ABSTRACT
                 Factors reported to be important in the design,
implementation, and evaluation of professional development programs
for department chairs are described. Attention is also directed to
results from a goal-focused evaluation of the 6-year-old program to
train new department heads in the nine state universities of Florida,
a program that is being adopted across the United States and Canada.
The widespread recognition of a need to train chairs and some
important characteristics of such programs are considered. In
addition, the means by which institutional administrators can assess
the need for training are examined. Results are also provided of
several training programs, which should complete the information
institutional officials need to decide the kind of program they
should underwrite for the professional development of department
chairs. It is noted that an important way to determine the need for
training before the situation becomes critical is to carefully
examine the job and role characteristics of all chairs in an
institution. Several kinds of surveys that have been used to study
department heads are discussed. Information from reports about
training programs is presented concerning the participants, what is
learned, experiences after the training program, and whether the
programs are successful. (SW)

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS:
CONSIDERATIONS AND OUTCOMES

John S. Waggaman

Development Programs for Academic Administrators: Considerations and Outcomes

John S. Waggaman

This paper describes the factors reported to be important in the design, implementation, and evaluation of professional development programs for department chairs. The paper also considers some results from a goal-focused evaluation of the six-year-old program to train new department heads in the nine state universities of Florida, a program that is being adopted across the U.S. and Canada

The first section discusses the widespread recognition of a need to train chairs and some important characteristics of such programs. The second section describes the means by which institutional administrators can assess the need for training, and the last section reports the results of several training programs, which should complete the information institutional officials need to decide the kind of program they should underwrite for the professional development of department chairs

BACKGROUND

The importance of the position of department chair has been recognized for decades. but only in recent years has any serious response been made to the necessity for training them (Jennerich 1981).

If one organization had to be identified as significant in the furtherance of training for department chairs, it undoubtedly would be the Kellogg Foundation. In 1977, it funded the development of a model

training program. preparation of materials for use by participants, and pilot testing of a model program in Florida. Later, the American Council on Education (ACE) was supported by Kellogg so that 12 state systems of higher education could implement the model training program; ACE also edited and published a volume of materials used in the workshops (Tucker 1981). The latest effort supported by Kellogg and its director expands the applicability of the training program to individual and systems of community colleges, an arrangement coordinated through the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. All of this activity indicates a clear interest in professional training of department heads.

The need to train department chairs arises from a variety of factors (Olswang and Cohen 1979). A high rate of turnover for chairs creates a distinctive need. Heimler (1967) suggested nine reasons for chairs resigning; they include the individuals' personal attitudes as well as problems with organizations and their policies. Chief academic officers often believe that many of these difficulties can be ameliorated through training. Providing training each year for the new group of department chairs is one. way to help them become effective very quickly—even more necessary when a new chair comes from outside the institution and has to unlearn old policies and procedures and learn new ones. In some institutions, new administrators—and chairs thought to be candi-

dates for higher administrative posts—have been trained.

The need for training also may arise when a college or university wants to enhance the general quality of administration (Scott 1978). Well trained department chairs can aid an institution as it confronts declining and changing enrollments, shrinking financial support, and changing priorities in the society at large. Affirmative action programs and the necessity to be familiar with procedures for collective bargaining and grievances have also underscored the need for training programs. Previous training programs focused on the improvement of faculty teaching and course materials. Programs for administrators were usually ad hoc or provided outside the organization, for example by the training institutes of ACE and other national associations.

National associations for the academic disciplines, of which English is a prime example (Booth 1982), have sponsored ongoing programs for department heads. New programs, like those sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation, have focused on many of the details that are critical to the effective administration of a department. They are sponsored at the system level so that persons from different campuses can learn from one another, their experienced peers, and the experts.

The most recent description of training programs for department heads can be found in Booth (1982). The programs are grouped according to the extent to which

*Associate Professor of Higher Education, Department of Educational Leadership, College of Education, The Florida State University, Tallhassee, Florida.

development or intervention for change is identifiable - for example, those that help clarify roles, those that use peer learning and disciplinary training, and those that deal with basic problems (pp. 24-30). The Kellogg program contains 12 subject units: (1) responsibilities, roles, and powers of department chair; (2) types of departments; leadership styles; delegation; and committees; (3) faculty grievances and unions; (4) faculty evaluation; (5) performance counseling—dealing with unsatisfactory performance; (6) assigning and reporting faculty activities; (7) faculty development—encouraging professional growth; (8) departmental decision making and bringing about change; (9) dealing with conflict and maintaining faculty morale; (10) departmental accomplishments and aspirations—setting goals and developing action plans; (11) the budget cycle—preparing departmental budget requests and persuading the dean; and (12) managing departmental resources—time, people, and money.

The literature contains few details about the programs, however, and interested readers contact the authors cited for additional information.

Before committing themselves to the development or purchase of a program, administrators should examine local needs. Training programs receiving the greatest support have been those designed to meet individual desires for improvement rather than those directed toward institutional or organizational development (Scott 1978). Unfortunately, an institution or system without a strong sense of what is best for it is most likely to contribute to department heads' role ambiguities and role conflicts, two difficulties that underlie many of the problems faced by department heads.

DETERMINING THE NEED FOR TRAINING

An important way to determine the need for training before the situation becomes critical is to carefully examine the job and role characteristics of all chairs in an institution. This examination will reveal that numerous concepts of a chair's role exist. These differences can be found among chairs in the same discipline and among chairs within the same school, college, or university. Some other differences that give a particular cast to the role of chair are whether departments are large or small and whether they are located in urban, research-oriented, or older institutions (Waggaman 1982). Membership in a collective bargaining unit or designation of the chair as a professional administrator may also color the role

(Ehrle and Earley 1977). The only differences between chairs in various disciplines has been found between clusters of chairs (a cluster being a group of related disciplines, for example; the life sciences). Differences in clusters are significant in the role that chairs played in faculty development activities (Creswell et al. 1979).

A detailed examination of the role of chair can begin with a specification of the ideal characteristics expected of the persons elected or appointed to the position so that it can be used in the specification of a set of desired characteristics or competencies that best fit the local situation. Strong character, an administrative frame of reference, administrative performance skills, ability in human relations counseling, and outstanding professional ability in an academic field are probably the most important traits of an ideal chair (Heimler 1967). A more functional inventory of the chair's role includes four required skills: planning; communicating, representing, negotiating; coordinating; and facilitating; problem solving; organizing and administering (Roach 1976). Even more detailed lists of functions are possible (see, for example; Hill and French 1967 and Hoyt and Spangler 1979). One study that asked chairs to rate a predefined list of skills and competencies needed in their job included a broad mixture of items, with character integrity ranking most important and fund raising ability last (14th) (Jennerich 1981). This study, according to the author, shows "unequivocally that there is a universal set of competencies that all chairpersons consider necessary for their jobs" (Jennerich 1981 p. 54). The concept of leadership is broader in Brown (1977), which emphasizes instruction and scholarship. Brown's humane view of academic administration illustrates the relationship between parts of the hierarchy above and below department chair.

Administrators who perceive an emerging need to train chairs should consider whether training is likely to solve any problems. For example, communications problems often have their roots in role conflict (Carroll 1976); and role conflict for chairs usually emanates from college deans, other chairs, university administrators, and faculty. Perhaps these other people need training as well if confused responsibilities are to be resolved.

The problem perceived to require some training for chairs can be clarified as various institutional records are explored to determine the extent and the kind of training that might be needed. For example, institutional self-studies, often completed

in preparation for accreditation visits, and the subsequent accreditation reports often contain indications of needed training. An examination of the perennial problems coming before a faculty senate or the most frequent faculty grievances filed can also indicate such needs. Department (and school) program reviews and self-studies prepared for professional accreditation or long-range planning can also be helpful (Booth 1977). If academic programs are reviewed across several institutions, the comparative results may be very informative. A thorough program review will reveal much about the administration, governance, and productivity of a department and the success of its head. (A program and its head are often perceived as one and the same (Hengstler et al. 1981).)

Surveys of department chairs, before training begins are also possible; this pretest should be considered a diagnostic evaluation. The test can ask for opinions about a need for training (Jennerich 1981) and can ask for answers to questions that would test a person's knowledge of the functions, roles, and skills necessary to solve or ameliorate typical problems confronting a chair. The test should not be used in conjunction with or as a substitute for annual evaluations of chairs because training surveys of this kind need complete responses uncontaminated by the chairs' reactions that might be based on anxieties about job security.

Another kind of survey that has been used to study department heads relies upon faculty members to rate the effectiveness of their particular chairs. Faculty evaluate department heads on a one-dimensional factor, which may be a result of "both a generosity error and a halo effect" (Hengstler et al p. 271). Some of the activities Hengstler et al. used to rate chairs, however, may have been too general to measure specific attributes.

In a similar approach, but without collecting new data, evaluation reports by a dean (of chairs) might be researched for any pattern of a need for training. Such reports would be especially valuable if performance had been evaluated. Evaluation is still subjective enough, however (Fisher 1978; Reid 1982), that it is less reliable or useful than other methods for determining a need for training.

Additional information and consultation about the assessment of needs can be obtained from experts on and off campus. The Higher Education Management Institute's Program Handbook (1978) contains a section on such assessment and con-

tracks for it and for complete training pro-
grams (Webster 1970, Cortine and others
...on campus could be helpful if surveys
are to be used. institutional researchers,
educational test and measurement spe-
cialists, business marketing professors,
and survey researchers.

Once needs have been assessed and a
desire for training confirmed, several
issues must be decided. Should a pre-
packaged program be purchased or
should local training be developed? Can a
local training program be developed with
several other institutions to spread the
cost and to obtain the input of a hetero-
geneous mix of people? What materials
should be used? Where are the best facil-
ities and the best location for the ses-
sions? How many local leaders and how
many outside experts will be used? Should
training sessions use a lecture or discus-
sion format? The 13 issues reviewed in
the conduct of the Kellogg Foundation
workshops are discussed in Waggaman
(1982, Section III). These points could be
used as a guide to plan and develop other
training programs. An excellent detailed
discussion of all kinds of training pro-
grams for chairs can be found in Booth
(1982). Experienced adult education fac-
ulty and training program designers on
the staffs of professional development
and continuing education offices can as-
sist in designing a training program.

TRAINING PROGRAMS AND
RESULTS

Very little is reported about the conse-
quences of training programs for chairs,
although this gap is partially remedied in
Booth (1982). This section reviews the
results of the few reports published about
training programs. Four questions were
asked in the review. Who participates?
What do they learn? What happens to par-
ticipants after the training sessions? Were
the programs successful? The answers
should help create realistic expectations
about training programs for chairs.

First, the participants. Volunteers ap-
pear to be the largest group. Some pro-
grams are designed to attract volunteers,
for example by focusing on questions of
leadership rather than on management
procedures (Plough 1979). Nominees are
another group, they might be recommend-
ed for training because they are new or
because they need training in a specific
skill. Older chairs are sometimes recrui-
ted to attend training sessions because
of their experience and understanding. It
is the perception of those who have
reviewed training programs that arts and
humanities chairs may be among the
most reluctant to participate because of a

fear they will be infected with a "manage-
rial mentality". Some evidence suggests
that the most competent persons are the
ones most likely to participate in devel-
opment activities (Garlock 1979). Com-
pulsory attendance can be required at
training sessions, of course, but that
approach places a great burden on the
training staff to constantly justify them-
selves.

What do participants learn? Most for-
mal training programs focus on leader-
ship, administration, and/or curriculum
and instruction (Doersom 1980). They
may emphasize interpersonal skills (Gil-
bert et al 1977). The individual subjects
may be very broad or specific, directed
toward changing attitudes, or designed
for learning new skills and problem solv-
ing. One evaluation reported that chairs
learn many things not part of the formal
curriculum at regional or state conferen-
ces (Waggaman 1982, Section V). Chairs
reported that the three greatest insights
coming from the workshops were ideas
and solutions to problems from the spe-
cific topics covered (19 percent of total
respondents), feeling better about one-
self, that is increased self-confidence in
the role of chair (13 percent), and being
able to adopt a modified approach to
department problems (4 percent). Other
and unexpected insights included the
consideration of resigning or deciding to
resign (3.1 percent), seeing the contrasts
between policies of universities in the
same system (1.6 percent), and learning
that their problems are not unique (1.5
percent).

The workshops also had some informal
benefits. The most frequently mentioned
were the opportunity for discussion with
others from different institutions (26 per-
cent), the opportunity to compare the pol-
icies and practices of others (6 percent),
and the opportunity to build a group spirit
among chairs and deans from the same
university (6 percent). The importance of
having people at the workshops from
several different institutions was clearly
apparent. This interaction led to the crea-
tion of some informal networks of chairs
for problem solving, mutual support, and
planning.

What did the chairs do with their new
knowledge and skills after their training
sessions? Participants from some pro-
grams might attempt to implement their
new ideas, but other entire groups could
lack sufficient motivation to do anything
(Shtogren 1978). In Florida, 41 percent of
the chairs described an important event
or situation occurring after a workshop in
which they were aided by information
from it (Waggaman 1982). These situa-
tions fell into four groups, professional
relations, leadership of the department,

budget and financial matters and miscel-
laneous. Of those respondents, a large
percentage indicated they applied infor-
mation gained at a workshop; and others
wrote they were able to identify and antic-
ipate problems and prevent them because
of what they had learned.

Were the reported training programs
considered successful? Yes, in part.

*The program produced desired results if
the dean actively supported the idea of
administrative training, let the chair know
that training was important, and main-
tained frequent contact with the chair
(Booth 1982, p. 30)*

One program was successful in terms of
socialization and role (re)definition "and
somewhat weak in terms of the specific
skill development objective" (Plough 1979,
p. 10). The chair and faculty need approp-
riate incentives if training is to be produc-
tive (Shtogren 1978, p. 193). The goal of
the program in Florida was to introduce
change in departmental administration
and leadership (Waggaman 1982). In that
respect, the program could be considered
successful: 69 percent of the responding
chairs attempted to implement some
procedures like those read about and dis-
cussed at the workshops. When asked
about the extent to which they were able
to implement in their department the
changes they said were necessary at the
end of a workshop, 29 percent of the
respondents claimed success; 50 per-
cent were able to implement partial
change; and 21 percent indicated failure.

Probably the most important conse-
quence of the Florida program, especially
for new chairs, was that the workshops
made it possible for them to learn that they
do not have to interpret departmental
affairs personally and subjectively. In-
stead, when chairs recognize and under-
stand the commonality of problems facing
them, then they can treat departmental
affairs objectively and apply various ana-
lytical frameworks and alternative solu-
tions to them (Waggaman 1982, p. 52-53)

The need for better departmental ad-
ministration during very difficult times has
spurred the decision at many institutions
that chairs need some kind of training. To
be meaningful, a definition of training
needs should rely upon a thorough under-
standing of the role of chairs and the ways
in which training may teach problem-
solving skills, reduce role conflict, and
clarify expectations. These objectives can
be at least partially achieved, given what
we now know about programs already
undertaken.

REFERENCES

1982 *The Department Chair: Professional Development and Role Conflict.* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Report No. 10. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education. ED 226 689 60 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$7.24.

Booth, David B. Winter 1977. "Institutional and Disciplinary Ideas for Development." *Educational Record* 58: 83-90.

Brown, J. Douglas. 1977. "Departmental and University Leadership." In *Academic Departments*, edited by Dean E. McHenry and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey—Bass.

Caroll, Archie B. 1976. "The Role Conflict Phenomenon: Implications for Department Chairmen and Academic Faculty." *Improving College and University Teaching* 24: 245-46.

Creswell, John W., et al. Winter 1979. "Professional Development Training Needs of Department Chairpersons: A Test of the Biglan Model." *Planning and Changing* 10: 224-37

Doersom, Barbara. 1980. *The State of Professional Development in Pennsylvania Institutions of Higher Education.* Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania State Department of Education. ED 183 106. 14 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74.

Fisher, C. F., ed. 1978. *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership.* New Directions for Higher Education No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ehrle, Elwood B., and Earley, Jane F. 1977. "The Effect of Collective Bargaining on Department Chairpersons." *Educational Record* 57: 149-54.

Garlock, Victor P. 1979. "Faculty Development at the Community College: Who Participates?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 8. San Francisco, California. ED 168 621. 16 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74.

Gilbert, V. K., et al. 1977. *Perceptions of Educational Leadership: A Study of the Needs and Training Opportunities for Educational Leadership in Ontario.* Toronto, Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Hammons, James; and Thomas, Wanda. Winter 1980. "Performance Appraisal of Community College Department/Division Chairpersons." *Community College Review* 7: 41-49.

Heimler, Charles H. 1967. "The College Department Chairman." *Educational Record* 48: 158-63.

Hengstler, Dennis D., et al. 1981. "Faculty Ratings as a Measure of Departmental and Administrator Quality." *Research in Higher Education* 14: 259-75.

Higher Education Management Institute. 1978. *Management Development and Training Program for Colleges and Universities: Program Handbook.* Coconut Grove, Fla.: Higher Education Management Institute. ED 159 946. 93 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$9.37

Hill, W. W.; and French, W. L. March 1967. "Perceptions of Department Chairmen by Professors." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2: 553.

Hoyt, D. P., and Spangler, R. K. 1979. "The Measurement of Administrative Effectiveness of the Academic Department Head." *Research in Higher Education* 10: 291-303

Jennerich, Edward J. Spring 1981. "Competencies for Department Chairpersons: Myths and Realities." *Liberal Education* 67: 46-70.

Olswang, Steven G., and Cohen, William D. 1979. "The Identified Need and Means for the Inhouse Training of Higher Education Administrators." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, April 18-19, Washington, D.C. ED 174 178 21 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74.

Plough, Thomas B. 1979. "Academic Leadership Development for Department Chairpersons." Paper presented at annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, May 13-17, San Diego, California. ED 174 064 13pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74

Powell, J. P. May 1982. "Enhancing the Managerial Effectiveness of Heads of Departments through Trigger Film Workshops." Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration 4: 79-81.

Reid, John Y. 1982. "Politics and Quality in Administrator Evaluation." Research in Higher Education 16: 27-40.

Roach, James L. Winter 1976. "The Academic Department Chairperson: Functions and Responsibilities." Educational Record 57: 13-23.

Scott, Robert A. 1978. The Development of Competence: Administrative Needs and Training Goals in American Higher Education. New York: Exxon Education Foundation. ED 179 143. 45 pp. MF-$1.77; PC-$5.49.

Shtogren, John A., ed. 1978. Administrative Development in Higher Education: The State of the Art. Vol. 1. Richmond, Va.: Higher Education Leadership and Management Society, Inc.

Tucker, Allan. 1981. Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership among Peers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Waggaman, John S. 1982. A Program Evaluation of the Department Chairpersons Project Sponsored by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the State University System of Florida, 1977-1981. Tallahassee: Institute for Departmental Leadership, Florida State University. ED 231 268 87 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$9.37.

Webster, Richard Scott. Summer 1979. "A Management Team Approach to Institutional Renewal." Educational Record 60: 241-52.