

A leadership deficit: The discipline of development

**Linda M. Ellington, Ed.D.
Palm Beach Atlantic University**

Abstract

The world is facing a leadership deficit within higher education institutions. These very institutions have the opportunity to fill the gap by identifying emerging “best practice” leadership programs and developing curricula to eliminate the deficit. A narrow functional expertise in leading post secondary institutions is passé; what universities demand will be those who are familiar with ways of increasing revenue, running competitive commercial-like organizations, and yet be a traditional administrator in a university setting. They must understand what universities are about and empathize with them, but they must also know how to run a business within a university. Few college presidents have served previously as deans of business schools, but the task of leading a college is demanding the incorporation of business capabilities as an important intellectual engine in the leading of these institutions. A specific course curriculum to develop this type of leader may be the critical success factor in eradicating the deficit.

Keywords: Leadership deficit, emerging higher education leaders.

Introduction

Today more than ever, there is a need for academic leadership that reflects a business attitude, and more importantly, business acumen. Slaughter and Leslie state, “Policy makers at the level of the nation state, whether responding to pressure from the market, international capital mobility, or the business class, are concentrating state money on higher education units that aid in managing or enhancing economic innovation and thereby, competitiveness” (1997). The overarching purpose of this paper is to try to convince traditional post-secondary leaders that the leadership deficit should be considered serious and the ideas presented in this paper may move them into action. The desire of this author is to ask leaders to judge it as useful to the extent that it helps them understand how the development of the leaders, prior to obtaining their position, will close the deficit gap that is occurring in the ‘business’ of academics. This will take discipline on the part of today’s leaders to implement the proposed seven course developmental curricula. The paper is an attempt to share “best practices” that is proven to be successful at the University of London, and examine the opportunity to transfer those best practices into the United States’ higher educational system. This may be the beginning of eradicating the skill deficit of those who are charged with leading post secondary institution through the 21st century.

Organization

The paper begins with a discussion on the leadership deficit and follows with a program outline that encompasses coursework vital to post-secondary leadership in the 21st century. It examines the central ideas of these “best practices” and explores an emergent model of leadership and global application based on a 2003 research conducted at the University of Oxford, United Kingdom. There is an argument for business-enterprise benchmarking methods to be used within the academic environment, and for leaders to investigate a number of courses and learning tasks that would accelerate the development of those who have the desire to lead a Higher Education Institution (HEI) but not the skills nor the know-how in which to be successful in the competitive global environment. The objective of this paper is to challenge the future HEI leaders to engage in such learning tasks, unmask traditional power, overcome fear of change, reclaim courageous leadership and practice a new style of leading. The paper’s conclusion is a statement on how leaders can combat the tendencies to ignore the business aspect of a university and provide a practical and relevant curriculum to teach future leaders a new approach to leading post secondary institutions.

The awareness of the deficit

The environment of higher education is changing, and doing so at unprecedented speed and on a global scale. Historically it has been commonplace for a leader of a university to come from the ranks of academia. However, there is a chasm between being an academic and moving into a post-secondary leadership role. The chasm is a traditional mindset, lack of experience in a business enterprise environment, minimal preparation for such leadership, and lack of familiarity with all the aspects involved in

managing and leading a college or university. More recently, powerful external stakeholder groups have imposed a template of college-as-business-enterprise on higher education (Lyons, 2004).

Since higher educational institutions have historically been insulated from the business-enterprise configuration, and although the significant differences between higher education and business enterprises will remain, society is inviting a mindset into academia that is demanding an increase in value of the education and accountability from the colleges' leadership. Along with the financial stringency that accompanies this mindset is that universities learn the art of financial survival in the new world (Williams, 2003). The increasing number of college presidents hired from outside academia reinforces this new paradigm.

In the 21st century, post secondary leaders are expected to design compelling visions, manage people efficiently, and steer their institution to profitability; but, where are the developmental actions that provide that skill or learning for these leaders? Consideration of the "best practice" learning presented in this paper may inspire leaders to experiment with different approaches in the way they develop future post-secondary leaders, or even allow space for the transferring of the best practice to occur within their university. For example, how do we teach academics to 'run on the edge' if running on the edge is a competitive skill to possess? Those courageous leaders who are edge runners don't fit squarely into any one box. In their leadership journey they interpret trends from the marketplace, translate messages across the departments, and envision the future impact of today's decisions and actions. Running on the edge is a behavior of a leader who knows how to use their campus infrastructure to generate income. One example of using a campus infrastructure as a cutting edge endeavor is the University of Warwick's campus grocery supermarket. According to the 2002 Earned Income Report, the intrapreneurial enterprise generated over £4 million in one year. "The University of Warwick's supermarket is the most successful grocery store market of its type in the United Kingdom," stated a key leader at that university. In order to have a successful supermarket that is a model for the industrial sector, it was important to adopt a 'runners on the edge' mindset, and that is often seen as risk taking by the university" (Smith, 2003).

Being a leader who runs on the edge does not come without its challenges and often they clash with more traditional, rule-bound colleagues, and they are often frustrated by organizational systems that are risk averse. And yet with today's unprecedented speed of change, diverse, and globalized world, HEIs need to develop these special people in order to stay competitive. A specific developmental curriculum that provides the laboratory for these new leaders to explore the opportunities and foster their creativity in all aspects of their leadership role is critical to the sustainability of a competitive college.

In the curricula there should be discussions on how academic leaders can generate income for their academic business, (intrapreneurial mindset) and also explore how the leaders of income generating ventures run their businesses that are not in the academic arena. This is a very different aspect of college leadership than traditional perspectives. Kanter describes this type of experience as "opportunities for integrative thinking that actively embrace change," (1983). She stated in her book, *The Change Masters*, those schemes to create mechanisms for exchange of information and new ideas across boundaries, and ensure that multiple perspectives are taken into account in decision-

making, provide an environment where innovation flourishes (1983). Now 23 years since her book was published, we are still able to identify a gap in leadership that does not have such schemes in place. If we wish to create such schemes as Kanter describes, there needs to be a developmental curriculum strategy that prepares leaders, such as college deans, or even department chairs, and ultimately presidents of colleges and universities. To do this well, leaders need to understand what universities are about and empathize with them, but they also need to know how to run a business within a university. This dichotomy requires the leader to know how to maintain a balance between the often-conflicting demands of non-traditional actions and the core mission of the university. Universities need to know how to successfully manage the tensions between old and the new, between tradition and iconoclasm, between continuity and change. The University of Oxford is in some sense the same institution that came into existence in the thirteenth century, in every detail, apart from a few remnants of buildings and occasional references to Greek philosophers; now it comprises a different set of ideas, entities, and activities (Williams, 2003).

The business of universities and college is knowledge. A modern university creates and interprets information and ideas and it trades in them. Until the late twentieth century, ideas and information evolved slowly. However, the need for the university enterprise to ensure survival and success is speeding up. New ideas need to be acted on almost immediately or they will be appropriated elsewhere (Williams, 2003).

“Universities are based on knowledge, but no university or set of universities can stop or even seriously slow its international growth. Caught in the swell of knowledge production, even the richest institutions find full coverage of old and new fields beyond their capability” (Clark, 1998). The “best practices” captured in this paper identify courses that may just transform a traditional leader into the leader required for the 21st century.

What does it mean to lead in a higher education institution? As a practicing educator in England, Michael Shattock suggests several specific ways leaders can help escape a traditional thought of leading in an academic setting (Shattock, personal communication, August 16, 2005). One innovative strategy is through specific coursework in which future leaders will learn to identify their skills and techniques that transform their academic strength and link it to leading a business. Another scheme would be to learn in an international virtual classroom with leaders who are enrolled in the same type of specific coursework. This collaborative international laboratory would expose leaders to alternative approaches to leading by gaining an understanding and awareness of the enterprises their global colleagues are learning to lead. This experience may be a catalyst in closing the gap of the leadership skill deficit. It will provide initiatives that will serve to create global thinking leaders who will understand academics, business practices, and a global perspective of leading. The phenomenon of leading a university as a business creates a need for a leader to have feet in both camps; the academic side of the university and the business aspects of leading a dynamic, forward moving university.

The direction of university leadership is being transformed due to many factors; limited governmental and tuition based funding, global thinking, speed of technology changes, and the cost of not developing leaders to provide the new direction of universities. We must know that we cannot untransform and then transform. The

transformation is a process, and the ideas presented in this paper may be the impetus to the transformational change on how to prepare leaders of higher education.

The discipline to develop

The strategy underlying the outline of the best practice coursework from the MBA in Higher Education Program at the University of London maximizes the impact of gaining business acumen while also learning the academic nuances within a post secondary institution. The time and energy invested in this effort will pay both short and long term benefits, not the least which is competitive posture for the institution and its sustainability. These potential leaders may be described as hybrid leaders who have academic excellence with industrial relevance (Smith, 2003). The person selected to fill the highest position within an institution needs to be familiar with ways of making money, running competitive commercial organizations, and yet be a traditional administrator in a university setting. They must know what today's universities are about. They must empathize with them, but must know how to run a business within a university. The right person to lead a HEI is one who is able to commute fluidly between university and industry. It is difficult to get a leader who is good at both business enterprise and university. Because if a leader is doing business enterprise they do not know about universities and if they are doing universities they do not know about business-enterprises. If missing either of those in the future, it is probably terminal in being able to lead a university that is innovative, competitive, and a place where intrapreneurial creativity flourishes.

The proposed course contents offer an intellectual and professional challenge that will become recognized components in the professional formation of future higher education leaders in the United States. The courses will foster the creation of a community of practice, including an international community with the proposed collaborative work with international institutions. Six of the courses are an example of what is being taught in the program at the University of London, and the seventh is a new course designed for providing future leaders to look through the lens of a different approach to leading. The total program from the University of London would not be instantly transferable to United States' higher educational institutions, and it would be unjust to attempt to do so. However, there are some elements within the program that would transfer well into the American structure if today's leaders are open to change, and are not feint of heart. The proposed program would consist of seven courses:

1. Higher education and research institutions as organizations: Strategic Management.
2. The management of financial resources in higher education: Principles of university finance.
3. Management of teaching and research in higher education.
4. Institutional governance and marketing considerations in higher education.
5. The management of third stream activities in higher education.
6. The international role of higher education.
7. The virtual laboratory of international collaboration in a movement toward a theory of participative self-governance.

The foundation of the design of the courses demonstrates an understanding of the concept of a dichotomy in leading higher educational institutions. Leaders are never to lose sight of the mission to teach, conduct research, and service, but yet the new world is expecting the leadership to know how to be creators of wealth for the institution and to do so with a business-enterprise mindset. The importance of knowledge in wealth creation has steadily grown and is now about to leap to a much higher level and cross additional borders as more and more parts of the world plug into an ever growing, ever changing, ever more accessible planetary brain bank (Toffler, 2006).

There is a temptation to design a course from scratch; however, the speed of change in higher education would benefit from implementing the “best practices” that can be easily transferred into a university setting. The business-enterprise does not always create from scratch; they identify benchmarks and adopt the proven and successful elements from the benchmarks to move their organization forward. Academic benchmarks, such as these proposed courses, should be explored and courageously implemented. To grasp the significance of this proposed higher educational leadership program, we need to recognize that no institution exists in isolation, and the development of leaders rests on these core ideas, which if mastered, can make sense in realizing that the university, although a powerful component of a larger macrosystem, is becoming a college-as-business-enterprise.

Course Outlines:

Course 1: Higher education and research institutions as organizations: Strategic Management.

This course introduces students to organizational theory and to concepts of strategic management, strategic positioning, and strategic thinking using models from both the private and public sectors, as well as from higher education itself. Several of the elements within this course are: 1) organizational theories and organizational culture, including global cultures; 2) introduction to strategies of HEIs, the governments, and the market for intrapreneurial endeavors; 3) for-profit strategies in translation research; 4) the management of change in HEI; and, 5) management of planning, opportunities, and uncertainty.

There is and will continue to be a growing need for ongoing and effective strategic visioning, the process that facilitates strategic leaders to see, construct a compelling vision, and chart a new course with integrity (Huber and Walker, 2005). Huber, et al, continues to state that although applicable to many different organizational contexts, strategic visioning is often viewed as an elusive and confusing concept. This is primarily due to the myriad of leadership theories and ever-increasing pile of literature contending for the mind of the practitioner. Yet too often, the literature highlights the significance of strategic vision without answering the critical question of *how* to effectively navigate this complex and sometimes treacherous strategic leadership process (2005). This course must answer that question.

Course 2: The management of financial resources in higher education: Principles of university finance.

This course offers a generalist's view of a specialist subject. It does not cover any of the technicalities of accounting practice, but focuses instead on finance as an integral aspect of university management (both public and private). It provides participants with a broad understanding of where the traditional funding comes from to operate a university, a college or even a department, how the leaders choose to spend it, and how the leaders try to control expenditures. Case studies will be used in understanding:

1. Trends and diversity in university funding
2. Basic dynamics of a university's internal economy
3. Systems of control and what goes wrong with them

In addition, new opportunity funding sources, such as intrapreneurial endeavors, must be understood. Some of the elements in this course are: a) changing patterns of financing HEIs; b) economics of university borrowing; c) institutional arrangement for resource allocation; d) generating non-state income (private funding); e) finance-led strategic position; e) principles of the development planning of a university foundation; and, f) combining aesthetics with usefulness in university building.

Course 3: Management of teaching and research in higher education.

This course is concerned with teaching and research and how they are 'managed' and by whom. Teaching and research are the core business of higher education institutions, but their 'management' at departmental or institutional level does not always reflect this. The ideas discussed in-depth in this course are: 1) external pressures for accountability, improve performance, and greater effectiveness; 2) the nature of professional expertise – skill, function and role; 3) building a research culture across all colleges; 4) teaching and research relationship building; and, 5) the meaning of quality and the effectiveness of quality assurance mechanisms, and their impact on HEIs.

Course 4: Institutional governance and marketing considerations in higher education.

The aim of this course is to introduce the students to the principles and practice of institutional governance and to consider them critically from a higher education perspective. Corporate governance issues in higher education have become increasingly important, as many HEIs have undertaken large-scale reforms in their governance. This course addresses this theme and examines evidence of changes in institutional governance and the roles of key players and structures.

There is a focus on marketing management, strategic marketing, competitive positioning, and satellite and online campuses as implicit management tools within higher education. Each aspect of structure and operation is singled out for analysis and study.

Course 5: The management of third stream activities in higher education.

This course examines the institutional management issues involved in what are often called, "third stream" activities, covering higher education institutions' roles in economic development, regional engagement, relations with industry, intellectual property, and the exploitation of research outcomes. "Translational research" raises significant strategic and financial issues for institutions in their relations to mainstream teaching and research.

In depth case studies will be used on how third stream activities are integrated into overall institutional strategies, how they are managed and on what financial basis, what risks they entail; and, how they are reconciled with other concepts of higher education institutions' roles in society.

Course 6: The international role of higher education.

This particular course explores some of the biggest challenges that higher education institutions face today due to the increased pressures from globalization. The students critically examine the international activities of various universities and the management issues raised at the various leadership levels within the institution. Topics covered will include student recruitment, academic concerns of overseas students, international student exchanges, remote campuses, and competition and collaboration in international research. This course would be an effective experience for international 'virtual' classroom collaboration.

Course 7: The virtual laboratory of international collaboration in a movement toward a theory of participative self-governance.

In addition to the six courses described, it is important to gain a practical understanding how to lead, not in terms of industrial age leading, but in terms of leading knowledge workers. The leadership style discussed in this section is a fresh idea, and one with powerful new tools for thinking about and preparing for the future. Probing into this new leadership behavior adds to the scholarly works of Apps' theory that a "new kind of leader, with a new approach to leadership, is essential for postsecondary institutions" (1994).

Learning about the application of a participative self-governance leadership (PSG) approach may be a pivotal learning point in the developmental strategy for emerging HEI leaders. The fundamental characteristics of this leadership framework are:

1. Independent scholars;
2. Future oriented momentum is based on decisions derived from a basis of persuasion, discussion, debate, and consultation;
3. Significant amount of time working and learning together (meshing); and,
4. Synergy of brilliance.

This course's concept is for the learners to first understand each of the characteristics of PSG and then have the opportunity to apply it in a collaborative, international learning laboratory.

Characteristic One: *Independent Scholars*

An important element of a PSG structure consists of independent scholars. A leader at the University of Oxford stated, "Everyone thinks they are their own boss and by the very nature of this university people are bright and independently minded. They know that the leadership style of self-governance creates incredible people who work together and do incredible things" (Smith, 2003). What this leader does is share success stories. Heifitz

stated, “We must avoid the pressure to be heroic and to think of ourselves as one who can solve an organization’s problems alone. Instead we work together on it. That process is quite painful, because the university historically wants to project hopes, dreams, and antagonisms onto some heroic figure. The leadership style must be one that knows it cannot solve this problem alone, but can do so together. There is no one boss and no heroic figure” (Apps, 1994).

And yes, there are independent scholars in PSG theory, but the university, by its governance, has some framework of regulations. However, leading with the PSG leadership style the university operates in an outward oriented manner and knows that it is a body that needs to be engaged with the world outside. There is no direct authority that will block the exploration or the ability to discuss new ideas, new expeditions with academic or public and private enterprises throughout the world.

The PSG style is designed to allow leaders to gain access to senior level people in industry, and do so without permission from the university or asking for approval through a committee. “If we, as future oriented leaders, are going to give the universities real live programs we must do so without waiting for the academics to take twenty years to decide,” stated a PSG leader at the University of Warwick (Smith, 2003).

The mitigating factor in the “independent scholar” characteristic of PSG is that the university encourages innovative leaders to do things differently and to not be burdened with a standard academic process, up to a point. PSG leaders give permission for organizations inside the institution to set their tone, the vision and the pace of their organization, and communicate this to the university without a directive telling them the path and the vision they should set for their organization.

Leadership without leading is not only motivational, but because of this style, everyone connected to the university or college can see the business getting better, and that it is within their hands to create wealth for their organization and the university; even if it is to increase enrollment in a medieval writing interpretation course. Leadership without leading is an attitude of the PSG leader who wants the innovative side of the university to be successful, as well as the traditional aspects. Self-governance enables leaders to go in the direction they believe they should, do what they think they should do, and then bring people together to ensure it happens. “Because of the faith in self-governance, I am able to synthesize issues, decide the resolution of the issues, and discuss the issues and solutions through,” stated a leader at the University of Warwick (Smith, 2003).

The strength of a PSG style of leading allows for people to find ways to be creative, innovative, and to resolve conflict in their own leadership way. The faith in self-governance is demonstrated by the university always moving forward, taking calculated risks, leveraging the talent they hire, and not dictating the exploration and experimentation efforts. A professor at the University of Oxford stated, “This style of university leadership is exciting because you can see how innovation can work in a totally different environment than from the traditional aspect of university leadership” (Smith, 2003). Everyone bears the responsibility for the consequences of their performance and the effect it may have on the university’s image, reputation and fiscal contribution. However, there is no one breathing down the neck or measuring the daily performance. This enables initiatives to occur, universities to grow, expand, and become dynamic. These transformed institutions will gain the reputation for being innovative.

Once you dictate how to innovate, you lose creativity (Smith, 2003). Give the professors and leaders their space in which to be innovative and do not interfere in a directive sort of way. This is the genesis of a future oriented university.

Characteristic Two: *Decisions by discussion, debate, persuasion and consultation*

This characteristic is not leadership by executive decision making or control. Self-governing leadership enables creativity and innovation to be supported by debate and persuasion, and not by directives or control. This is a change from the executive culture where rules and regulations come down from the top. Covey stated, “We live in a Knowledge Worker Age but operate our organizations in a controlling Industrial Age model that absolutely suppresses the release of human potential” (2004). He further writes that the mind-set of the Industrial Age that still dominates today’s workplace will simply not work in the Knowledge Worker Age and new economy (2004). Everything should be thought about, discussed, debated, and justified. What is important though is to ensure that this democratic process does not slow things down. The majority of the debates and consultations are not done in committees but are done by sitting and talking with each other. Leaders are empowered to lead by their expertise in negotiating skills, their persuasion skills, and their acceptance to risk. The decisions are based on the leaders working with each other, debating each side of the issues, and then moving forward to ensure success of the decision. One of the key traits of ensuring this decision-making style works is to make relationships work. Everyone in the university is a microcosm of what the university does, so it is important that every one talks, discusses, and debates when making decisions not only for their organization, but also for the university.

An example of this style of decision making in practice is when a key leader at the University of Warwick was negotiating a contract with an overseas company. He needed to hedge currency and needed to do financial activities that universities are not geared to do. Through his discussions and persuasive skills with the university, he reached a ‘go ahead’ decision on risking the funding. Decisions are not always unique, but many times are trying to improve the competitiveness of the university, and as long as decisions are made in a democratic process, the posture of the competitiveness is incorporated into the forward movement of the university.

It takes courage and a reputation of speaking the truth when debating and discussing. Imaginative leadership is needed in the university system. Courageous leadership is needed that allows for the decision making process to be based on debates and consultation rather than on directives from executive orders. Going out to the front line and taking risks is an important element, but one must do so from the groundwork of discussing and consulting, not only with internal stakeholders, but also the external stakeholders.

Characteristic Three: *Time and effort talking and learning together*

This element of PSG leadership requires a significant amount of time and effort spent talking together as a team. PSG leaders are supportive of each other, rather than the prescribing of actions. An example of support for each other is:

There was a professor in the University of Oxford who was running a company in his research lab using research students. Supposedly this person had told the technology transfer office about this because he wanted to sell the company. The potential buyers wanted the university to write a letter stating that they had no ownership to the intellectual property.

The university did have a claim. Here is a perfect example of one academic who was a mile outside the intellectual property regulations. So what did the leadership do? They spent a significant amount of time helping him back over the fence. PSG leaders helped him to stay within the intellectual property regulations, and maintained the relationship with the academic professor, who is the person leaders are at the university to support. (Smith, 2003).

This support action is known as meshing. It is when leaders spend most of their time talking and learning in concert with a number of interested parties so that everyone knows what is occurring in the university. The talking and learning is bi-directional, which enables leaders to interact appropriately with the internal factions of the university, but also with the outside world. The time talking and learning is essential for innovation to flourish. “What is key to ensuring success is that there is common sense, there is a great deal of talking, and that we share our process and our knowledge” stated a professor at the University of Oxford (Smith, 2003). Leaders need to be willing to always exchange views, and mix academic and administrative teams to work together. The evolution occurring in HEIs is all about creating cross-disciplinary teams who can work together on a project, rather than one single department to take on the work. This is a key focus of PSG leadership. This teamwork support structure enables the university to be seen as doing the right thing in a professional way for the university’s competitive posture on a global scale.

Characteristic Four: *Synergy of Brilliance*

The process of learning from each other feeds the value and application of applying this learning to innovation within a university. “This value is fostered by working in a climate where there is an appreciation for a strong perfectionist way of doing things,” stated a leader at the University of Warwick (Smith, 2003). The synergy of brilliance is demonstrated by the fact that as a PSG leader what you say your team can deliver, your team must deliver, and the results must be of the highest standard. Extraordinary results are achieved because of the brilliant people the university hires to perform the university work. Leaders need to use the strength of the synergy to move the university forward and thus, affect the shape and the direction of the university.

The financial bottom line will not be achieved unless the university hires the right skills with the right attitudes and, decisions and direction are based on that synergy. Collins (2001) stated, “We must first get the right people on the bus, the right people in the right seats, and the wrong people off the bus, and then figure out where to drive it.” “We achieve results because of the people we hire. Not only because they are good scientists, or good leaders, but because they share their expertise and apply this sharing by supporting and helping as opposed to being self serving,” stated a key leader at the University of Oxford (Smith, 2003).

“There is an admiration for my leadership in bringing senior level people in government and the world of policy and practice to a point where they are thirsty for research and then we bring them into real partnership with the university. There is also admiration for the capacity to turn that skill into funded projects,” stated a University of Warwick academic leader (Smith, 2003). The atmosphere that the PSG leader creates and maintains is one where everyone is explicitly valuable and the strategies developed are based on that value. Without this leadership skill, the university would not proceed effectively and competitively in the direction it chooses.

Overall, the PSG leader needs to be familiar with concepts of generating revenue, running competitive commercial organizations, and yet be a traditional administrator in a world-class university. PSG leadership is a democratic style of leadership in which individual contribution is critical to the acceptance of decisions and directions agreed to by the leadership core. “Leadership decisions need to be taken on the outcome of a balance of influence rather than on pure procedures put in place by leaders” (Handy, 1993). To apply this leadership style within an HEI it is important that the leader has academic excellence combined with business relevance. PSG leaders identify the best, nurture cooperation, create the environment that enables the synergy of brilliant people, and then get out of the way for innovation to occur.

Conclusion

Few college or university presidents have served previously as deans of business schools, but the task of leading a college is demanding the incorporation of business capabilities as an important engine in the leading of these institutions. A program of specific courses to develop this type of leader is the critical path in eradicating the skill deficit.

Universities are expecting more of their leaders, and leaders in all chairs – but in particular, college deans, department chairs, and presidents. This paper is an effort to address important issues, but nothing as important as reducing the skill deficit of those leading HEIs, and their ability to compete globally. Future leaders need to engage their university into exploring, studying, and closing the deficit gap in leadership skills and abilities. The responsibilities of university leaders are enormous, and leaders are needed who can see opportunity, make bold but intelligent decisions, and implement solutions - all in an uncertain world.

Little is written about the best way to develop leaders who demonstrate the desire and courage to fulfill a leadership position within higher educational institutions, such as a department chair, deans, or even presidents of colleges and universities. There has been no roadmap for such positions. It is time for us to look at ‘international’ best practices, and emerging leadership styles.

This paper foresees the critical need for new leadership that will be required in 21st century higher education institutions. If we have the courage, and do not allow those who are feint of heart to discourage the intrapreneurial spirit of new ideas, and we find ways to implement these seven courses, then just possibly we have begun the journey to eliminate the deficit in HEI leadership. Kotter tells us that we do not create change unless we establish a sense of urgency (1996). The urgency is upon us, and we need to begin the process of developing HEI leaders who are exposed to the proposed innovative

classes. They need to develop and experience using a PSG leadership style. The specific program from the University of London would not be instantly transferable to US Higher Education institutions, and it would be unjust to attempt to do so. However, this paper identifies proposed coursework that may easily transfer well into the US structure if the leaders are open to change, and have the courage to create a university that is different than the one they are currently leading. A narrow functional expertise in leading post secondary institutions is passé; what universities demand will be those who are familiar with ways of generating revenue, running competitive commercial organizations, and yet be a traditional administrator in a university setting.

References

- Apps, J. (1994). *Leadership for the emerging age*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, B. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities*. Oxford, UK: IAU Press.
- Collins, J. (2001). *From good to great*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Covey, S. (2004). *The 8th habit*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Handy, C. (1993). *Understanding organizations*. New York: Penguin.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Huber, N., & Walker, M. (2005). *Emergent models of global leadership*. Maryland: James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership.
- Kanter, R. (1983). *The change masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lyons, R. (2004). *Success strategies for adjunct faculty*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, L. (2003). *Leadership: The intrapreneurial experience at the University of Oxford and the University of Warwick, United Kingdom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Toffler, A., & Toffler, H. (2006). *Revolutionary wealth*. New York: Random House.
- Williams, G. (2003). *The enterprising university*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.