2009) survey tool as well as activities referenced in the literature review of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Maintaining relations with parents of students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fundraising (building relations with alumni, foundations, other donors)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Maintaining relations with college enabling areas (i.e. marketing, facilities, HR, information technologies, registrar)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Building relations with other academic departments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Championing your unit within the college</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Representing your unit outside the college</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Attending convocation, award, celebratory events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Preparing budgets, handling other financial matters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Developing revenue-generating initiatives for the department</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Managing facilities, equipment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Maintaining departmental records</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Writing departmental reports</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Participating in committee meetings within the department</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Participating in committee meetings outside the department</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Evaluating faculty and other staff performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Dealing with serious performance issues</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Recruiting faculty and other staff</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Approving faculty and staff leaves</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Mentoring faculty</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Resolving faculty member conflicts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Resolving other staff conflicts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Assigning faculty course work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Assigning faculty-student advisors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note – the following list of activities was gathered through a combination of the activities listed in Lydia Boyko’s (2009) survey tool as well as activities referenced in the literature review of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>34. Providing professional leadership/setting example</th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Maintaining morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Encouraging good teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Develop/Create professional development opportunities for faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Succession planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. In order of importance to you, what do you feel are the three top priorities associated with your role?

1) __________________________________________
2) __________________________________________
3) __________________________________________

Have changes in the Ontario CAAT system affected the role  
(Addresses research question 1c)

30. Do you believe there are significant changes that have taken place within the Ontario college system between the years 2000 - 2014?  
☐ Yes  
☐ No  

31. If yes to above, please describe what you consider to be the most noteworthy changes:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

32. Do you believe the changes in the Ontario college system have had an effect on your job responsibilities?  
☐ Yes  
☐ No  

33. If yes to above, please elaborate:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Degree Implications:

34. Does your institution offer degree-level programs?
   - Yes
   - No

35. Are you directly involved in the delivery and/or development of degree programs at your institution?
   - Yes
   - No

36. Has the offering of degrees at your institution had a direct effect on your job responsibilities?
   - Yes
   - No

37. If yes, please explain:

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

38. Has the offering of degrees at your institution had an effect on your relationship with faculty members who report to you?
   - Yes
   - No

39. If yes, please elaborate:

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

Applied Research Implications:

40. Does your institution place significant importance on applied research? (i.e. have a Dean of Research, have an institution wide Research Agenda, a Research Ethics Board, contribute $s to research activity).
   - Yes
   - No

41. Are you directly involved in applied research activity at your institution?
   - Yes
   - No

42. Has the involvement in applied research had a direct effect on your job responsibilities?
   - Yes
   - No
43. If yes to above, please explain:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

44. Is there anything else related to research activity at your institution that you care to elaborate on:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Institutional Differentiation:

45. Has your institution been granted differentiated status such as Institute of Technology and Applied Learning (ITAL)?
   ❑ Yes
   ❑ No
   ❑ Don’t know (not sure)

46. Has the change in institutional status had a direct effect on your job?
   ❑ Yes
   ❑ No

47. If yes to above, please explain:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Other Changes:

48. Are there any other issues related to changes currently taking place in the Ontario CAAT system that you feel should be addressed?
   ❑ Yes
   ❑ No

49. If yes to above, please elaborate:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Middle Management Challenges (Relates to research question 1d)

50. Listed below are eight challenges identified in the literature as being directly related to middle-management roles. What level of importance would you place on each challenge as it relates to your own situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle-management challenges as defined by the literature:</th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acting as a communication conduit between senior management and front line workers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of input into institutional strategic planning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Getting front line workers to perform in accordance with management’s strategic decisions made at the senior level</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overcoming the sensation of feeling ‘Caught in the middle’</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ambiguity associated with the role</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lack of respect afforded the position</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time management stresses associated with the role</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of leadership development opportunities provided for middle managers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Are there other challenges related specifically to your role as a mid-manager college administrator that you feel should be captured? Is so, please elaborate:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
LEADERSHIP - Research question 2

Leadership Competencies deemed valuable to Associated Deans/Chairs (Relates to research question 2a).

52. The following chart contains a list of leadership competencies determined by the Chair Leadership Academy as being useful to college academic middle managers.

On a scale of 1 to 4 (1=not important, 4=very important), please indicate the degree of importance you place on the leadership competency as it relates to your own role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note – this series of leadership competencies is adapted from the Chair Leadership Academy. The Leadership Academy Program Competencies are aligned with the Competencies for Community College Leaders developed by the American Association of Community Colleges, and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges.¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP COMPETENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Clarify values through a personal and professional mission statement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Engage in reflective practice and journaling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator capable of building and sustaining relationships for individual and organizational success</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Be inclusive by appreciating, respecting, and valuing diversity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note – this series of leadership competencies is adapted from the Chair Leadership Academy. The Leadership Academy Program Competencies are aligned with the Competencies for Community College Leaders developed by the American Association of Community Colleges, and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Build and maintain effective relationships and work teams</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manage individual and team performance by appropriate delegation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrate recognition and celebration into the culture of teams and the organization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a thoughtful and diligent manager of talent who develops, coaches, and mentors others for individual, team, and organizational success</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Differentiate and develop talent and skill in roles and responsibilities as a leader and manager</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop and effectively lead high performance teams and work groups</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effectively mentor, coach, and develop talent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resolve and manage conflict productively</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand and utilize clear and effective practices for hiring for excellence</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Orient and retain employees and staff through effective management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop employees and staff through succession planning and professional development opportunities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop inclusive strategic plans for effectively managing and leading part-time staff⁷</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a studied, strategic, forward-thinking, and innovative leader who creates success through excellence in transformational leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note – this series of leadership competencies is adapted from the Chair Leadership Academy. The Leadership Academy Program Competencies are aligned with the Competencies for Community College Leaders developed by the American Association of Community Colleges, and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate and employ contemporary research and theory into organizational excellence and best practices in management and leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop and implement planning processes for strategic planning, scenario thinking, and disciplined decision making</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dissect processes and strategies for successfully implementing and managing change</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore and develop specific constructs and behaviors of transformational leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. Are there any leadership competencies not mentioned in the list above that you feel would help you to be successful in your role?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

54. If yes, please elaborate:
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

**Leadership competencies related to Change** (relates to research question 2c)

55. Do you believe that there are leadership competencies that would specifically help you lead the changes currently taking place in the Ontario college system?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

56. If yes, please explain:
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
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57. Has your institution provided you with any professional development and/or training opportunities to assist in leading the changes currently taking place?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

58. If yes, please elaborate:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

Leadership competencies related to Middle Management

59. Do you believe that there are certain leadership competencies that would specifically help middle-managers to be successful in their roles?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

60. If yes, please elaborate:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

61. Has your institution provided you with any professional development and/or training opportunities specifically related to middle-management leadership?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

62. If yes, please elaborate (i.e. do you think the training was beneficial, do you have suggestions for further training etc.)
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

Systems Theory (Relates to research question 2c).

63. Have you been exposed to systems theory as it relates to your current position?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

64. Has your institution provided you with any professional development and/or training opportunities directly related to practicing systems theory?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No
65. If yes, please explain:


DEVELOPMENTAL OPPORTUNITIES – Research Question 3

66. Do you personally believe that you have mastered the leadership competencies required to be successful in your role?
   □ Fully Mastered
   □ Mostly Mastered (with room for improvement)
   □ Somewhat Mastered (but not at the level required of the role)
   □ Lacking (definite need for leadership development)

67. Do you believe that there is a difference between leadership competencies and management competencies?
   □ Yes
   □ No

68. If yes, please elaborate:


69. How much importance do you place on mastering the leadership competencies that would help you be more effective in your role?
   □ Very important
   □ Somewhat important
   □ Not Important

70. Do you believe that your institution places importance on you possessing strong leadership competencies?
   □ Yes
   □ No

71. Has your institution provided you with any professional development and/or training opportunities directly related to leadership?
   □ Yes
   □ No

72. If yes, please explain:


73. Do you feel the leadership development your institution has provided you has been beneficial?
   □ Greatly
   □ Somewhat
   □ Very little

74. Do you have any suggestions to make the leadership development and/or training opportunities more effective:

75. Do you believe that your institution should do more to provide you with leadership development opportunities?
   □ Yes
   □ No

76. If yes, please elaborate:

77. Are you aware of leadership development opportunities provided to mid-level administrators in other colleges that your institution does NOT participate in?
   □ Yes
   □ No

78. If yes, please elaborate:

79. Please provide any additional feedback you believe would be relevant to this study - Leading change from the middle – an exploration of leadership competencies that would assist Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles.
Thank you for completing the online survey questionnaire!

Your assistance is greatly appreciated. Please contact me in writing or by email if you would like to be provided with a summary of the findings when the project is completed.

Would you be interested in participating in a follow up face-to-face interview to this survey? (The interview can possibly be done through Skype).

- Yes
- No

(I am happy to provide a $50 Keg gift certificate to face-to-face interview participants as an appreciation).

If yes to above, please provide your name and email address below:

________________________________________________________________________________________

(Note – Interviews would last a maximum of one hour and be scheduled to a time and location at your convenience – perhaps by phone or Skype. Six candidates will be selected for the interviews representing a purposeful sampling of this population.).

Sincere thanks:

Researcher: Gary Lima
Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4

Home address: ___________________________; Phone: ___________________________

Thesis Supervisor:
Peter Dietsche
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4

Email: ___________________________; Phone: 416-209-4324

Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto:
Telephone: 416-946-3273
Email: ethics.review@utoronto.ca
Appendix D.

Online Survey for Deans

RESEARCH FOR A DOCTORAL THESIS

ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE to DEANS

RESEARCHER – Gary Lima
Doctoral Student, OISE, University of Toronto

Title of study - Leading change from the middle: An exploration of leadership competencies to help Ontario CAAT Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles.

Note – this survey is an adaptation of the work formerly completed by Dr. Lydia Boyko (2009) through her Doctorate dissertation for the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

Acknowledgement of invitation to participate and consent:

I acknowledge that I have read the invitation to participate in the online survey. I have been provided the opportunity to ask questions or seek further clarification through direct contact with the researcher. I have also been provided contact information to the University of Toronto’s Office of Research ethics, as well as contact information to the researcher and the researcher’s thesis supervisor. This contact information can also be found at the end of this survey.

My understanding is that:

The findings of this study will be made available publicly in the form of a doctoral thesis. In no way will I be personally identified in any of the findings. There are no harms or consequences expected as a result of participating in the survey. Participation is completely voluntary and I am free to not respond to any question(s) that I do not wish to answer and may withdraw from the survey at any time without explanation or consequence. In the event I withdraw from the study, all responses will be shredded and/or permanently deleted and destroyed. I can notify the researcher of my desire to withdraw through email, written letter, or phone message.

All data collected in the survey will be digitally stored and protected through encryption. All data will be kept in confidence and secured as required by OISE University of Toronto and will be destroyed upon completion of the study. None of the participants will be identifiable in any way in reporting of the findings.

I have read the invitation to participate in this survey and freely consent:

☑ YES
☑ NO [Go to END]
DEFINING THE ROLE – Research Question 1

1. College name: ________________________________

2. Number of Associate Deans and/or Chairs who report directly to you: _____

3. Schools, Program areas or Program clusters you are responsible for:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Listed below are 38 typical activities of Associate Deans and/or department chairs. What level of importance would you place on each activity as it relates to the role?

Note – the following list of activities was gathered through a combination of the activities listed in Lydia Boyko’s (2009) survey tool as well as activities referenced in the literature review of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note – the following list of activities was gathered through a combination of the activities listed in Lydia Boyko’s (2009) survey tool as well as activities referenced in the literature review of this study.</th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing departmental plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementing departmental plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involvement in student recruitment activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involvement in student retention strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Implementing institutional policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teambuilding in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reviewing existing programs and curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Developing new programs and curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participating in external audits of departmental programs and curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Maintaining relations with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Maintaining relations with parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fundraising (building relations with alumni, foundations, other donors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Maintaining relations with college enabling areas (i.e. marketing, facilities, HR, information technologies, registrar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Building relations with other academic departments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Championing your unit within the college</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Representing your unit outside the college</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Attending convocation, award, celebratory events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Preparing budgets, handling other financial matters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Developing revenue-generating initiatives for the department</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Managing facilities, equipment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Maintaining departmental records</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Writing departmental reports</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Participating in committee meetings within the department</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Participating in committee meetings outside the department</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Evaluating faculty and other staff performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Dealing with serious performance issues</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Recruiting faculty and other staff</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Approving faculty and staff leaves</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Mentoring faculty</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Resolving faculty member conflicts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Resolving other staff conflicts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Assigning faculty course work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Assigning faculty-student advisors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Providing professional leadership/setting example</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Maintaining morale</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Encouraging good teaching</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Develop/Create professional development opportunities for faculty and staff</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Succession planning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. In order of importance to you, what do you feel are the three top priorities associated with the role?
   1) __________________________________________________________
   2) __________________________________________________________
   3) __________________________________________________________

Have changes in the Ontario CAAT system affected the role
(Addresses research question 1c)

6. Do you believe that significant changes have taken place within the Ontario college system between the years 2000 - 2014?
   □ Yes
   □ No

7. If yes to above, please describe what you consider to be the most noteworthy changes:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

8. Do you believe the changes in the Ontario college system have had an effect on the job responsibilities of the Associate Deans/Chairs who report to you?
   □ Yes
   □ No

9. If yes to above, please elaborate:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
Middle Management Challenges (Relates to research question 1d)

10. Listed below are eight challenges identified in the literature as being directly related to middle-management roles. What level of importance would you place on each challenge as it relates to the Associate Deans/Chairs who report to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle-management challenges as defined by the literature:</th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acting as a communication conduit between senior management and front line workers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of input into institutional strategic planning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Getting front line workers to perform in accordance with management’s strategic decisions made at the senior level</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overcoming the sensation of feeling “Caught in the middle”</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ambiguity associated with the role</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lack of respect afforded the position</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time management stresses associated with the role</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of leadership development opportunities provided for middle managers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Are there other challenges related specifically to the role of a mid-manager college administrator that you feel should be captured? If so, please elaborate:
In the questions that follow, leadership is defined as, “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives” (Yuki, 2002, p. 7).

Leadership Competencies deemed valuable to Associated Deans/Chairs (Relates to research question 2a).

12. The following chart contains a list of leadership competencies determined by the Chair Leadership Academy as being useful to college academic middle managers.

On a scale of 1 to 4 (1=not important, 4=very important), please indicate the degree of importance you place on the leadership competency as it relates to your own role.

Note – this series of leadership competencies is adapted from the Chair Leadership Academy. The Leadership Academy Program Competencies are aligned with the Competencies for Community College Leaders developed by the American Association of Community Colleges, and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP COMPETENCY</th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Be a competent, thoughtful, and introspective leader who values the talents and strengths of self and others</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify values through a personal and professional mission statement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manage the multiple roles and responsibilities of post-secondary leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appreciate, respect, value, and work effectively with others by understanding behavioral styles</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Value and maximize strengths for engagement and performance excellence</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engage in reflective practice and journaling</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a compassionate and conscientious communicator capable of building and sustaining relationships for individual and organizational success</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be inclusive by appreciating, respecting, and valuing diversity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note – this series of leadership competencies is adapted from the Chair Leadership Academy. The Leadership Academy Program Competencies are aligned with the Competencies for Community College Leaders developed by the American Association of Community Colleges, and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build and maintain effective relationships and work teams</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage individual and team performance by appropriate delegation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate recognition and celebration into the culture of teams and the organization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a thoughtful and diligent manager of talent who develops, coaches, and mentors others for individual, team, and organizational success</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate and develop talent and skill in roles and responsibilities as a leader and manager</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and effectively lead high performance teams and work groups</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively mentor, coach, and develop talent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve and manage conflict productively</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and utilize clear and effective practices for hiring for excellence</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient and retain employees and staff through effective management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop employees and staff through succession planning and professional development opportunities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop inclusive strategic plans for effectively managing and leading part-time staff</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a studied, strategic, forward-thinking, and innovative leader who creates success through excellence in transformational leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note – this series of leadership competencies is adapted from the Chair Leadership Academy. The Leadership Academy Program Competencies are aligned with the Competencies for Community College Leaders developed by the American Association of Community Colleges, and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Not Important</th>
<th>2. Little Importance</th>
<th>3. Quite Important</th>
<th>4. Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate and employ contemporary research and theory into organizational excellence and best practices in management and leadership</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop and implement planning processes for strategic planning, scenario thinking, and disciplined decision making</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dissect processes and strategies for successfully implementing and managing change</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore and develop specific constructs and behaviors of transformational leadership</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Are there any leadership competencies not mentioned in the list above that you feel would help Associate Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles?
   □ Yes
   □ No

14. If yes, please elaborate:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

15. Please provide any additional feedback you believe would be relevant to this study - Leading change from the middle – an exploration of leadership competencies that would assist Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs be successful in their roles.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
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Thank you for completing the online survey questionnaire!

Your assistance is greatly appreciated. Please contact me in writing or by email if you would like to be provided with a summary of the findings when the project is completed.

Sincere thanks:

Researcher:  Gary Lima  
Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education  
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)  
University of Toronto  
252 Bloor Street West  
Toronto ON M5S1V4

Home address:  
Email:  
Phone:  

Thesis Supervisor:  
Peter Dietsche  
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)  
University of Toronto  
252 Bloor Street West  
Toronto ON M5S1V4  
Email:  
Phone: 416-209-4324

Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto:  
Telephone: 416-946-3273  
Email: ethics.review@utoronto.ca
Appendix E.
Invite and Consent Form: Associate Deans/Chairs

LETTER of INVITATION and CONSENT to ASSOCIATE DEANS and/or CHAIRS to PARTICIPATE in DOCTORAL RESEARCH ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Doctoral Student, OISE, University of Toronto

Please Respond by April 12, 2015

Title of study - Leading change from the middle: An exploration of leadership competencies to help Ontario CAAT Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles.

Dear ________________,

My name is Gary Lima and I am currently a doctoral student enrolled in the Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. I am hoping to gain your assistance and participation in my doctoral thesis research project.

This purpose of this study is to explore the role of the Associate Dean and/or Chair within the Ontario colleges of applied arts and technology (CAAT) system, and specifically focus on an investigation of the leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles. The study is situated within the context of changes currently taking place within the Ontario College system as those changes are redefining aspects of the role.

I currently hold the role of Vice President Academic at Fanshawe College, but I have held previous roles as both Dean and Associate Dean. I hold the personal belief that colleges should do more to assist Associate Deans and/or Chairs build the necessary leaderships competencies required to be successful in their roles. The paper assumes a constructivist and advocacy approach.

I am inviting you to participate in an online survey questionnaire to assist me with my research. I realize that you are incredibly busy. To that end, the survey should take between 30-40 minutes to complete. You will be provided with a unique identification code upon entering the survey that will allow you to exit, save and return to the survey should you choose to do so. Reference to your unique identification code will also allow you to entirely delete your input to the survey should you wish to withdraw from the study.

The survey is password protected with access only available to myself and my thesis supervisor, Dr. Peter Dietsche (from the University of Toronto).

All data collected in the survey will be digitally stored and protected through encryption. All data will be kept in confidence and secured as required by OISE University of Toronto and will be destroyed upon completion of the study. None of the participants will be identifiable in any way in reporting of the findings.
No harms or consequences are expected as a result of participating in the survey. Participation is completely voluntary and participants are free to not respond to any question(s) that they do not wish to answer and may withdraw from the survey at any time without explanation or penalty. In the event you withdraw from the study, all your responses will be shredded and/or permanently deleted and destroyed. You can notify me of our desire to withdraw through email, written letter, or phone message.

Please be sure to read the acknowledgement of invitation to participate and consent section found at the end of this letter before accessing the survey that can be found at this link: https://pseinfosys.com/GLima_Survey

This invitation is extended to Associate Deans and/or Chairs in the Ontario CAAT system. The findings of this study will be made available publicly in the form of a doctoral thesis. The potential benefit shall be a deeper appreciation of the role and leadership competencies associated with the position of Associate Deans and/or Chairs in the Ontario College System.

Your contribution will help to bridge a gap in the literature related to the Ontario College Associate Dean and/or Chair.

In no way will you be personally identified in any of the findings. The actual data upon which the findings are based will remain confidential in all reports, publications and public presentations. A summary of the findings of this study will be made available to participants upon written or email request.

As an appreciation, I will be using a random selection process to offer $25 Tim Horton’s gift cards to eight participants of the online survey. Providing I receive a minimum of 100 responses, I will also use a random selection process to offer a $500 Best Buy gift certificate to one participant. Get yourself an iPad or new toy!

I will also be looking to interview a certain number of Associate Deans and/or Chairs in person in order to further explore this topic. The interview would last one hour and will be scheduled at a time and location of your convenience. If you would consider being interviewed for this research project, please check the appropriate box in the online survey.

If you have any further questions about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Gary Lima, Researcher

Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4

Home address:

Email:
or

Phone:
Acknowledgement of invitation to participate and consent

Participant Consent:

I acknowledge that I have read the invitation to participate in the online survey as previously described. I have been provided the opportunity to ask questions or seek further clarification through direct contact with the researcher.

I may choose to not respond to any question(s) that I do not wish to answer and may withdraw from the survey at any time without explanation or consequence. In the event I withdraw from the study, responses will be shredded and/or permanently deleted and destroyed.

Please access the survey through this link:
https://pseinfosys.com/GLima_Survey

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me or Dr. Dietsche directly.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

For information regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto: (telephone) 416-946-3273; (email) ethics.review@utoronto.ca

Gary Lima, Researcher

Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4

[Institution individual REB contact information would go here as appropriate.]

Thesis Supervisor: Peter Dietsche
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4

Email:  ; Phone:  416-209-4324
LETTER of INVITATION and CONSENT to DEANS
to PARTICIPATE in DOCTORAL RESEARCH ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Doctoral Student, OISE, University of Toronto
Please Respond by April 30, 2014

Title of study - Leading change from the middle: An exploration of leadership competencies to help Ontario CAAT Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles.

Dear _____________________,

My name is Gary Lima and I am currently a doctoral student enrolled in the Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. I invite you to participate in my doctoral thesis research project.

This purpose of this study is to explore the role of the Associate Dean and/or Chair within the Ontario colleges of applied arts and technology (CAAT) system, and specifically focus on an investigation of the leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles. The study is situated within the context of changes currently taking place within the Ontario College system as those changes are redefining aspects of the role.

I currently hold the role of Vice President Academic at Fanshawe College, but I have held previous roles as both Dean and Associate Dean. I hold the personal belief that colleges should do more to assist Associate Deans and/or Chairs build the necessary leaderships competencies required to be successful in their roles. The paper assumes a constructivist and advocacy approach.

I am inviting you to participate in an online survey questionnaire to assist me with my research. I realize that you are incredibly busy. To that end, the survey should not take more than ten minutes to complete. The results of this survey will be compared to the findings from a more extensive survey presented to Associate Deans and/or Chairs.

You will be provided with a unique identification code upon entering the survey that will allow you to exit, save and return to the survey should you choose to do so. Reference to your unique identification code will also allow you to entirely delete your input to the survey should you wish to withdraw from the study. The survey is password protected with access only available to myself and my thesis supervisor, Dr. Peter Dietsche (from the University of Toronto).

Please be sure to read the acknowledgement of invitation to participate and consent section found at the end of this letter before accessing the survey that can be found at this link: https://pseinfosys.com/GLima_Dean_Survey
This invitation is extended to Deans in the Ontario CAAT system. There are no harms or consequences expected as a result of participating in the survey. Participation is completely voluntary and participants are free to not respond to any question(s) that they do not wish to answer and may withdraw from the survey at any time without explanation or penalty. In the event you withdraw from the study, all your responses will be shredded and destroyed. You can notify me of our desire to withdraw through email, written letter, or phone message.

All data collected in the survey will be digitally stored and protected through encryption. All data will be kept in confidence and secured as required by OISE University of Toronto and will be destroyed upon completion of the study. None of the participants will be identifiable in any way in reporting of the findings.

The findings of this study will be made available publicly in the form of a doctoral thesis. In no way will you be personally identified in any of the findings. The actual data upon which the findings are based will remain confidential in all reports, publications and public presentations. A summary of the findings of this study will be made available to participants upon written or email request.

The potential benefit shall be a deeper appreciation of the role and leadership competencies associated with the position of Associate Deans and/or Chairs in the Ontario College System.

If you have any further questions about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4

Home address:
Email:
or
Phone:
Acknowledgement of Invitation to Participate and Consent

Participant Consent:

I acknowledge that I have read the invitation to participate in the online survey as previously described. I have been provided the opportunity to ask questions or seek further clarification through direct contact with the researcher.

I may choose to not respond to any question(s) that I do not wish to answer and may withdraw from the survey at any time without explanation or consequence. In the event I withdraw from the study, responses will be shredded and/or permanently deleted and destroyed.

Please access the survey through this link: https://pseinfosys.com/GLima_Dean_Survey

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me or Dr. Dietsche directly.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

For information regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto: (telephone) 416-946-3273; (email) ethics.review@utoronto.ca

[Institution individual REB contact information would go here as appropriate.]

Thesis Supervisor: Peter Dietsche
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4
Email: ; Phone: 416-209-4324
Appendix G.

Invite and Consent Form for Interviewees

LETTER of INVITATION and CONSENT to ASSOCIATE DEANS and/or CHAIRS to PARTICIPATE in DOCTORAL RESEARCH INTERVIEW REQUEST

Doctoral Student, OISE, University of Toronto

Please Respond by April 30, 2014

Title of study - Leading change from the middle: An exploration of leadership competencies to help Ontario CAAT Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles.

Dear [Prospective Participant]

My name is Gary Lima and I am currently a doctoral student enrolled in the Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. I invite you to participate in my doctoral thesis research project.

This purpose of this study is to explore the role of the Associate Dean and/or Chair within the Ontario colleges of applied arts and technology (CAAT) system, and specifically focus on an investigation of the leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles. The study is situated within the context of changes currently taking place within the Ontario College system as those changes are redefining aspects of the role.

In an earlier online survey that you completed related to this topic, you indicated that you would be willing to participate in a one-on-one interview to assist me with my research. I realize that your role places heavy demands on your time. To that end, the interview will not take more than one hour. If you consent, you will be contacted and the interview will be scheduled at a time and location of your convenience.

This invitation is extended to a cross-section of Associate Deans and/or Chairs in the Ontario College system who agreed to be interviewed in the online survey. There is no harm or consequences expected as a result of participating in the interview. Participation is completely voluntary and participants are free to not respond to any question(s) that they do not wish to answer and may withdraw from the project at any time without explanation or penalty. In the event you withdraw from the study, all your conversation will be destroyed. You can notify me of your desire to withdraw through email, written letter, or phone message.

The interview will be digitally recorded and then transcribed to a text format. All recordings and transcripts will be stored and protected through encryption. All data will be kept in confidence and secure as required by OISE University of Toronto and will be destroyed upon completion of the study. None of the participants will be identifiable in any reporting of the findings.
The findings of this study will be made available publicly in the form of a doctoral thesis. In no way will you be personally identified in any of the findings. The actual data upon which the findings are based will remain confidential in all reports, publications and public presentations. A summary of the findings of this study will be made available to participants upon written or email request.

As a thank you for participating in the interview, I am happy to provide you with a $50 gift card to the Keg Restaurant to be enjoyed at your convenience.

The potential benefit from your participation shall be a deeper appreciation of the role and possible assistance for Associate Deans and/or Chairs in the Ontario College System.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

If you have any further questions about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Gary Lima

Acknowledgement and consent to be interviewed:

I have read this invitation and consent to be interviewed. I have been provided the opportunity to ask questions or seek further clarification through direct contact with the researcher.

My understanding is that:

The findings of this study will be made available publicly in the form of a doctoral thesis. In no way will I be personally identified in any of the findings. There are no harms or consequences expected as a result of participating in the study. Participation is completely voluntary and I am free to not respond to any question(s) that I do not wish to answer and may withdraw from the interview at any time without explanation or consequence. In the event I withdraw from the interview, all responses will be shredded and/or permanently deleted and destroyed.

All data collected in the survey will be digitally stored and protected through encryption. All data will be kept in confidence and secured as required by OISE University of Toronto and will be destroyed upon completion of the study.

I can notify the researcher of my desire to withdraw my participation from this study through email, written letter, or phone message.

My signature herein signifies my acceptance for the researcher to use the data obtained for the purposes of this doctorate research project as outlined:

Name (printed): _________________________________________________
Signature: _________________________________________________
Job Title: _________________________________________________

I agree to have the interview recorded on an audio device and transcribed (please check): ☐

Date: _________________________________________________

Please retain a copy of this form for your records.
For information regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto: (telephone) 416-946-3273; (email) ethics.review@utoronto.ca

Gary Lima, Researcher

Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4

[Individual college REB information.]

Thesis Supervisor: Peter Dietsche
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4
Email: ; Phone: 416-209-4324
Appendix H.

University of Toronto Research Ethics Board Approval

PROTOCOL REFERENCE # 30164

June 10, 2014

Dr. Peter Dietsche
OISE/UT: LEADERSHIP, HIGHER AND ADULT
EDUCATION
OISE/UT

Mr. Gary Lima
OISE/UT: LEADERSHIP, HIGHER AND ADULT
EDUCATION
OISE/UT

Dear Dr. Dietsche and Mr. Gary Lima,

Re: Your research protocol entitled, "An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario college associate deans and/or chairs be successful in their roles"

ETHICS APPROVAL

Original Approval Date: June 10, 2014
Expiry Date: June 9, 2015
Continuing Review Level: 1

We are writing to advise you that the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Education Research Ethics Board (REB) has granted approval to the above-named research protocol under the REB’s delegated review process. Your protocol has been approved for a period of one year and ongoing research under this protocol must be renewed prior to the expiry date.

Any changes to the approved protocol or consent materials must be reviewed and approved through the amendment process prior to its implementation. Any adverse or unanticipated events in the research should be reported to the Office of Research Ethics as soon as possible.

Please ensure that you submit an Annual Renewal Form or a Study Completion Report 15 to 30 days prior to the expiry date of your current ethics approval. Note that annual renewals for studies cannot be accepted more than 30 days prior to the date of expiry.

If your research is funded by a third party, please contact the assigned Research Funding Officer in Research Services to ensure that your funds are released.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your research.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Wakefield, Ph.D.
REB Chair

Dean Sharpe
REB Manager
Appendix I.
Research Ethics Approvals for Colleges

Algonquin College Research Ethics Board
Certificate of Approval to Conduct Research

Protocol #: (54) 2014-AUG-LIMA

This is to certify that the Algonquin College Research Ethics Board (REB) has approved the application for the research project titled:

“An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles”

to be conducted by:

Gary Lima.

The members of the REB are satisfied that this research project, as described in the application package, meets the appropriate ethical standards as set out in Algonquin College Policy RED3 – Research Involving Human Subjects.

This certification is valid for one year from the date indicated below. If the researcher(s) wish to continue their study beyond the date indicated below, they will be required to submit an Application for Annual Renewal Form, available on the Algonquin College Research Ethics website.

If at any time during the course of the study the participants or researcher(s) encounter any adverse events, they are required to report them to the REB immediately, per RED3 – Research Involving Human Subjects.

If at any time researchers wish to change any aspect of the study (e.g. data collection, recruitment procedures, research personnel), the researchers must inform the REB of the proposed changes and request their approval prior to implementing any changes.

Upon completion of the project, and no later than one year from the date indicated below, the principal investigator is required to submit a Study Completion Report to the REB.

The members of the Algonquin College REB would like to wish the researcher(s) well in their research.

Louise Boudreault, Ph.D.
Acting Chair, REB
Algonquin College

September 2, 2014
Approval Date
September 2, 2014

To: Gary Lima

RE: An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics Approval</th>
<th>Original Approval Date: September 2, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expiry Date: September 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am pleased to inform you that the Cambrian College Research Ethics Committee has granted approval to the above-named research study under the REC’s delegated review process.

Please note that approval is based on the following:

a) The REC must be informed of any protocol modifications if they arise.

b) Any unanticipated problems that increase risk to the participants must be reported to the REC immediately.

c) The study is approved for one year. If needed, please apply for an extension before the expiry date.

d) A copy of the final report must be submitted to the REC upon completion of the project.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your project.

Sincerely,

Sherrill McCall
Dean, Planning and Research
Cambrian College
October 27, 2014

Gary Lima  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)  
University of Toronto

Dear Gary,

Re: Protocol #14-10-071A An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and / or Chairs be Successful in their Roles – University of Toronto #30164

It is our pleasure to advise you that the Research Ethics Board at Nipissing University has granted institutional approval for the research project as noted above, during the period of October 27, 2014 to June 9, 2015.

If you require additional time or an extension you are required to complete a Request for Renewal of an Approved Protocol form located at http://www.nipissingu.ca/academics/research-services/reb/Pages/Protocol-Forms.aspx

If there are any changes to the project you are required to advise the Research Ethics Board at ethics@nipissingu.ca.

At any time during your research should any participant(s) suffer adversely you are required to advise the Research Ethics Board at Nipissing University, (705) 474-3450 ext. 4055 within 24 hours of the event.

We wish you all the success in the completion of your project.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Susan E. Elliott Johns, Chair  
Research Ethics Board

cc: Research Services  
Dr. Peter Dietsche, OISE (Faculty Supervisor)
Mr. Gary Lima  
Fanshawe College  
August 5, 2014

**REB application # 206: An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles**

Dear Gary,

The Centennial College Research Ethics Board involving Human Subjects has reviewed your ethics review application and documentation and grants approval for the above-named study. The approval is based on the following:

1) The Centennial REB must be informed of any protocol modifications as they arise
2) Any unanticipated problems that increase risk to the participants must be reported immediately
3) You have one year approval for the study: if needed, an annual renewal form will be required at that time
4) A study completion form is submitted upon completion of the project.

These forms can be downloaded from the Centennial College ethics website:  
[http://www.centennialcollege.ca/applied/ethics/submitapplication](http://www.centennialcollege.ca/applied/ethics/submitapplication)

On behalf of the committee at Centennial, I’d like to wish you every success with your project.

Sincerely,

Lynda Atack, R.N., Ph.D
Chair
Research Ethics Board involving Human Subjects
Centennial College
Email: [redacted]
Tel: 416. 289-5000 x 4003
Certification of Ethical Acceptability
of Research Involving Human Participants

REB NUMBER: 136
REPORTS REQUIRED: Completion Report
TYPE OF REVIEW: Delegated
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary Lima, Office of the Senior Vice President Academics
DEPARTMENT: Fanshawe College
SPONSOR: Unspunored
TITLE OF PROJECT: An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles

APPROVAL PERIOD: September 8, 2014 to September 8, 2015

A delegated review was completed by members of the Conestoga College ITAL Research Ethics Board in which they examined the protocol which describes the participation of the human subjects in the above-named research project and considers the procedures, as described by the applicant, to conform to the College's ethical standards and the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2. As a result, the CCITAL REB has approved your application to conduct research using human participants at CCITAL.

Please include a statement on all documentation which participants will receive which notes that this application has been reviewed by and received approval from the Conestoga ITAL REB.

If you intend to use the online data collection tool Survey Monkey (or any other on-line data collection tool covered by the U.S. Patriot Act which allows the U.S. government to access data residing on U.S. servers) please specifically mention this fact in the information and consent letter.

This approval is for the research protocol described in the above-numbered application. If you wish to make substantive changes to any part of the application documentation you have provided for approval (i.e. to change items such as the research protocol, the information and consent letter, survey or questionnaire wording etc.), these proposed changes should be handled through a Change Request Form. Change Request Form

Adverse or unexpected events must be reported to the REB immediately with an indication of how these events affect, in the view of the Principal Investigator, the safety of the participants and the continuation of the protocol. Adverse Events Report

The Tri-council Policy Statement requires that the ongoing research be monitored by, at a minimum, a final report. Please note that it is the responsibility of the Principal Investigator to submit a Completion Report when all interaction with human participants is complete. Should you wish to continue your research beyond the approval period, you must request further approval from the REB. Completion or Renewal Request Report

On behalf of the REB, I wish you the best of luck with your research at CCITAL.

Approval Date: September 8, 2014

Russell Foubert, Chair
Research Ethics Board
Gary Lima  
Senior Vice President Academic  
Fanshawe College

Re: An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles

Thank you for your applications to our Research Ethics Board (REB). We are pleased to inform that the Confederation College Research Ethics Board has now approved your application to conduct the following study at Confederation College:

An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles

You may now begin your research. Note that the approval is based on the following:

1) The Confederation College REB must be notified of any protocol modifications as they arise
2) Any unanticipated problems that increase risk to the participants must be reported immediately
3) You have approval for one year from the date of the approval for the study. To ensure continuing approval, submit a request for annual approval to the Board 2-4 weeks prior to this date.
4) Please submit a summary of the results of your research with us as they become available.

If you have any questions regarding your submission or the review process, please do not hesitate to get in touch with Don Duclos at 807-475-6694 or email: [email]

Don Duclos  
Chair, Research Ethics Board  
Registrar, Confederation College
Gary Lima  
250 North Centre Road #29  
London, Ontario  
N6G 5A4

October 1, 2014

REB application: 071-1415 Gary Lima – An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles

Dear researcher,

The Durham College Research Ethics Board (REB) has considered your applications for ethical review of your research study and related documentation, and hereby grants approval for the above-named study. This approval is valid for a one-year period commencing on October 1, 2014 and will expire on October 1, 2015. The approval is based on the following:

1. All protocols from your revised application submitted on September 27, 2014 are adhered to;
2. Any unanticipated issues that may increase risk to participants or have other ethical implications that may affect participants’ welfare must be reported to the REB immediately and without delay;
3. The REB must be informed of any substantive protocol changes prior to any changes being implemented;
4. If you require an extension, a study renewal request must be submitted no less than 30 days prior to the expiry of this approval; and
5. Upon completion of the projects, a study completion report must be submitted on or before the expiry of this approval.

Forms for all reporting requirements will be distributed to you by email. Please submit all documentation and communications to [email protected]

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. On behalf of the REB, I’d like to wish you every success with your project.

Sincerely,

Dana Chorney, RN BSCN MN  
Chair, Research Ethics Board
Fanshawe College Research Ethics Review Board

Approval Notification of Proposed Research Involving Staff/Students and/or facilities at Fanshawe College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol Number:</th>
<th>14-07-28-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Researcher(s):</td>
<td>Gary Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Protocol Title:</td>
<td>An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project Start Date:</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected date of termination:</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents Reviewed:</td>
<td>Protocol; Appendices A-I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based solely on the ethical considerations raised by the research proposed in the application, the Research Ethics Board has completed its Delegated Review of the above Research Proposal and Approved the Project on August 22, 2014.

Comments and Conditions:

Please note that the REB requires that you adhere to the protocol reviewed and approved by the REB. The REB must approve any modifications to the protocol before they can be implemented.

Researchers must report to the Fanshawe REB:

a) any changes which increase the risk to the participants;
b) any changes which significantly affect the conduct of the study;
c) all adverse and/or unexpected experiences in the course of carrying out the study;
d) any new information which may adversely affect the safety of the participants or the conduct of the study.

Researchers must submit a Progress Report annually for all ongoing research projects. In addition, researchers must submit a final report at the conclusion of the project.

ETHICS APPROVAL DOES NOT CONSTITUTE PERMISSION TO CONDUCT THE RESEARCH, AND APPROVAL FOR CONDUCTING THE PROJECT MUST BE OBTAINED FROM THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY IN WHOSE AREA THE RESEARCH WILL TAKE PLACE, OR IN THE CASE OF COLLEGE WIDE SURVEYS THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING.

Members of the FCREB who are named as investigators in research studies, or declare a conflict of interest, do not participate in discussion related to, nor vote on, such studies when they are presented to the FCREB.

August 22, 2014

Mr. Steve Crema, BA, MA
Acting Chair, School of Health Sciences
Fanshawe College
September 30, 2014

Gary Lima
Glima@fanshawec.ca

Re: Submission to Research Ethics Board for Approval of Research Protocol

Dear Gary,

The Fleming College Research Ethics Board (REB) received your application for Ethics approval to carry out research involving humans on July 26, 2014.

The REB met on August 29, 2014 and reviewed your proposal. Our review concluded with a decision of Approved as Submitted.

Approval #20140930 - Lima

This approval expires September 30, 2015. Should you require an extension please contact the REB one month prior to your approval expiration.

Please note your responsibilities under section 6 of Fleming College’s Policy 2-216 including that you are required to report any changes from your research protocol, any adverse events, any unforeseen harm, or any unanticipated risks or problems.

Best wishes in your research.

Sincerely,

Michele J. McIntosh,
Chair, Research Ethics Board
Dear Mr. Lima,

RE: REB file # 6004031 Title: An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles

We are writing to advise you that the Research Ethics Board (REB) has granted approval to the above-named research study, for a period of one year, under the REB’s expedited review process. Please note that approval is based on the following:

Please add the GBC REB contact information on all information letters and consents for the participants at GBC.

In addition:

a) The REB must be informed of any protocol modifications as they arise.
b) Any unanticipated problems that increase risk to the participants must be reported to the REB immediately.
c) The study is approved for one year: if needed, apply for a renewal before the expiry date.
d) A study completion form must be submitted to the REB upon completion of the project.

The following documents have been approved for use in this study: the information letters, consent, and questionnaires. Please insert the ethics approval number (6004031) into these documents. Each participant should receive a copy of his or her consent form.

Please quote your REB file number (6004031) on future correspondence.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your study.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Evans, RN, MN, EdD
Chair, Research Ethics Board
cc: Applied and Institutional Research, George Brown College

It is the responsibility of the Principal Researcher to keep the file complete and up-to-date at all times.
10/17/2014

Gary Lima

Dear Gary:

Re: Study Number 1314-61

Study Title: An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles

The Georgian College Research Ethics Board (REB) has completed its review of your submission. Your research project now has Georgian College research ethics approval for a one-year period. Please note that before proceeding with your project, compliance with other required approvals/certifications, institutional requirements, or governmental authorizations may be required.

Please note that REB approval policies require that you adhere strictly to the protocol as last reviewed by the REB and that the Research Ethics Board must approve any modifications before they are implemented. Adverse or unexpected events must be reported to the REB as soon as possible. If research subjects are in the care of a health facility, at a school, or other institution or community organization, it is your responsibility to ensure that the ethical guidelines and approvals of those facilities or institutions are obtained and filed with the Georgian College REB prior to the initiation of any research.

It is expected that you will abide by the Ontario Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and any other privacy legislation or institutional procedures relevant to your project. If you have any questions regarding the Act please contact me directly.

Please be advised that if the project is not renewed, approval will expire and no more research involving humans may take place. If you wish to extend your research beyond the date this approval expires, please submit a Renewal form.

When you have completed your research or when this approval expires, please submit a Final Report to REB.

If you have any questions regarding your submission or the review process, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me at 705.728.1968, ext. 5583 or [redacted].

Congratulations and best of luck in conducting your research.

Richard Acton-Rinaldo, Ph.D.
On behalf of the Georgian College Research Ethics Board

c. Dr. Peter Dietsche
September 2, 2014

Gary Lima  
Office of the Senior Vice President Academic  
Fanshawe College  
1001 Fanshawe College Boulevard  
P.O. Box 7005  
London, ON  N5Y 5R6

Dear Gary,

Your project, An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles, received delegated review by members of the Humber Research Ethics Board and was approved pending revisions. These revisions have now been completed.

Your protocol number is 0298. Please use this number for any application for amendment or continuation.

Your project has been approved for one calendar year from the date of this letter, until September 2, 2015. If you require an extension, or you revise your research methodology, please visit the Humber Research website (www.humber.ca/research) to locate the appropriate form.

When you complete your project, please submit a copy of the Completion Report for the project, along with a copy of the document, paper or other artifact that results from your research. The form for this report can also be found on the Humber research website.

Congratulations and best wishes as you pursue your research interests.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul Griffin, PhD  
Chair, Humber Research Ethics Board
OFFICE OF THE CHAIR OF THE RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

September 22, 2014.

Project Title: “An Exploration of Leadership Competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be Successful in their Roles”

Project #: LAM105

Principle Investigator: Gary Lima

The project “An Exploration of Leadership Competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be Successful in their Roles” has been subject to a delegated review by the Lambton College REB. We are pleased to inform you that the project has been approved.

We will expect a final report once the project is complete.

On behalf of the members of the Lambton College REB, I wish you success with your project.

Regards,

Beth Ann Wiersma
Chair, Lambton College Research Ethics Board

Cc: Mehdi Shiekhzadeh, Dean, Applied Research
September 4, 2014

Principal Investigator: Gary Lima
Research Study: An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles
SLC REB #2014-101GL – Loyalist College

This application was subject to:

☐ Full Board Review  ☑ Delegated Review

Dear Gary:

I am writing to advise you that the Research Ethics Board (REB) of St. Lawrence College (the REB of record for Loyalist College) has granted Approval to the above-named research study. Your research may start at Loyalist College.

You have one year to complete the project from the time of approval. Should you require more time to complete your project, you will be required to submit a Request for Continuation (or Amendment) of an Approved Project Form, in order to obtain ongoing ethics approval for your project. This must be submitted prior to REB approval expiry.

Any changes to the approved protocol or consent materials must be reviewed and approved through the amendment process prior to its implementation. Both a Request for Amendment of an Approved Project form and a revised SLC REB application must be submitted to the research office for review by the REB.

Any adverse or unanticipated events should be reported to the REB as soon as possible. The REB reserves the right to review your file at any time to ensure that research is being conducted in accordance with all SLC policies.

Once your project is complete, you are required to complete a Project Termination form. This form must be submitted as a final report about your research to the REB.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Alison Tucker
Chair, Research Ethics Board

cc. Cam McEachern, Director, Research
Carly Kelly, Loyalist College
# Research Ethics Board
## CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Lima</td>
<td>VPA, Fanshawe College</td>
<td>14-016-C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTITUTION(S) WHERE RESEARCH WILL BE CARRIED OUT:**
Multi-site across colleges

**FACULTY ADVISOR (if student research):**
Peter Dietsche

**SPONSORING AGENCIES:**
NA

**TITLE:**
An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVAL TYPE</th>
<th>APPROVAL DATE</th>
<th>APPROVAL PERIOD (YEARS)</th>
<th>COMPLETION REPORT/ RENEWAL DUE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>October 20, 2014</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>October 20, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CERTIFICATION**

The protocol describing the above-named project has been reviewed by the Mohawk College Research Ethics Board and the procedures were found to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research involving human subjects.

---

Approval of the Research Ethics Board by:
Donna Rawlin, RN, BScN, MSc(T), PhD(student)
Chair

This Certificate of Approval is valid for the term indicated provided there is no change in the experimental procedures.
Research Ethics Board (REB)
researchethics@niagaracollege.ca

APPENDIX A – LEVEL OF RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW AND MONITORING
APPLICATION FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>September 4, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator:</td>
<td>Gary Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Department/Division and/or Institution (if not Niagara College):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB File Number:</td>
<td>NC2014-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Certificate Number:</td>
<td>CEC-NC2014-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Date:</td>
<td>September 4, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Research Study:</td>
<td>Leading Change From the Middle – An Exploration of Leadership Competencies to Assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be Successful in their Roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHICS CLEARANCE GRANTED - LEVEL 1 (Review and Monitoring Level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Clearance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiry Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final/Interim Report Due Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Niagara College Research Ethics Board (REB) has reviewed the above-named research study and considers the procedures, as described in the application, to conform to the College’s ethical standards and the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Human Participants (TCP5 2). Clearance has been granted from 9/4/2014 to 8/31/2015.

During the course of your research, all substantive changes (e.g., changes that may increase the level of risk to participants) and significant changes to the final approved documentation as described in the application; unanticipated issues or events that have/may increase the risks to participants; and research study time extension requests, must be reported as soon as possible to the REB by submitting the Request for Changes to a Previously Approved Research Ethics Application – Form. The proposed changes shall not be implemented without REB clearance, except when necessary to eliminate any immediate risks to the participants. If you anticipate for your research study and/or involvement with research participants to extend beyond the expiry date, you are required to submit your request before 7/31/2015.

A Research Study Status Report and End-of-Study Report – Form, shall be submitted to ensure the continuing research ethics review of approved research projects and to report the completion of a research study. The form shall be submitted as follows; at minimum, an annual status report (for multi-year research projects), and an end-of-study report (for projects lasting less than one year). Continued approval of multi-year projects is contingent on timely submission of report.
APPENDIX A – LEVEL OF RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW AND MONITORING
APPLICATION FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

The REB has the mandate to review and monitor the ethical conduct of research, which includes approving, rejecting, terminating, and suggesting modifications to any approved or ongoing research study. Refer to the attached Appendix A - Level of Research Ethics Review and Monitoring, for information on your research study’s level of monitoring. As the principal investigator, you hold the responsibility and are required to monitor your research to ensure that it is conducted in an ethical manner; supervise all team members in the application of the research procedures; ensure that all researchers are qualified and versed in the conduct of ethical research; and protect the welfare of all research participants. The REB requires that you adhere to the protocol as last approved by the Board. Any unreported/unauthorized changes to the research study and its final documentation, as well as failure to comply with the information outlined in this certificate may lead for the REB to rescind the Certificate of Ethical Clearance.

In addition, all research involving research participants in the care of a health facility, at a school, or other institution or community organization, shall receive approval from those entities prior to the initiation of any research protocols. In all cases, please ensure that your research complies with the TCPS 2 and Niagara College standards.

We wish you success with your research.

Approved:

Andrea Bodnar, Co-Chair

Tatiana Young, Co-Chair

Best Regards,
Niagara College Research Ethics Board
August 18, 2014

Gary Lima
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto
250 North Centre Road, Unit 29,
London ON N6G5A4

Re: Ethics Review Application – File #14-04

Dear Gary,

Thank you for applying to the Research Ethics Board (REB). I am pleased to inform you that the Northern College Research Ethics Board has now approved your application to conduct the following study at Northern College:

"An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario college associate deans and/or chairs be successful in their roles"

You may now begin your research.

Please note that your REB approval is contingent upon your adherence to the exact procedures and documents as described in the final version of the application documents that you have submitted to the REB as of this date. Should you make any substantive changes to your research processes from what has been described in these application documents, or should you wish to do any research beyond what was described in the application in the future, you will need to re-apply for REB review and approval. You are not permitted to implement any changes until you have received the written approval of the REB.

Researchers are expected to keep detailed records of their research activities (i.e., interview log sheets, signed consent forms etc.) in a secure place along with the data collected and destroyed when the data is destroyed in accordance with the REB approved application. Please notify me when you research has been completed.

All the best with your study.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Name]

Aaron Klooster, Chair
Northern College Research Ethics Board

C: Tori Hanson, Director Trades and Technology
Notification of Initial Approval

Date: November 19\(^{th}\), 2014

Principal Investigator: Mr. Gary Lima Ph.D. Student

Study Title: An Exploration of Leadership Competencies to Assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be Successful in Their Roles

Date of Review: November 19\(^{th}\), 2014

Expiry Date: November 18\(^{th}\), 2015

Documents Approved: Ontario Community College Multi-site Application
- Letter of Invitation to Participate and Consent
- Online Survey Questionnaire to Associate Deans/Chairs
- To Participate in Doctoral Research Interview Request
- Interview Questions
- Letter to Heads of Ontario CAAT Human Resources
- Methodology

Type of Review: Full Board

Documents Acknowledged: Ontario Multi-site REB Application Form

The Sault College Research Ethics Board has reviewed and approved your application.

This approval is valid for one year. If your study continues past the expiration date as noted above, you will be required to submit an ethics application. The REB must be notified of the completion or termination of this study and a final report provided.

Any changes to the approved documents must be approved by the REB prior to implementation.

If, during the course of this study, there are any serious adverse events, confidentiality concerns, changes in the approved project, or any new information that must be considered with respect to the project, these should be brought to the immediate attention of the REB.

All study related documents should be retained so as to be available to the Sault College Research Ethics Board upon request. They should be kept for the duration of the project and for at least 5 years following study completion.

Sincerely,

Co-chair, Sault College Research Ethics Board
October 24, 2014

To: Gary Lima
Email: [REDACTED]
CC: Thomas McLerie, Chair, Seneca REB

Re: Ethics Review Application – File #14-20

Dear Gary Lima:

Thank you for applying to the Research Ethics Board (REB). I am pleased to inform you that the Seneca Ethics Review Board has approved your application to conduct the following study at Seneca College:

"An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles"

You may now begin your research.

Please note that your REB approval is contingent upon your adherence to the exact procedures and documents as described in the final version of the Ethics application documents that you have submitted to the REB as of this date. Should you make any substantive changes to your research process from what was described in these application documents or should you wish to do any research beyond what was described in the application in the future you will need to re-apply for Ethics Review and approval. You are not permitted to implement any changes until you have received the written approval of the REB.

Researchers are expected to keep detailed records of their research activities (i.e., interview log sheets, signed consent forms etc.) in a secure place along with the data collected and ensure that the data are destroyed in accordance with the REB approved application. Please notify me when your research has been completed.

All the best with your study.

Sincerely,

James Watzke, Ph.D.
Dean, Applied Research and Innovation

8 The Seneca Way, Suite 1004, Markham, Ontario L3R 5Y1
Tel: (416) 491-5050 ext. 77901, Fax: (905) 479-5461 e-mail:
September 3, 2014

Gary Lima
Senior Vice President Academic
Office of the Vice President Academic
1001 Fanshawe College Blvd.
London, ON N5Y 5R6

Re: Sheridan Research Ethics Board – Delegated Approval
REB Ref SREB N° 2014-09-004-026

Dear Mr. Lima,

The review process of your application for the ethical review of research at Sheridan is now complete. Your application, “An Exploration of Leadership Competencies to Assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be Successful in their Roles” has received delegated REB approval for this project.

Please note that a third party may access the SREB office file. You will be informed should access be given to anyone but yourself and members of your research team to your files.

Please contact me for any questions or clarification you may need.

Sincerely,

Dr. Kirsten Madsen, Chair
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Sheridan Institute of Technology & Advanced Learning
November 7, 2014

Mr. Gary Lima
Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V4

Reference: 2014-01-Lima

An Exploration of Leadership Competencies to Assist Ontario Colleges Associate Deans and/or Chairs to Be Successful in Their Roles

Dear Mr. Lima:

The St. Clair College Research Ethics Board, by means of a (Full) Board Review, has approved your proposal entitled ‘An Exploration of Leadership Competencies to Assist Ontario Colleges Associate Deans and/or Chairs to Be Successful in Their Roles’ for ethical compliance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (TCPS2) and St. Clair College Research Ethics policy.

In accordance with the Tri Council guidelines and the St. Clair College Research Ethics Policy, your project has been approved for one year. At the end of your term of approval, the St. Clair Research Ethics Board will ask if your project has been completed and if not, what changes have occurred or will occur in the next year period. We commend you on the relevance, timeliness and meaningfulness of this research topic. During the review however, it was noted that there was no mention of a date where participants could withdraw from the study. The board suggests that a date of this nature should be included.

You are reminded of your responsibility to advise the St. Clair College Research Ethics Board of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period. An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the St. Clair College Research Ethics Board within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the St. Clair College Research Ethics Board. For example, you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures.

On behalf of the St. Clair College Research Ethics Board, I wish you success in your research.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Jody Merritt
Chair, St. Clair College Research Ethics Board

cc: S. O'Neil, Director of Applied Research and Development
September 25, 2014

**Principal Investigator:** Gary Lima  
**Research Study:** An exploration of leadership competencies to assist Ontario College Associate Deans and/or Chairs be successful in their roles  
**SLC REB #2014-102GL**

This application was subject to:

- [ ] Full Board Review  
- [x] Delegated Review

Dear Gary:

I am writing to advise you that the Research Ethics Board (REB) of St. Lawrence College has granted **Approval** to the above-named research study. Your research may start at St. Lawrence College.

You have one year to complete the project from the time of approval. Should you require more time to complete your project, you will be required to submit a **Request for Continuation (or Amendment) of an Approved Project Form**, in order to obtain ongoing ethics approval for your project. This must be submitted prior to REB approval expiry.

Any changes to the approved protocol or consent materials must be reviewed and approved through the amendment process prior to its implementation. Both a Request for Amendment of an Approved Project form and a revised SLC REB application must be submitted to the research office for review by the REB.

Any adverse or unanticipated events should be reported to the REB as soon as possible. The REB reserves the right to review your file at any time to ensure that research is being conducted in accordance with all SLC policies.

Once your project is complete, you are required to complete a **Project Termination form**. This form must be submitted as a final report about your research to the REB.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your project.

Sincerely,

Alison Tucker  
Chair, Research Ethics Board

cc. Cam McEachern, Director, Research
Appendix J.

Face-to-Face Interview Questions: Associate Deans/Chairs

RESEARCH FOR A DOCTORAL THESIS

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

RESEARCHER: Gary Lima
Doctoral Student, OISE, University of Toronto

Title of study:
Leading from the middle: An exploration of leadership competencies to help Ontario colleges Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles.

Interview Questions:

Opening statement:
You have agreed to participate in this study and interview as described in the emailed letter of invitation and consent. You are free to discontinue the interview at any time. You are also free to withdraw from the study at any time and all data related to this interview will be shredded and/or permanently deleted and destroyed.

Understanding the role:

1. Tell me how you came to be hired into this role – what was your background in terms of education and work experience, were you appointed, were you interviewed etc? (Relates to question 1a).

2. In your opinion, what are the most important responsibilities associated with your role? (Relates to question 1b).

3. Were you provided with an accurate job description and explanation of responsibilities associated with your role when you were hired? (Relates to question 1a).

4. There has been much written in the literature related to the roles of middle managers. Do you feel there are distinctive challenges associated with your role – that is the role of middle management? (Relates to questions 1d).

5. Have you participated in any leadership development opportunities prior to assuming this role? If so, what were they? (Relates to question 1a, 3a).

Changes in the system:

6. Are you directly involved in the delivery and/or development of degree activity at your institution? (Relates to question 1c, 2b, 3d)

7. Has your involvement in degrees activity at your institution had a direct effect on your job responsibilities? (Relates to question 1c, 2b, 3d)
8. Are you directly involved in applied research projects at your institution? (Relates to question 1c, 2b, 3d)

9. Has your involvement in applied research had a direct effect on your job responsibilities? (Relates to question 1c, 2b, 3d)

10. Has your institution been granted differentiated status such as Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (ITAL) or Polytechnic Institute? (Relates to question 1c, 2c, 3d)

11. Has the change in institutional status had a direct effect on your job? (Relates to question 1b, 2c, 3d)

12. Have any of these changes in the system affected your relationships with people that you work with? (Relates to questions 1b, 1c, 2b, 3d)

13. Are the any other major changes going on in the Ontario CAAT system that you believe affect your role and/or responsibilities? (Relates to research question 1c).

14. If yes to the above, how so? (Relates to research question 1c).

**Leadership:**

In the questions that follow, leadership is defined as, “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives” (Yukl, 2002, p. 7).

15. Do you believe that having strong leadership competencies are important to the success of your role? (Relates to questions 2a, 2b, 3d)

16. If yes to above, please elaborate – what competencies? (Relates to questions 2a, 2b, 3d)

17. Do you believe that there are certain leadership competencies that would specifically help you to lead the changes currently taking place within the system? (Relates to questions 2b, 3d).

18. If yes to above – which competencies (this is directly related to leading change)? (Relates to questions 2b, 3d).

19. Do you feel that it is the responsibility of your institution to provide you with development opportunities related to leadership? (Relates to question 3c).
20. Are there current leadership development opportunities for Associate Deans/Chairs at your institution? (Relates to questions 3a, 3b).

21. If yes and you have participated, do you feel that they are they effective? (Relates to questions 3a, 3b).

22. Do you believe that your institution provides you with adequate training and/or PD opportunities for you to develop leadership competencies you feel required in your role? (Relates to research question #3b).

23. If you have not prior to this interview, would you participate in leadership development opportunities should they be made available to you? (Relates to question 3c).

24. Are you aware of any future leadership development opportunities that will be made available to you in the relatively near future? If so, what are they? (Relates to question 3aB)

25. Are there any stories you can tell where having strong leadership competency proved useful in your position? (Relates to questions 2b).

26. Are there any stories that you can share where having lack of strong leadership competency proved a disadvantage in your position? (Relates to question 2b)

27. Are you familiar with the term, “systems thinking”? (Relates to question 2c).

28. Do you think there should be training related to systems thinking as part of your job? Would that prove beneficial? (Relates to question 2c, 3c).

29. Do you feel a study such as this is warranted (An exploration of leadership competencies to help Ontario colleges Associate Deans and/or Chairs to be successful in their roles)?

Thank you for participating in this interview!

Your assistance is greatly appreciated. Please contact me in writing or by email if you would like to be provided with a summary of the findings when the project is completed.

Gary Lima:
Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4
Email: [email] or [email] ; Phone: [phone]
Appendix K.
Letter to Heads of Ontario CAAT Human Resources

LETTER TO HEADS OF ONTARIO CAAT HUMAN RESOURCES

Doctoral Student, OISE, University of Toronto

Please Respond by April 30, 2014

Title of study - - Leading change from the middle – an exploration of leadership competencies that would assist Ontario CAAT Associate Deans/Chairs to be successful in their roles.

Dear ________________,

My name is Gary Lima and I am currently a doctoral student enrolled in the Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. I invite you to participate in my doctoral thesis research project.

This purpose of this study is to explore the role of the Associate Dean and/or Chair within the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT) system, and specifically focus on an investigation of the leadership competencies that would help them to be successful in their roles. The study is situated within the context of changes currently taking place within the Ontario College system as those changes are redefining aspects of the role.

The potential benefits of the study shall be a deeper appreciation of the role, and possible assistance for Associate Deans and/or Chairs in the Ontario College System. I will happily share the results of my findings across the Ontario CAAT system if requested.

Prior to sending this letter, I have received approval from your institution’s Research Ethics Board to conduct an online survey with Associate Deans and/or Chairs. The survey focused on gaining a more fulsome understanding of their roles, and an exploration of the leadership competencies they feel would assist them to lead the unprecedented amount of change currently taking place in the system.

It would also be incredibly beneficial for me to also obtain any institutional documentation related to this topic. To that end it would be greatly appreciated if you would provide information related to the following topics:

1. A job posting related to the role of Associate Dean and/or Chair. (Perhaps you could point me to something on-line if that proved more convenient).

2. A job description (obviously without salary referenced) from your institution describing the duties and responsibilities associated with the role of Associate Dean and/or Chair.

3. A brief description of any Leadership Development opportunities provided for Associate Deans and/or Chairs at your institution. (Please respond directly in the body of this text or in the email).
Acknowledgement and consent:

The findings of this study will be made available publicly in the form of a doctoral thesis. Your willingness to participate in this study is completely voluntarily. Please be aware that any information you provide might be found in my final dissertation. You may respond to all, some or none of the requests at your discretion. Any, some or all of the information you submit shall be removed from this study at your request (other than information already made available to the public from your institution’s website).

Please advise me by email, phone or letter if you wish to exclude any of the information provided by you from my final dissertation. Any data related to information that you ask me to exclude shall be destroyed.

I have read the invitation and consent to respond to this brief questionnaire. My response signifies my acceptance for the researcher to use the data obtained for the purposes of this doctorate research project as outlined:

Name (printed):  

Job Title:  

Date:  

Thank you for participating in this research project!

Your assistance is greatly appreciated. Please contact me in writing or by email if you would like to be provided with a summary of the findings when the project is completed.

Researcher:  Gary Lima  
Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education  
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)  
University of Toronto  
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4

Thesis Supervisor:  
Peter Dietsche  
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)  
University of Toronto  
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto ON M5S1V4

Email:  
Phone:  416-209-4324

Home address:  
Email:  
Phone:  

Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto:  
Telephone: 416-946-3273  
Email: ethics.review@utoronto.ca
Appendix L.

Background Experience of Face-To-Face Interview Participants

AD/Chair AA (Business cluster): had been a faculty member in advertising and communication for almost 20 years, and also had coordinating experience prior to assuming his/her current role. He/she accepted the role as a developmental opportunity—when he/she accepted it, there was a three-year window where he/she could have changed his/her mind and returned to faculty. At the time, he/she had not considered this role, but was encouraged to apply which he/she did as there was nothing to lose (as he/she could always return to a faculty position). He/she was the successful candidate in a competition for the role. Originally, full-time faculty did not report to this position, but due to a restructuring, full-time faculty now do report to this position. He/she currently holds an MBA acquired after assuming the position.

He/she was provided with a job description (at the time of hiring) that was fairly accurate; however, the role has changed a lot now that full-time faculty report directly to this position.

AD/Chair BB (Applied Arts cluster): did not come to the role in the traditional manner. He/she was not a former faculty member, and had spent years in different admin roles in various institutions, many in the Office of the Registrar. However, he/she did work closely with faculty assessing student admission requirements into college. He/she does not currently hold a Master’s degree but notes it is now a requirement on job postings for the Associate Dean/Chair role at his/her current institution.

He/she claims the job description “absolutely did not” match the job. He/she claimed what he/she found surprising was the volume of student issues, and the competition for new students.

AD/Chair CC (Business Cluster): had been a faculty member for over 14 years, and a program-coordinator for most of that time, prior to accepting the role of AD/Chair. He/she had been identified through succession planning as a potential AD/Chair and had been sent to the Chair’s Academy as a developmental opportunity far in advance of assuming the role. He/she had experience in developing new programs and was instrumental in helping hire part-time faculty (as a coordinator). He/she was the successful candidate for his/her current role through a job competition—this was the third time he/she had applied for an Associate Dean/Chair role. There was a Masters requirement with a specific discipline for the role, and although he/she already had a Masters in higher education, he/she was strongly encouraged to pursue a second Masters related to the discipline of the portfolio he/she now manages, which he/she is currently doing. Note—he/she has not completed the 2nd Masters on time due to the heavy time demands of his/her current job.
He/she claims there was absolute truth in the job description; although admits that managing various relationships, particularly partnerships with other institutions, was more complicated than originally anticipated.

AD/Chair DD (Health cluster): has a credential as a Registered Nurse, has taught in nursing programs, and also has some international experience. He/she started in the college as sessional part-time faculty, became full-time faculty and then a program coordinator. He/she has held various mid-level management positions including a secondment in the Centre for teaching and learning. He/she was encouraged to apply for an AD/Chair position (in another portfolio) and was the successful candidate. Then due to restructuring, he/she was moved to his/her current AD/Chair position. He/she manages various college/university partnership degree programs. He/she has a Master’s of Science graduate credential.

He/she claims that aspects of the job description were accurate; however, it did not capture all the nuances of the role, particularly day to day management issues that could only be learnt through hands on experience.

AD/Chair EE (Applied Arts cluster): is a graduate from a diploma program in the college where he/she is currently employed. He/she is a former part-time faculty member who also coordinated some projects, but was never full-time faculty. He/she was encouraged to apply for the AD/Chair role because of his/her industry and entrepreneurial experience. He/she attained the job as the successful candidate through an interview process, and was not required to have a Master’s degree at the time. He/she has since been encouraged to pursue a Masters, which he/she is now doing. He/she enjoys the Master’s program but finds it difficult to complete due to time demands of the current job.

He/she claims the job was completely new when he/she assumed it, so it is not fair to assess whether the job description was accurate. He/she also claims that there was a steep learning curve when he/she started the job, particularly around budgeting, hiring practices, and program development.

AD/Chair FF (Applied Arts cluster): had previously held an Acting Dean position at a regional campus. Prior to this, he/she had responsibility as a program manager and a continuing education manager. Most of his/her experience has been in admin; although, he/she also spent about two years teaching in order to gain perspective of the faculty position. He/she was appointed into his/her current position. Has a Master’s degree that he/she did while working.

He/she says there was no job description when he/she assumed the role as it was a new position. At the time of hiring, he/she acted as a conduit between faculty members and the Dean. He/she claims that the role has evolved and now entails a lot more responsibility, specifically, managing full-time faculty who now report to this position.

AD/Chair GG (Technology cluster): was a faculty member for 18 years at his/her institution prior to assuming his/her current role. He/she was encouraged to apply
for the current AD/Chair role; however had no interest at that time. They were a family oriented unit that had very little turnover, so in order to maintain continuity and keep a family atmosphere, he applied for the job and was the successful candidate. He/she does not hold a Graduate degree and will not be pursuing one at this time.

He/she claims the responsibilities associated with the role were outlined in the job description; however, the description did not accurately capture what it took to be successful in the role.