

**FINAL REPORT**  
**Steering Committee on the University of Wisconsin System**  
**Summer Leadership Institute**  
**September 1999**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Members of the Steering Committee on the Summer Leadership Institute .....ii**

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. The Importance of Leadership Development.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. The 1999 Institute.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. Participant Evaluations.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. Recommendations .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6. Timeline and Budget for 2000 Institute.....</b>	<b>7</b>

### **Appendices: Documents from the 1999 Summer Leadership Institute**

- A. Data on Full-time UW Administrators in Top Salary Ranks, by Gender and Multicultural Status
- B. Sample Letter of Appointment to Steering Committee
- C. Letter of Invitation to Chancellors, Selection Criteria, Goals, and Proposed Outcomes
- D. Readings Distributed to Participants and Speakers
- E. Information Packets on Participants and Speakers
- F. Session Schedule
- G. Summary Of Participant Evaluations

**Members of the Steering Committee on the Summer Leadership Institute:**

Kate Davy, Co-chair, Dean, School of the Arts, UW-Milwaukee  
Gerard McKenna, Co-chair, Dean, College of Fine Arts & Communication, UW-Stevens  
Point

Marcia Bromberg, Vice President for Finance, UW System  
Jane Crisler, Dean, UW-Rock County  
Heidi Fencil, Director, Women and Science Program, UW System  
Suzanne Griffith, Women's Studies Coordinator, UW-Superior  
Judith L. Kuipers, Chancellor, UW-La Crosse  
Margaret Karsten, Director, Extended Degree Program, UW-Platteville  
Joan North, Dean, College of Professional Studies, UW-Stevens Point  
Mark Perkins, Chancellor, UW-Green Bay  
Mary Pinkerton, Associate Dean, College of Letters & Science, UW-Whitewater  
Pat Takemoto, Special Assistant to the Senior Vice President of Administration, UW  
System  
Jacqueline Ross, Director, UW System Women's Studies Consortium (ex officio)  
Gregory Vincent, Assistant Vice Chancellor, UW-Madison  
Donna Weber, Affirmative Action Officer, UW-Stout

**Staff:**

Laura Stempel Mumford, Staff Director, Initiative on the Status of Women  
Cate Irsfeld, Assistant to the Staff Director (October 1998-April 1999)  
Geeta Raval, Assistant to the Staff Director (May-November 1999)

## **1. Introduction**

A major quest for the University of Wisconsin System is to educate and prepare our students for a world of increased multicultural and global opportunities. Positioning our institutions for this changing environment requires energetic commitment, visionary leadership, and a more diverse and multicultural workforce. The small number of women and minorities among senior administrators of the University of Wisconsin System has been a long-standing concern in achieving this goal. In 1997-98, for example, only 24.4% (90 of 369) of full-time administrators in the top salary ranks (\$75,000 and above) were women, 4% (18) were identified as multicultural, and 1.8% (7) as multicultural women. In contrast, 48.6% of the 26,866 UW employees in 1997-98 were women, 8.28% were identified multicultural, and 3.7% as multicultural women (Source: 1997 IPEDS Fall Staff Survey, UW System Office of Policy Analysis and Research; see Appendix A for complete tables).

Due in part to concern over this gap, a proposal was made to President Katharine Lyall in 1998 to establish a one-year Initiative on the Status of Women. The Initiative began in October, 1999, and included two ad hoc Systemwide committees, one of which was charged with studying the current status of women throughout the UW System. The second group, the Steering Committee on the Summer Leadership Institute, was charged with reviewing options to increase the numbers of women and minorities in upper-level administrative positions, including the possibility of organizing a pilot Summer Leadership Institute for the summer of 1999. The thought was that such an Institute could provide some of the leadership experience and information needed by members of underrepresented groups, and to increase their access to the pipeline to senior administration.

The Committee, co-chaired by Kate Davy (then Dean of the School of the Arts at UW-Milwaukee) and Gerard McKenna (Dean of Fine Arts & Communications at UW-Stevens Point), met during the fall semester and reviewed the existing options for leadership training, including programs at Bryn Mawr College, Harvard University, as well as those sponsored by regional and national professional organizations. These institutes and workshops can provide valuable experience and networking opportunities, but they can also be expensive (the 1999 programs at Harvard cost up to \$5900 per participant), time-consuming (some of the major institutes last as long as 4 weeks), and in any case, do not address the System-specific needs of UW faculty and staff.

Committee members and other people within the UW community were also concerned that, without some kind of System-oriented training and specific support and guidance in advancing through the administrative hierarchy, valuable UW faculty and staff members interested in administrative positions would find their opportunities elsewhere, and leave Wisconsin. They also believed that a UW leadership program can offer a personal,

focused learning and experiential opportunity in a way that other, non-UW programs cannot.

As a result of this analysis, the Committee therefore decided to propose that a pilot Institute be held.

## **2. The Importance of Leadership Development**

Steering Committee members developed the Institute based on the following precepts:

- The maximization of all leadership talent is critical to the success of any institution.
- If leadership talent is underutilized, institutions of higher education are at risk.
- Empirical evidence clearly demonstrates that in the case of women and minorities, such underutilization exists in leadership positions both nationwide and within the UW System.
- Current leadership, nationally and locally, has a critical role to play in the process of identifying and developing leadership talent among women and underrepresented minorities, both
  - formally, through the identification of existing leadership development programs, while at the same time providing opportunities for those with leadership potential to participate in them, and by developing local, Systemwide or campus-specific programs;
  - informally, through the creation of a supportive climate and the development of activities such as mentoring programs.

Committee members also maintain that those who want to develop their own leadership potential have a responsibility to make their interest clear by identifying themselves to current leaders.

## **3. The 1999 Institute**

With President Lyall's approval, the Steering Committee designed and implemented a pilot Summer Leadership Institute, which was held July 19-22 at the Pyle Center in Madison. Chancellors from all 15 UW institutions, along with President Lyall, were each invited to select three participants for the pilot Institute from among the faculty and/or staff administrators who they believed have the potential to move up in the ranks of higher education administration, particularly those from underrepresented groups and those with alternative leadership experiences. The invitation to the Chancellors explained that those selected should have leadership potential as well as administrative experience; a commitment to explore future leadership opportunities; and should demonstrate the knowledge and skills deemed most critical to the practice of effective leadership and

administration in a rapidly changing, diverse, higher education environment. (The letter to the Chancellors, along with an outline of selection criteria, goals, and proposed outcomes, appear in Appendix B.)

Funding for speakers, Institute-related meals, audiovisual equipment, and other expenses was provided by President Lyall as part of the budget for the Initiative on the Status of Women, whose office also staffed the Institute. The Chancellors agreed to fund travel, lodging, and additional meal expenses for the participants from their institution. (Detailed budget information appears below in Section 6.)

Participants were given a small set of readings to complete before the Institute began, and additional readings were distributed on-site. Participants and the invited speakers were also asked to provide information about their career histories and goals, for distribution at the Institute. (A list of readings and the packets containing information about participants and speakers appear in Appendix D and E.)

The Institute began with a keynote address by Catherine Stimpson, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences at New York University, and during the next three days, speakers from inside and outside of the UW System covered a range of topics, including the administrative search process, leadership and management tools, and personal career development stories, along with breakout sessions on such subjects as human resources, university relations, and budget, and two case studies. Participants were assigned to specific breakout sessions based on their preferences, as well as to small groups, which met separately to discuss the case studies. The Institute closed with a celebratory dinner on the final evening. (The complete Institute schedule appears in Appendix F.)

#### **4. Participant Evaluations**

The response to this pilot Institute was overwhelmingly positive from the vast majority of participants, presenters, and committee members. At the end of the Institute, participants were asked to complete an evaluation form. The following section, prepared by Gerry McKenna and Joan North, provides a brief summary of their responses. (The complete summary of participants' evaluations appears in Appendix G.)

##### **A. Planning and Organization**

###### **I. Composition of group**

- Some participants noted a lack of diversity among the presenters, particularly a shortage of women of color, of representatives of campuses other than Madison and Milwaukee, and of mid- or lower levels of administration.
- Some participants were from academic ranks and others were from staff and student affairs positions. Those in the latter category did not seem to find sufficient presenters or issues relevant to their situations.

## **II. Impact on participants' inclination toward (further) leadership positions**

- Participants were about evenly split between being encouraged toward (further) leadership positions and being uncertain. A handful was actually discouraged. Perhaps a third considered themselves too new in their jobs or too senior in their careers to connect well with the Institute.
- Some of the participants were able to be reflective about their own careers and appreciated the lack of a “tightly structured” approach. Others wished for a more structured approach with some attention needed for leadership models other than Chancellor positions.

## **III. Information needed by participants prior to Institute**

- Intended outcomes
- Organizational information about format, breaks
- Information on other participants
- Expectations about readings

## **IV. Content and Format for Sessions**

1. The overwhelming response was a plea for a greater variety of formats.
  - Variety of presentations and a balance between listening to speakers and interacting with smaller groups of participants (one said that the split should be 50-50).
  - Many wanted introductions of participants at the beginning of the Institute, ice-breakers, and more meaningful interactions with one another.
2. Speakers were well received, and there were notable expressions of appreciation for President Lyall's participation.
3. Clarity about the intended target audience will probably influence changes in both content and format. The participants wanted to retain the personal stories from speakers (though perhaps a fewer of them), as well as the focus on diversity, case study or studies, and leadership-related topics.
4. Some wanted more time on the how-to (breakout) sessions, and some wanted more connection to the literature in the field of higher education administration, at least lists of references.
5. Many felt that the Institute was too long, but length will have to be reconciled with weaving in significant interactions. Suggestions for shortening the Institute included reducing lunch breaks, making the cases shorter, and ending the Institute at lunch rather than dinner.
6. Suggestions for follow-up to the Institute included:

- Developing a web site for sharing and posting readings
- Listserv
- Alumni network (as ACE offers)
- Add participants to planning committee and include as future presenters
- Additional but shorter meetings around the state for follow-up

In general, Committee members felt that the pilot Institute was successful. They also felt strongly that the Institute was extremely productive and successful for its targeted audience. Committee members believed that most of the concerns expressed by participants came, understandably, from those who fall into categories for which the Institute was not specifically designed.

## **5. Recommendations**

The success of the 1999 pilot Institute demonstrates that the UW System can provide an excellent program in a cost-effective way. Based on its analysis of the pilot project, the Steering Committee therefore strongly recommends that the UW System Leadership Institute be continued on an annual basis, and that it continue to include a focus on diversity as part of the UW's ongoing commitment to expanding opportunities for women and other underrepresented groups. The Committee also suggests that UW System Administration explore additional ways of expanding access to and professional developing training for women and minorities interested in moving into senior administration.

The Committee recommends that the general format of the 1999 Institute be retained. However, while evaluations by participants and Committee members make it clear that the pilot was an overwhelming success, several structural features do need to be rethought.

### **A. Target Audience**

The audience for the Leadership Institute should remain faculty members who aspire to the position of Dean and above, as well as their counterparts in academic staff positions. Particular attention, emphasis, and focus should be given to potential leaders among women and minorities within the UW System.

### **B. Nomination Process**

The nomination process should be reviewed and made consistent across all UW institutions. To accomplish this, the Committee recommends that a sub-group of two or three people from the "Core Team" (see Section D below) be assigned the task of reviewing the nomination process and developing criteria for nominations, as well as strategies for communicating these with System Chancellors in order to ensure that

members of the target audience are identified and reached in a consistent manner across institutions.

### **C. Diversity Focus**

It is critical that the Institute continues to emphasize and focus on women and underrepresented minorities, both in the selection of participants and in the presence of a session that deals explicitly with issues of diversity. However, given the following two factors:

- the scarcity of women and minorities in the "pipelines" of faculty and senior administrative staff,
- the importance for those currently in these pipelines of understanding the issues and advocate for women and minorities,

no nominee will be excluded from participation based on gender, race, or any other identity category.

### **D. Staffing and Coordination**

Planning and coordination of the Institute requires contributions from many people. It is crucial that staff within UWSA be dedicated to this, ideally as part of an Office on the Status of Women, as recommended by the Committee on the Status of Women. We therefore recommend that both professional and support staff dedicated to future Leadership Institutes be part of such an office. Committee members feel strongly that the expansion of experience in and access to women and minorities interested in senior administration and the increase in their numbers among UW administrators is a key element in improving the status of women and other underrepresented groups throughout the UW System.

If such an office is not established, however, staff for the Institute should still be the responsibility of UW System Administration, in order to achieve the highest possible visibility for the key project. Staff could be housed in a number of other System offices, such as Academic Affairs. The logistical work required to produce the Institute (e.g., the organizing of meals, equipment, and so on) should be contracted out to UW-Extension's professional conference planners.

Top-level advocacy is also necessary, so that the importance of leadership development training and activities are brought to the attention of senior administrators and UW staff whenever and wherever possible.

In addition, the Committee recommends that two groups be established, with membership on a voluntary or non-compensated basis, to work with UWSA staff on the planning and coordination of future Institutes and other leadership development activities:

**Core Team:** This group consists of six people with the responsibility of determining the format, participants, nomination process, and other fundamental features of the Institute, in consultation with the professional staffing the Institute. Team members would all have had some role in the previous year's Institute; for example, one speaker, three former

Committee members, and two participants. These people would be selected by those current Committee members who had been able to attend the previous year's Institute. At least three of these six Core Team members would serve for two years.

**Advisory Committee:** This group is conceived as a larger advisory body representing all UW institutions. Its purpose is to advise the Core Team, and to ensure that the interests of all UW constituencies are considered in the planning of future Institutes. All former members of the Core Team would become members of the Advisory Committee. 1998-99 co-chairs Kate Davy and Gerry McKenna will serve on the 1999-2000 Committee and develop a list of potential members for consideration by the current (inaugural) Committee, which will disband after both the Core Team and Advisory Committee are established.

## 6. Planning for the 2000 Institute and Beyond

### A. Timeline

Based on our planning of the 1999 pilot Institute, we suggest the following timeline for the 2000 Institute:

- **early December:** Core Team finalizes general themes and rough schedule; announcement to Chancellors of upcoming year's Institute, goals, and criteria for selecting participants; meeting with Advisory Committee
- **early January:** invitations to major speakers; planning of more detailed session schedule, readings, and other events begins
- **early February:** letters to Chancellors inviting nominations
- **mid-March:** deadline for Chancellors to submit names of participants; Institute schedule completed
- **early April:** first mailing to participants with basic information, tentative schedule
- **early May:** update to participants, including request for summer addresses, information for distribution at Institute
- **early July:** final mailing to participants and speakers, including advance readings, final schedule, information packet on participants and speakers
- **late July:** Institute held
- **August:** Core Team and Advisory Committee review participant, committee, and staff evaluations, select potential members of new Core Team and Advisory Board
- **September:** Core Team begins planning of next year's Institute

In future years, planning should begin early enough so that the Core Team can finalize Institute themes and the tentative schedule in **November**, with invitations to major speakers made in **December**.

## B. Budget

We also recommend that the Institute be staffed by a 25%-time professional and a 25%-time support staffperson. In addition to salary, a budget for specific expenses connected with the running of the Institute can be extrapolated from the costs of the 1999 pilot, which included the following major expenses:

Speakers' expenses (travel, lodging, meals for all non-UW speakers)	<b>\$2280</b>
Honorarium for keynote speaker	<b>1000</b>
Pyle Center catering (food for all speakers & participants), A/V, and other expenses	<b>5200</b>
Committee meeting expenses (catering, parking)	<b>500</b>
Miscellaneous Institute expenses (supplies, copying)	<b><u>200</u></b>
<b>TOTAL 1999 budget</b>	<b>\$9180</b>

This total does not include basic S&E costs, which were supplied as part of the overall budget for the Initiative on the Status of Women. In addition, because of budgetary limitations, only the keynote speaker was paid an honorarium. For future Institutes, the Committee believes very strongly that all speakers should receive at least a small honorarium. In addition, while the focus should be on asking UW faculty and staff to share their own experiences and expertise with participants, planners should also be able to invite experts from outside of the UW System to serve as speakers, in order to provide Institute participants with the highest quality training.

To that end, we propose the following tentative budget for the 2000 Institute:

Speakers' expenses (travel, lodging, meals for all non-UW speakers)	<b>\$ 5000</b>
Honoraria for all outside speakers	<b>3000</b>
Pyle Center catering, A/V, and other expenses	<b>6000</b>
Committee meeting expenses	<b>600</b>
Miscellaneous Institute expenses	<b><u>500</u></b>
<b>TOTAL 2000 budget, not including staffing and S&amp;E</b>	<b>\$15,100</b>

In order to meet this increased budget, Chancellors could be asked to make a greater contribution to the expense, including covering a larger proportion of the costs for their institutions' participants, such as the full cost of the meals that are part of the Institute program.

**APPENDICES:**

**DOCUMENTS FROM THE 1999 SUMMER LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE**

- A. Data on Full-time UW Administrators in Top Salary Ranks, by Gender and Multicultural Status
- B. Sample Letter of Appointment to Steering Committee
- C. Letter of Invitation to Chancellors, Selection Criteria, Goals, and Proposed Outcomes
- D. Readings Distributed to Participants and Speakers
- E. Information Packets on Participants and Speakers
- F. Session Schedule
- G. Summary Of Participant Evaluations