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This project investigated the development and trial of a Leadership Capacity Development Framework (LCDF) for teaching and learning in higher education. The primary aim of the project was to assess the relevance and validity of a LCDF in developing leadership capacity.

Four Australian universities were involved in the project. In the first stage the LCDF was trialed in two universities that were similar in size, regional positioning, and current mission (i.e. developing a teaching and learning-intensive culture within a research-intensive culture). In the second stage, two additional universities trialed a refined LCDF using a ‘cascade approach’, whereby the facilitators and participants from the first stage universities mentored and supported the second stage universities.

The LCDF was assessed and reviewed through an iterative evaluation process. Participants in Stage 1 of the project informed the evaluation and subsequent modification of the LCDF. The LCDF was then trialed, evaluated and validated by Stage 2 participants.

Participant evaluations indicate that the factors critical to the success of the LCDF include engagement in:

- Formal leadership training and professional development activities;
- Authentic learning activities that are situated in real contexts;
- Reflective practice;
- Opportunities for dialogue about leadership practice and experiences; and
- Activities that expand current professional networks.

Leadership Capacity Development

Participants perceived that the LCDF and its associated activities were beneficial in developing leadership capacity.

Key to the success of the LCDF was a desire and willingness on the part of the emergent leader to develop leadership capacity. For this reason, self-nomination rather than delegation for involvement in the program is crucial.

Scholars reported that the overall benefits of engagement in the program included the opportunity to:

- See themselves as leaders and appreciate their leadership potential;
- Establish an awareness of what is involved in being a leader;
- Broaden their understanding of what leadership can be and how it can be developed; and
- Address the questions of what is leadership and how this notion of leadership relates to them.

Distributive Leadership

In the context of this project distributive leadership was defined as the distribution of power through a collegial sharing of knowledge, of practice, and reflection within the socio-cultural context of the university.

A distributive perspective of leadership underpinned the implementation of the LCDF. In the context of this project this manifested in the strategic development of potential leaders across multiple levels of the university. Project participants (scholars) were at various stages of their career and assumed a range of leadership roles and responsibilities in their faculty, the institution and nationally.

The Project found that:

- Distributive leadership is most successful if the leadership roles and responsibilities are negotiated rather than delegated;
- Distributive leadership harnesses individual strengths and abilities appropriate for the required leadership, irrespective of formal position.
- A distributive approach provides an opportunity to take a leadership role, ascertain leadership capability, and further develop aptitudes before acquiring a formal leadership position.
A Framework to Support Leadership Capacity Development in Higher Education

The LCDF has been organised into five domains:

1. Growing,
2. Reflecting,
3. Enabling,
4. Engaging, and
5. Networking.

In reviewing and evaluating the LCDF and its associated activities, scholars reported that:

- Authentic learning activities, i.e. a faculty-based project, was the key to enabling development of leadership capacity;
- Strategic mentoring and coaching assisted in the consolidation of understanding and development of leadership capacity in higher education; and
- Professional development activities were crucial for leadership knowledge, understanding and skill development.

Further details of these domains and the associated practical activities facilitated throughout the project have been assembled here in the GREEN Resource.

Implications for the Sector

In order for a new generation to lead universities, potential leaders need to be prepared to take on leadership roles for an ever changing and dynamic higher education system (Knight & Trowler, 2001).

Distributive models of leadership capacity development, such as the LCDF, provide a scaffold for preparing potential leaders for formal leadership positions (Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004). The feedback and evaluations of participants in the project suggest that the LCDF is a sound model for developing leadership capacity in higher education.

However, the successful implementation of the LCDF relies on an investment and commitment in the implementation of the program from universities, institutional policy makers and senior leaders. Without the support of senior executive distributive models of leadership capacity development will not be successful (MacBeath, 2005). The creation of learning and changed practice across institutions needs adequate financial funding support to ensure the findings for success, as reported in this resource, are appropriately implemented.

Initiatives designed to enhance and promote leadership capacity at all levels of the university are required. Senior institutional leaders should actively support and encourage the development of leadership capacity in potential university leaders through the negotiated allocation of complex tasks. This enables the developing leader to engage and practice relevant leadership knowledge, skills and competencies (Elmore, 2000).
The Project

“...I have a better sense of myself as a leader than I did before this project. I really wasn’t sure I could be a leader whereas now I know what attributes I have. I have a sense of what skills I need to continue to develop to be a good leader and I have an appreciation that leadership is not necessarily about the position you hold, or your personal achievements. ... leadership is about finding ways of bringing about sustainable enduring change ... to make teaching, learning and student assessment more effective.” (2007 Scholar)

Managing change and leading institutions in new directions can no longer be supported strategically by a hierarchical leadership organisation that supports the notion of heroes or born leaders. There is a need to foster and support a distributive perspective of leadership capacity development that incorporates the collegial sharing of knowledge, practice and reflection.

According to the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (2002), a range of challenges have arisen over the past decade due to the dramatic changes that have occurred across the university environment. These changes will have a major impact on the way in which universities are governed and managed in the future.

This project addresses the need for system wide development of leadership for teaching and learning. It provides a framework for the development of individuals’ leadership capacity across multiple levels of the university and explores an innovative process for development that focuses on a community of practice and individuals working collegially and collaboratively within this community to improve learning and teaching. It moves from notions of leader as individual to leader as first amongst peers, acknowledging the ability of people at many levels to take leadership for different aspects of teaching and learning (Knight & Trowler, 2001).

The project design included two stages: the development and implementation stage, and the cascade stage, with an iterative evaluation process to support ongoing improvements.

Stage 1: Development and Implementation

In the development phase, each university identified participants to engage in the project. A significant financial contribution per scholar was made by each university to reduce the scholar’s workload.

Initially scholars came together for a three-day residential leadership retreat designed to: enable them to develop collegial relationships; formulate and discuss aspects of their authentic learning task related to assessment; and participate in leadership training.

Scholars led the implementation of an authentic-learning project in their faculty. At the same time engaging in: institutional and cross-institutional communication and collaboration; strategic leadership mentoring and coaching; and reflection. As part of the reflective focus the scholars were encouraged to maintain a reflective journal and participate in a cross-institutional online collaborative space.

At the end of the implementation phase, the scholars organised and facilitated a national roundtable. This focused on assessment and was related to their faculty-based project. It involved academic staff from their own and other universities, leaders in the field identified through professional associations. It included invited participants from other universities who indicated an interest in participating in the next stage of the project.

This stage culminated in the refinement of the LCDF that would be implemented in the next stage, following an extensive evaluation that included both formative and summative evaluation activities.
Stage 2: Cascade

In this stage the first generation participants acted as key supporters for the second generation participants through the provision of mentoring.

The participants from each inaugural university mentored and supported the implementation of the modified LCDF in two partner universities. This second stage of the program continued to evaluate and validate the LCDF.

Aim

The aims of the project include:

- To develop and trial a leadership capacity development framework for teaching and learning that will be available across the sector.
- To develop cross-institutional networks to support the adoption and adaptation of this leadership framework for multiple contexts.
- To develop resources to support this framework that will be available and accessible to all institutions.

Outcomes

Three overarching outcomes were addressed through this project:

- A framework to support capacity development for leadership in higher education.
- Creation of learning and changed practice within the cross-institutional teams.
- Research to feed into the policy and theories of academic development.

The distributive leadership project has ethics approval from University of Wollongong, Ethics Number HE06/356.
The Products

The GREEN Report

The GREEN Report is the final report on the Project:

- **GROWING** presents materials and outcomes of the project and details the potential for systemic change;
- **REFLECTING** provides formative and summative evaluation of the project;
- **ENABLING** details the events, linkages and activities of the project;
- **ENGAGING** overviews the names of the key stakeholders and how they were involved in the project; and
- **NETWORKING** identifies materials and resources produced for the project to act as catalysts for implementation by others.

National Assessment Roundtable

Two national assessment roundtables were organised and facilitated by scholars engaged in the project. The *Assessing Student Learning: Using Interdisciplinary Synergies to Develop Good Teaching and Assessment Practice* roundtable was held at the Sydney Masonic Centre on September 4, 2007.

The *Culture of Assessment in Higher Education* roundtable was held at the Novotel, Brighton Le Sands, on September 18, 2008.

These roundtable events signified the culmination of the formal engagement of scholars in each stage of the project and provided a means by which ongoing and potential collaborations and project initiatives could be explored and forged by the scholars.

A more detailed overview of the Roundtable event, associated resources and an evaluation of the event is presented on the GREEN website:


The GREEN Website

www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

The GREEN Website contains:

- the GREEN Report,
- the GREEN Resource,
- a detailed overview of the 2007 and 2008 roundtables including associated resources and evaluations,
- links to related project resources and references; and
- an annotated literature review.
The GREEN Resource has three sections:

PART 1
The Leadership Capacity Development Framework

This framework has been organised into five domains:

1. Growing;
2. Reflecting;
3. Enabling;
4. Engaging; and
5. Networking.

Each domain contains the relevant findings from the project, the underpinning theories and their practical application, characteristics of good practice, challenges and the implemented initiatives.

PART 2
Leadership Capacity Development Activities

These initiatives are the specific activities that were facilitated throughout the project to promote leadership capacity development.

- Activity 1: Leadership Retreat
- Activity 2: Leadership Workshop
- Activity 3: Authentic Action Learning - Faculty-Based Projects
- Activity 5: Mentoring and Coaching
- Activity 6: Reflective Practice
- Activity 7: Cross-Faculty, Institutional and Cross-Institutional Communication and Collaboration
- Activity 8: Cascading

PART 3
A Snapshot of the Distributive Leadership Project for the Development of Leadership Capacity in Higher Education

The faculty scholars from each institution are introduced with details of their projects in this section.

It also provides an overview of the publications and presentations which have been significant components of the dissemination strategy. The other significant dissemination strategy has been take up by other universities. Initially, at the national level, Flinders University had indicated an interest in engaging as a cascade partner with the project in 2008. La Trobe University also became a cascade partner for the 2008 implementation.

At the international level, there has been strong interest in the project and in 2008, Glasgow Caledonian University implemented their own version entitled Caledonian Scholars and Associates Scheme. The Project leader is an invited member of the assessor team. Further information about the scheme can be located at: www.academy.gcal.ac.uk/professional/sanda.html
The Leadership Capacity Development Framework

The LCDF builds on a Faculty Learning and Teaching Scholars program that was operating in each of the first stage universities. This scholars program partnered a small network of faculty-based academics with a mentor in a central academic development unit to achieve strategic change initiatives related to learning and teaching both within faculties and across the institution. The LCDF expanded the scholars model to explicitly develop leadership skills and capacity via cross-institutional consultation and collaboration, whilst maintaining the use of strategic faculty-based projects as vehicles for change. In addition scholars had the opportunity to provide leadership for a roundtable and engage in mentoring and coaching by strategic leadership coaches from the senior executive in each institution and an institutional facilitator. A further improvement was to cascade the model through the mentoring of stage 2 participants, by the stage 1 participants to further develop a cross-institutional network of scholars, and to provide opportunities for the scholars to gain leadership skills at a national level.

Five overlapping domains emerged from a qualitative analysis of the framework and its underpinning concepts. These domains provide the basis for the LCDF.

**Domain 1: Growing**
Scholars engaged in activities designed to develop their understanding of the social and cultural context of leadership and leadership capacity development in higher education and expand their awareness, knowledge and understanding of leadership and the relevant skills for leading in a higher education context.

**Domain 2: Reflecting**
Scholars engaged in a cycle of action and reflection. This cycle was a significant factor in the LCDF and its associated activities. Reflective practice is integral for the development of an understanding of the social and cultural context of leadership and of oneself as a leader.

**Domain 3: Enabling**
Scholars engaged in leadership capacity development that was enabled through the provision of opportunities and experiences that occurred in the authentic, real or actual context in which they reside. Consequently the development of leadership transpired through the enactment of leadership.

**Domain 4: Engaging**
Scholars established and forged relationships with significant others including other scholars, senior colleagues, institutional leaders, mentors, and coaches. The opportunities and activities that facilitated engagement in these relationships enabled the scholars to participate in dialogue that encouraged a deeper understanding of leadership roles and responsibilities.

**Domain 5: Networking**
Scholars undertook activities and engaged in relationships that broadened their professional networks across the multiple levels of higher education. These activities and relationships enabled the scholars to engage with a wider group of senior leaders and explore the potential for leadership opportunities.
Scholars engaged in activities designed to develop their understanding of the social and cultural context of leadership and leadership capacity development in higher education and expand their awareness, knowledge and understanding of leadership and the relevant skills for leading in a higher education context.

Project Findings

In reviewing and evaluating the activities and experiences that comprise this domain, scholars reported that:

- Formal training through professional development activities was highly important for the development of leadership.
- Professional development should occur prior to the commencement of other leadership development activities.
- It is advantageous to have a professional development event mid-way through the program.
- Professional development is best conducted at a time that does not interfere with teaching commitments.
- The professional development events generated enthusiasm and deeper engagement in the project.
- The focus of professional development should be towards advancing leadership knowledge, understanding and skills relevant to the higher education context.
- Conducting intensive professional development over a number of days and at an offsite venue is advantageous.
- Professional development should be portrayed as a significant component of the program. Investing in a high-quality venue was seen as a subtle means for communicating this.
- Professional development provided the space and opportunity for scholars to contemplate, design and progress their leadership capacity development.
- The professional development events were crucial in establishing and advancing ongoing cohesiveness, communication and collaboration among the institutional and cross-institutional scholar groups.
- A crucial requirement is that scholars are interested and committed to their development as a leader.
In the second year of the project, scholars participated in an additional leadership workshop. This workshop was conducted mid-way through the project and served to:

- reconnect scholars;
- enable reflection and assessment of their leadership capacity development and consider future development needs and opportunities; and
- progress understanding of leadership and the tools and skills for effective leadership in the higher education context.

Characteristics of Good Practice Drawn from the Interviews with Scholars

1. Ensure that there are adequate opportunities for scholars to establish social connections with each other.
2. Clearly communicate project deliverables and activities and negotiate a realistic timeline for the achievement of these.
3. Provide opportunities for Institutional groups to establish social connections and plan for ongoing communication and collaboration, (e.g. negotiation of a schedule of institutional meetings throughout the duration of the project)
4. Carefully consider activities that are best achieved/suited to a face to face forum and ensure these activities are incorporated into the program.
5. Ensure the facilitated activities are engaging; provide the opportunity for social collaboration and development of existing knowledge, understandings and skills; and centre on meaningful, authentic contexts that reflect practice.
6. Conduct the face to face events at an off-site venue that communicates to the scholars the importance of their work.
7. Schedule the face to face events to ensure the timing of these events is suitable for the scholars’ workload and teaching commitments (e.g. outside of teaching sessions).
8. Provide ongoing professional development outside of the formal face to face events (e.g. through virtual forums - provision of journal articles and research on effective leadership for higher education).

9. Ensure there is a clear understanding and definition of distributive leadership for the context and purpose of the project. This was a difficult concept for many of the scholars to comprehend given their experiences of hierarchical leadership in higher education institutions.

Key Challenges

Scheduling events to accommodate the commitments of all participants.

Designing professional development activities that suit the learning styles and needs of all participants.

Sustaining engagement in professional development activities.

Ensuring that the professional development activities meet the needs of scholars.

“The retreat served to cement a union among the group.” (2008 Scholar)

“I found all the face to face activities valuable – being able to go away and stay in a nice place – it communicated the value of the project.” (2008 Scholar)

“The best learning in my circumstance came from coming to terms with my responses to the indifference I encountered … in effect the authentic learning. I also believe there was good learning from working with the scholars group.” (2008 Scholar)
Employ some form of testing or measurement of leadership capacity before and after the program is implemented. This will enable some tangible assessment of the value of the implemented program.

A more detailed overview of the professional development activities, resources and evaluations are available at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

Associated Project Activities

**Activity 1:** Leadership Retreat

**Activity 2:** Leadership Workshop

References


Additional information about social constructivism and an annotated bibliography is available from the GREEN Website at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

Future Considerations

Provide definitions or a clear explanation of key terms and aspects of the project, e.g. distributive leadership. These could be incorporated into a booklet or manual that was given to participants prior to the commencement of the project.

Establish a repository or space for existing and future project resources such as relevant leadership and assessment journal articles, leadership theories, leadership styles and practices to be stored.
Reflective dialogue with like minded peers and scholars who had or were encountering similar experiences was highly beneficial.

Formal reflection occurred more commonly in a group setting (e.g. meeting) than individually.

The impetus of having to prepare a report or presentation required a degree of reflection.

"Reporting and updating in the various forums on the status of the project requires some degree of reflection that might not otherwise have occurred.” (2007 Scholar)

Underpinning Theories and their Practical Application in the Project

Theories of social constructivism and communities of practice underpin this domain. The mentoring and coaching relationships enabled a social context in which scholars could learn about leadership. The practice of reflection was a learning tool utilised in these interactions. The social contexts that were instigated throughout the project included:

- peer mentoring in institutional and cross-institutional meetings and as a consequence of professional development activities;
- mentoring by senior institutional leaders; and
- coaching by senior executive.

Wenger, McDermott and Snyder (2002), define communities of practice as “groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise... by interacting on an ongoing basis” (p.4). The scholars who shared a common interest in leadership development engaged in reflective activities to promote their collective learning in the area. The scholars engaged in reflection that focused on exploring and understanding dimensions of leadership practice (Schön, 1983).

In this project scholars engaged in formal and informal, individual and collective reflective activities. Some scholars recorded their reflective thoughts in journals while others were satisfied to just mentally engage in the practice. Strategies for reflecting were incorporated into the formal meetings (i.e. face to face, online, video and tele-conferences) and various other program activities such as mentoring and coaching.

The preparation of presentations and reports were also perceived by scholars as activities that facilitated reflection. Overall the scholars engaged in reflection to some degree and were highly positive in their perception of its value.
Characteristics of Good Practice Drawn from the Interviews with Scholars

1. The overall structure of the project (e.g. ongoing communication, formal meetings, mentoring and coaching) compelled scholars to engage in reflection.

2. Incorporating activities into the formal and informal meetings such as project updates and reports on the successes and challenges encountered by scholars in the implementation of their projects, required engagement in reflection. These activities also provided a springboard for dialogue that fostered deeper reflection.

Key Challenges

Getting engagement from all scholars in the cross-institutional communication particularly in relation to sharing personal reflections.

Problems with online and telecommunication modes (i.e. there were significant problems encountered with the online services used throughout the project to support communication and collaboration across institutions. There were also a number of issues encountered in both stages of the project with the videoconference and teleconference services).

Finding the time to engage in reflective journaling or share personal reflections and musings with the other scholars.

Establishing a network of individuals willing and able to discuss the faculty-based projects and provide feedback to scholars.

Future Considerations

Communication could be enhanced and reflective practices promoted through the use of effective online networking, communication and collaboration tools.

Scholars suggested the need for a range of strategies for reflective practice. It was further recommended that demonstrating multiple ways that reflective practice could transpire (e.g. written, audio, video) would be useful.

Resources developed to enhance reflective practices and activities are available at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

Associated Project Activities

Activity 5: Mentoring and Coaching

Activity 6: Reflective Practice

Activity 7: Cross-Faculty, Institutional and Cross-Institutional Communication and Collaboration

Activity 8: Cascading
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Additional information about social constructivism and communities of practice incorporated in an annotated bibliography is available from the GREEN Website at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
 Scholars engaged in leadership capacity development enabled through the provision of opportunities and experiences that occurred in the authentic, real or actual context in which they reside. Consequently the development of leadership transpired through the enactment of leadership.

**Project Findings**

In reviewing and evaluating the activities and experiences that comprise this domain, the scholars reported that:

The experience of leading, enabled the development of an appreciation of themselves as a leader and the leadership qualities they possessed or developed.

Engaging in authentic tasks enabled scholars to:

- experience and practice how to lead;
- assess how they operate as a leader within a group of leaders;
- engage in leadership practices they wouldn’t otherwise have had the opportunity or confidence to engage in;
- put into practice leadership knowledge, understandings and skills they had learnt about;
- envision their potential as a leader;
- contemplate leadership concepts and theories;
- appreciate the difficulties and challenges in leading;
- establish confidence in themselves as leaders; and
- appreciate a broader perspective of leadership in higher education beyond the faculty or department level.

"Involvement in this project has made me see what I can do in this institution and where I am and what I might do." (2008 Scholar)
Underpinning Theories and their Practical Application in the Project

Theories of authentic and situational learning underpin this domain. The best learning takes place when the tasks (or activities) transpire in the context in which the learning will be applied. Authentic learning includes the following characteristics: real-world relevance; defining the tasks and sub-tasks; including complex tasks; exploring the task from different perspectives; opportunities to collaborate and reflect; applicability for integration; application across different subject areas; and assimilated with assessment. (Herrington & Oliver, 2000, p. 25-26).

The faculty-based projects proposed by the scholars provided opportunities for authentic and situational learning; these projects were related to assessment and aligned to faculty and university strategic goals.

Scholars designed and articulated the strategic action plan for their faculty-based project and led the implementation of this plan. This implementation provided scholars with an opportunity to provide and practice leadership within their faculty and institution.

Scholars also had the opportunity to provide and practice leadership outside their institution in their organisation and facilitation of a national roundtable on assessment.

Characteristics of Good Practice Drawn from the Interviews with Scholars

1. The scholar self-nominates for leadership roles and responsibilities and is not delegated or assigned these.
2. Ensure there is effective and regular communication with project stakeholders.
3. Explicitly schedule time on a regular ongoing basis to attend to the implementation of the faculty-based project.
4. Ensure the negotiated expectations and outcomes of the faculty-based project are manageable and achievable.
5. In order to sustain momentum and enthusiasm the scholar needs to ensure that they have a commitment to and belief in the outcomes of the negotiated faculty-based project.
6. Scholars recognised that the more successful faculty-based projects were those that had ‘buy in’, and support from senior leaders in the faculty and institution.
Key Challenges

Collaborating and working with others in the facilitation of the faculty-based project and the organisation of the national roundtable. This was particularly relevant in instances where there were differing opinions and views for progressing these initiatives.

Enabling all scholars the opportunity for leadership in the organisation and facilitation of the national roundtable.

Getting senior faculty and institutional leaders to ‘buy in’ to and support the implementation of the faculty-based project.

Time constraints and the impact this had on scholars being able to engage in the organisation of the national roundtable and facilitation of the faculty-based project.

Some scholars had difficulties in accessing the funding that had been provided by their university to enable them to reduce their workload.

Some of the scholar’s workloads were established prior to their engagement in the project. In some instances this did not allow for reductions in existing commitments and presented a challenge for these scholars to engage in project activities.

“At the university level I think the challenge is how slowly change takes place.” (2007 Scholar)
Future Considerations

Enable a longer period of time for the implementation of the faculty-based projects, possibly 18 months to 2 years.

Conduct the roundtable at a time that ensures scholars have had adequate opportunity to complete a substantial amount of work in their faculty-based project.

Establish mechanisms to enable:

• future progression of the faculty-based projects; and
• facilitation of the improvements in assessment for learning and teaching that are identified.

A more detailed overview of the faculty-based projects and the national roundtables including resources and evaluations are available at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

Associated Project Activities

Activity 3: Authentic Action Learning - Faculty-Based Projects
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Domain 4

Engaging

Scholars established and forged relationships with significant others including other scholars, senior colleagues, institutional leaders, mentors, and coaches. The opportunities and activities that facilitated engagement in these relationships enabled the scholars to participate in dialogue that encouraged a deeper understanding of leadership roles and responsibilities.

Project Findings

In reviewing and evaluating the activities and experiences that comprise this domain, scholars reported that:

- Scheduling formal and informal meetings ensured they committed time to engage in the project and in relationships with others.
- Cross-institutional collaborations that might not otherwise have been possible were forged. The relationships that developed and subsequent dialogue that transpired enabled scholars to gain a wider perspective of leadership in higher education.
- Face to face meetings were the most effective and productive means of engaging with others.

- Opportunity to engage with the other scholars, senior colleagues, institutional leaders, mentors, and coaches helped elucidate strategies and skills for effective leadership.

“The most beneficial discussions I’ve had is with people involved in our group.” (2008 Scholar)

- Implementation of the faculty-based project and involvement in the organisation and facilitation of the roundtable enabled connections with individuals that may not have otherwise been possible or considered.

- Engaging with the institutional and cross-institutional networks (e.g. scholar groups, mentors, senior colleagues) encouraged sharing of relevant resources on both leadership and assessment.

- The institutional scholar meetings were the primary means for accessing feedback on faculty-based projects.

- Sharing progress, achievements and challenges often influenced how other scholar’s responded to challenges and exercised leadership in the context of their own faculty-based projects.
Underpinning Theories and their Practical Application in the Project

Theories of social constructivism and communities of practice underpin the activities and experiences that comprise this domain. The relationships and communities of practice that the scholars engaged in created a social context of leadership. This context provided a framework for discussions about leadership strategies, skills, styles and practices that were often then employed by scholars in their faculty-based projects.

The dialogue and interactions that transpired within the communities of practice were the catalysts for leadership capacity development.

Scholars forged relationships with:

- strategic leadership coaches;
- institutional leaders;
- project facilitators;
- senior colleagues;
- senior academics from other institutions;
- mentors;
- past scholars;
- peers; and
- each other.

Activities that initiated these relationships included:

- regular formal and informal institutional and cross-institutional meetings;
- facilitation of the national roundtables;
- coaching; and
- mentoring including the mentoring that occurred in the cascading stage of the project between past and present scholars.

“It’s allowed me to tap into the knowledge and skills of the other scholars and fellows.” (2008 Scholar)
Key Challenges

Getting engagement from all scholars in cross-institutional communication and collaboration.

Acquiring an effective tool that can be used to facilitate cross-institutional communication and collaboration.

Time constraints and the impact this had on scholars being able to engage in activities that facilitated engagement with others.

There is a need to develop a critical distance for the day to day operations of the project in order to avoid taking too much personal responsibility for it. While this is very difficult, it is important for leaders to develop a couple of tactics for stepping back and recognising that the project is not the top priority in everyone else’s lives.

“I needed to realise that not everyone was going to share my passion and that with the things that I am passionate about I needed to not take it personally that others maybe chose not to engage as much as I hoped.” (2008 Scholar)

Geographical distance or isolation may hinder engagement. Email communication is time consuming and the tone or intent of the email may be misunderstood.

Selection of appropriate mentors to suit the scholar.

Scheduling of the mentoring meetings. This was the responsibility of scholars but in many instances this was not managed and consequently the mentoring relationship did not eventuate.

Staffing changes had an impact on a few mentoring relationships.

Scholars’ confidence to engage with more experienced/senior academics.

“I felt within the group probably one of the least experienced, in terms of teaching background so therefore probably not in the strongest position to make a valuable contribution. So doubting my abilities there has probably held me back a bit or rather slowed me down in terms of involving myself more.” (2008 Scholar)
Future Considerations

Create opportunities throughout the implementation of the project for formal discussion and input about leadership theories and practice.

“I probably hoped for some more theoretical input along the way and more discussion about the leadership development theories. It would have been good generally to have had more theoretical material provided.” (2007 Scholar)

Establish an online repository or endnote library for the joint collection of relevant resources both on leadership and assessment.

Resources developed to enhance engagement and for related activities are available at:
www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

Associated Project Activities

Activity 5: Mentoring and Coaching
Activity 7: Cross-Faculty, Institutional and Cross-Institutional Communication and Collaboration
Activity 8: Cascading
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Additional information about social constructivism and communities of practice and an annotated bibliography is available from the GREEN Website at:
www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
Domain 5

Networking

Scholars undertook activities and engaged in relationships that broadened their professional networks across the multiple levels of higher education. These activities and relationships enabled the scholars to engage with a wider group of senior leaders and explore the potential for leadership opportunities.

Project Findings

In reviewing and evaluating the activities and experiences that comprise this domain, scholars reported that:

- Having contact with someone senior in the institutional hierarchy was extremely valuable and provided:
  - a broader cultural perspective of leadership across the institution and sector;
  - legitimacy within the faculty for the project;
  - an awareness of the cultural status of the sector (e.g. University agenda, DEEWR agenda, funding opportunities and requirements); and
  - greater opportunities for leadership roles and responsibilities outside the current sphere of practice.

  “It [contact with a senior leader] gives you credibility, it sometimes helps you get things through, it gives you a bit more smarts about the way to go about things.” (2007 Scholar)

  “It is valuable to have contact with senior leaders because they’re the key players in change and if you don’t have them on board you are not going to go anywhere.” (2008 Scholar)

  “They [senior leaders] have much more experience and I found their advice very useful.” (2008 Scholar)

- Presenting at institutional and National forums (e.g. national roundtable, conferences) generates opportunities for networking.

- Implementing the faculty-based project and organising and facilitating the roundtable instigated opportunities for networking and enhanced scholar’s confidence to pursue and engage in external networks.

  “The senior leader now knows who we are and that’s always a good thing. He also knows we are committed to promoting teaching and learning across the institution and will be more likely to consider us for roles and responsibilities within the university in relation to this.” (2007 Scholar)
Underpinning Theories and their Practical Application in the Project

The concept of communities of practice underpin this domain. The networking activities that occurred in the project transpired within communities of practice. The networking activities focused on: enabling individuals to share understandings, knowledge and responsibilities (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and encouraging the engagement of all members of the community (Carew, Lefoe, Bell & Armour, 2008).

Networks are important in communities of practice because they broaden the scope of experience and practice that can be considered in developing shared knowledge and understandings.

Networking activities that scholars engaged in included:

- meetings with: a strategic leadership coach, institutional leaders, senior colleagues, and senior academics from other institutions;
- presentations at institutional and national forums including the assessment roundtable; and
- development of relationships with key attendees at roundtable, exploring opportunities for future collaborations.
Characteristics of Good Practice Drawn from the Interviews with Scholars

1. Invite key people to the roundtable who will be able to provide scholars with constructive feedback on their faculty-based projects.

“The opportunity to invite and meet important people from higher education and to be able to target people we wanted to invite in a sense the bigwigs in assessment and higher education to the roundtable was great.” (2008 Scholar)

2. Scholars identify and establish relationships with leaders in the field they are investigating in their faculty-based project.

3. Scholars forge relationships with key leaders in their institution.

4. Regularly communicate developments in the faculty-based project to leaders in the faculty and institution.

5. Actively source and present at relevant institutional and national forums.

Key Challenges

Identification of appropriate and beneficial networks (e.g. conferences, leaders, departments, units) to establish and foster relationships with.

Scholar’s confidence to approach and network with key and strategic leaders.

Future Considerations

Devote time as a group to brainstorm a list of key leaders to develop relationships with, and strategic forums at which to engage and present. Initially these people and opportunities may be identified through a literature review.

Networking opportunities arise most commonly at conferences and in professional forums (e.g. work visits, sector meetings). Networking provides an opportunity for cross disciplinary associations that will advance learning and teaching. As such it would be beneficial to provide financial support for attendance at conferences and professional forums.

A more detailed overview of the presentations at the national roundtables and resources developed in relation to networking are available at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

Associated Project Activities

Activity 4: National Roundtable: Presentation
Activity 5: Mentoring and Coaching
Activity 7: Cross-Faculty, Institutional and Cross-Institutional Communication and Collaboration
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The leadership capacity development (LCD) activities are the specific activities that were implemented during the course of this project. These activities were the vehicles through which the key focus and desired outcomes of each of the domains (growing, reflecting, enabling, engaging and networking) were achieved.

While there is no one formula for LCD in higher education the following activities were identified as beneficial for LCD by the scholars who engaged in the project.

Each of the LCD activities detailed in the following section are intended as a possible means for addressing one or more of the LCDF domains. The applicable domain(s) are denoted by the related symbol at the beginning of each activity.
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The rationale for this activity was to provide an opportunity for scholars to:

- develop an understanding of leadership in the context of higher education and their leadership development; and
- expand their awareness, knowledge and understanding of leadership and the relevant skills for leading in a higher education context.

Overview

A 3-day leadership retreat was held at the beginning of each stage of the project. The purpose of the retreats was:

1. to provide scholars with an opportunity to develop and foster relationships with each other;
2. to enable scholars an opportunity to formulate and discuss aspects of their faculty-based projects; and
3. to engage scholars in explicit leadership development activities.
Activity 1 Leadership Retreat

Context
In Stage 1 the 3-Day leadership retreat was held at the Grange Conference Centre, Lancefield Victoria from 17th – 20th March 2007. The retreat was attended by eleven of the twelve scholars, project leaders from the two participating universities (University of Wollongong and University of Tasmania), the external evaluator, the project manager/retreat convener and the stage 2 project leader from Flinders University.

In stage 2 the 3-Day leadership retreat was held at Hawthorn Suites at 13th Beach, Barwon Heads Victoria from 17th – 20th February 2008. This retreat was attended by twelve of the thirteen scholars, project leaders from the three participating universities (University of Wollongong, Flinders University and La Trobe University), the external evaluator, the project manager/retreat convener and three of the Stage 1 scholars.
Program of Activities

In stage 1 the leadership retreat activities focused on:

1. Providing an overview of the project and related activities
2. Scholar’s presenting a précis of their faculty-based projects.
3. Exploration and examination of:
   - the importance of leadership;
   - distributive leadership;
   - leadership styles;
   - resilience and well being in leadership;
   - leadership in the context of higher education;
   - opportunities and challenges for leadership and leadership capacity development; and
   - the importance of leaders in managing change and leading change from a distributive perspective.
4. Reflective journaling;
5. Providing scholars an opportunity to design, develop and get feedback on their strategic action plans;
6. Introducing scholars to the EdNA/Carrick Exchange as a tool for facilitating institutional and cross-institutional communication and collaboration;
7. Strategies for evaluating, assessing and monitoring;
8. Providing scholars an opportunity to collaboratively plan the roundtable; and
9. Strategies for promoting faculty-based projects in the higher education community.

The retreat culminated with scholars presenting their formulated faculty-based project action plans to senior leaders from their institutions (University of Wollongong and University of Tasmania) for feedback.

The leadership retreat was formally evaluated at the conclusion of the retreat and stage 1. The program of activities for the stage 2 leadership retreat was informed by feedback received from stage 1 participants. The consequent changes to the program of activities included:

1. A more detailed overview of the project and its associated activities;
2. An examination and exploration of effective leadership - the importance and implications of effective leadership and the elements and competencies of effective leadership; and
3. An investigation of strategies for addressing issues, obstacles and difficulties in implementing the faculty-based project action plan.

A further development in stage 2 was the addition of a leadership workshop. This was directly related to the feedback from Stage 1 scholars that an extra event similar to the leadership retreat conducted mid-way through the project would be beneficial.
**Activity 1  Leadership Retreat**

**Success Factors of this Activity as Reported by Scholars**

Facilitating the retreat off-site enabled the scholars time and space to engage and focus on the project.

“The project was very generous and spoilt scholars, the accommodation and venues provided for the major activities was exceptional and it was nice to feel pampered, valued and important.” (2008 Scholar)

The retreat sets the tone for the ongoing collaboration and engagement of scholars in the project. Therefore it is essential that the overall experience is positive.

“The retreat got us going, momentum was at least started.” (2007 Scholar)

Ensure the retreat activities provide an opportunity for scholars to: gain a deeper understanding of the expectations for them in facilitating the project activities, and equips them to carry out the project activities.

“The retreat went very well - there were lots of project related activities and it was a good introduction to the project.” (2008 Scholar)

The leadership retreat enabled scholars to develop a deeper understanding of leadership related theories and practice as well as confirming some of the things they were already practicing in regard to leadership.

The retreat provided the opportunity for scholars to establish networks and build camaraderie across the institutional and cross-institutional groups.

“The retreat went well. I was really struck by how well the group came together and I think that was largely due to the retreat and whatever you did at the retreat to get that going. It was a remarkable group development process that happened.” (2008 scholar)

The retreat provided the opportunity for tangible and consolidated planning for the implementation of the faculty -based project and national roundtable.

**Key Challenges Experienced by Scholars**

Ensuring the group dynamic was one of openness, acceptance and tolerance where scholars felt secure in sharing personal insights, opinions, and values.

**Review and Improvement**

It was suggested that the retreat could provide some opportunity for instruction in research practices (e.g. focus groups) that some of the scholars were using in their faculty -based projects.

**Links and Resources**

A more detailed overview of the Retreat including agendas, associated resources and evaluations is available at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
The leadership workshop was an additional activity that was introduced in stage 2 in response to feedback from stage 1 scholars.

The rationale for this activity was similar to that of the leadership retreat in providing an opportunity for scholars to further develop their conception of leadership in the context of higher education.

Additionally, the leadership workshop provided an opportunity for scholars to reconnect and forge their relationships and work together to plan and organise the national roundtable.

Context

The Leadership Workshop was held at the Stamford Grand Hotel, Glenelg South Australia on 16th and 17th June 2008. The Workshop was attended by all thirteen scholars, project leaders from two of the participating universities (University of Wollongong and La Trobe University) and the project manager.

Program of Activities

The leadership workshop activities focused on:

1. Trialing a World Café forum as a possible presentation strategy for the national roundtable;
2. Exploring emotional intelligence competencies in relation to leading in a higher education context; and
3. Roundtable planning.

Success Factors of this Activity as Reported by Scholars

The leadership workshop reignited scholars’ enthusiasm and momentum in facilitating their faculty-based projects and greatly assisted formal planning for the national roundtable.

“I think from Glenelg [workshop venue] onwards is when everything started to fall into place.” (2008 Scholar)

Links and Resources

For a more detailed overview of the Workshop agenda, associated resources and evaluation visit: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
Activity 2  Leadership Workshop

“Roundtable planning was crucial as the email/video-conferencing did not allow us to reach a consensus – it could generate a list but not a decision.”  (Workshop evaluation 2008)

“A useful aspect of the day was the world café experience and understanding the concept and how it could be used [for the roundtable].”  (Workshop evaluation 2008)
Scholars engaged in leadership capacity development that was enabled through the provision of opportunities and experiences to practice leadership. These opportunities and experiences transpired throughout engagement in authentic and situational learning that occurred in the implementation of faculty-based projects. Implementing the faculty-based project compelled scholars to engage in leadership activities that they might otherwise not have embraced.

The leadership practice that scholars engaged in transpired in the context in which it would most likely be applied. Implementation of the faculty-based projects enabled scholars to engage in real-world, complex tasks that facilitated diverse leadership opportunities and the impetus for collaboration and ongoing reflection.

Through the facilitation of the authentic tasks (faculty-based projects) scholars were provided an opportunity to:

1. Develop ‘real-world’ leadership skills relevant for the context in which they would be employed; and
2. Construct a legitimate awareness and understanding of the relevance, complexity and perspectives of leadership in the higher education context.

"Doing the project is definitely useful leadership wise because it takes you out of your comfort zone." (2008 Scholar)

Context

Scholars nominated to be involved in the Distributive Leadership Project (DLP) by submitting an expression of interest (EOI). In submitting the EOI scholars identified the details of their faculty-based project including the intended goals, outcomes and deliverables of implementation. The EOI submissions were assessed against established criteria by institutional steering committees and suitable applicants for involvement in the project were identified.

A decisive factor in the assessment of the EOI nominations was that the proposed faculty-based project: was aligned to institutional and faculty strategic goals; related to improving assessment; and had the approval of the Faculty Dean (See part 3 of this report for an overview of the scholar’s faculty-based projects).

A meeting between the scholar and project leader and project manager was organised to discuss the details for involvement in the DLP. At this meeting scholars were given various participant information sheets and signed a project consent form and letter of agreement that outlined the activities and expectations for their involvement in DLP.

Scholars articulated the details of their faculty-based project and strategies for its implementation and considerations for the development of an action plan were discussed.

In the context of the DLP, facilitation of the faculty-based projects commenced after the leadership retreat and concluded at the roundtable. However, the majority of the projects were implemented for a longer duration.

A collection of resources and materials developed in relation to this activity including the call-out notice, letter of agreement and participant information forms, the ethics application, and reporting template are available on the GREEN website at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

Program of Activities

Scholars were required to construct a draft action plan for their faculty-based project that was reviewed and further developed at the leadership retreat. These action plans detailed the goals, outcomes and deliverables as well as the proposed strategies for the implementation of the faculty-based project.

An opportunity was provided at the leadership retreat for scholars to discuss, review and get feedback on their action plans, which were further developed in light of these activities. The refined action plans were presented, in a plenary session, to senior institutional leaders (from the participating universities) on the final day of the leadership retreat.

Scholars implemented their strategic action plans over the course of approximately 6 months. Mentoring and coaching, and institutional and cross-institutional meetings provided opportunities for scholars to discuss the status of their faculty-based projects and get feedback from peers, and senior institutional leaders.
“I spent a lot of time working on my action plan and I really thought a lot about the action plan and the different phases when I developed it. Then I’ve absolutely stuck to this plan and ensured I had everything done by the specified date. Definitely for me the planning has been most important.” (2008 Scholar)

Monitoring and evaluation of the faculty-based project and the implementation of the action plan was predominantly informal. However, feedback from stage 1 scholars indicated that an impetus to formally evaluate their faculty-based project, mid-way through the implementation phase, would be beneficial. Subsequently in the second stage of the project, scholars were required to produce an interim progress report.

The scholars’ action plans and progress reports for their faculty-based projects are available on the GREEN website at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

Success Factors of this Activity as Reported by Scholars

Key factors in the success of the faculty-based projects included:

- strong support from formal leaders in the faculty and/or institution;
- engagement, ‘buy in’ and support of faculty staff and other faculty-based project participants;
- having champion/s to assist in the promotion and progression of the faculty-based project (e.g. senior institutional leaders); and
- implementing a faculty driven project.

Developing a detailed action plan for the implementation of the faculty-based project and then adhering to this plan ensured that key outcomes, timelines and deadlines were achieved.

Opportunity to witness different models and perspectives of leadership contributed to scholars’ construction and awareness of leadership for the higher education context and in the management of their faculty-based project.

“Taking part in this project I have seen the inside workings of other departments and I think that is very important to developing leadership capacity. Getting to see other aspects of the department you learn more.” (2008 Scholar)

The opportunity for scholars to exercise and practice leadership skills and identify and progress leadership qualities they already possessed.

Implementation of the faculty-based projects provided opportunities for the scholars to develop versatile leadership skills that would have applicability across a diverse range of ‘real world’ contexts.

“Some [faculty members] just pay you lip service and give you reasons why it can’t work but these too are good comments that you get back. Many of the problems that these people give you are actually good because they are issues that you have to work through.” (2007 Scholar)

Transparent and regular communication of the status of the faculty-based project to faculty members and those directly involved in the project's implementation.
Key Challenges Experienced by Scholars

Getting ‘buy in’ and engagement from faculty members for the implementation of the faculty-based project.

“Employees directly associated with the project can see the value but they don’t always want the extra workload that comes with it.” (2007 Scholar)

Conflicting faculty agendas, projects and commitments and staff changes.

“Some employees or colleagues also have a wait and see attitude ... so basically if it works I’ll get on board.” (2007 Scholar)

Resistance from faculty members to the faculty-based project and addressing this resistance.

“Some people have expressed support and an enthusiasm in the project but for the most part people are busy and it is due to this that they have not engaged with the project. It was interesting to compare my project to one that was being pushed from the top down, mine was from the bottom up. There was a noticeable difference, mine lacked that faculty driven impetus, there wasn’t a purpose from the faculty for mine whereas there was in the other project.” (2008 Scholar).

Not taking setbacks, challenges and resistance personally, managing these strategically and thoughtfully not emotionally.

Sufficiently progressing the faculty-based project to be able to report on and discuss key findings at the roundtable.

“It was hard in the given timeline to experiment with assessment and trial something.” (2008 scholar)

Maintaining the original parameters of the faculty-based project. Many of the scholars found it difficult to keep their projects contained often adding extra tasks, outcomes, activities and deliverables to their action plan.

Lack of interest and enthusiasm in the faculty-based project from other members of staff.

Keeping participants engaged and sustaining their enthusiasm and interest in the faculty-based project.

Dispelling the notion that the faculty-based project belonged to the scholar, maintaining an ongoing appreciation that the project was a faculty initiative.

Obtaining specific and constructive feedback on the implementation of the faculty-based project. Scholars indicated that much of the feedback they received was generally not as detailed as they would have liked.

Monitoring and evaluating the progress of the faculty-based project.
Review and Improvement

It was suggested that assembling scholars into groups, at the leadership retreat, according to the focus of their faculty-based project would have established a community of practice and founded a group that could work collaboratively and provide specific feedback on the implementation of the faculty-based projects.

“It may have been beneficial if we had worked on the faculty projects in conjunction with someone else from one of the other universities talking about virtual teams in this sense.” (2008 Scholar)

Another suggestion was to have a Senior institutional leader (e.g. DVC) present the faculty-based project and scholar to a university wide forum. It was perceived that this would promote the project and communicate its credibility and worth to faculty members; thereby enhancing the possibility of ‘buy in’ and engagement from faculty staff.

More opportunities for specific feedback on the faculty-based projects from DLP participants and leaders was suggested. Enabling this to occur in a face to face manner was also perceived by scholars as highly beneficial.

The issue of obtaining specific feedback on the faculty-based projects was mentioned often. One suggestion for addressing this was to instigate formal feedback mechanisms, (e.g. a survey). It was further suggested that it would be worthwhile communicating the results from such a process back to the faculty.

Links and Resources

Resources developed throughout the Project to support this activity are available on the GREEN website: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
Organisation of the national roundtable event was intended to provide scholars with another opportunity to develop leadership skills through the practice of leading. It required the scholars to work collaboratively and pool their individual expertise to produce a professional outcome. The scholars practiced a distributive perspective of leadership in their negotiation of the roundtable agenda and activities, and their roles and responsibilities in facilitating the event.

“The organisation of the roundtable has been a way of putting leadership theories into practice which has also enabled learning about them.” (2008 Scholar)

For many of the scholars their involvement in this activity was their first opportunity to organise an event with such far-reaching influence. Engagement in the organisation of this event provided scholars with an opportunity to:

- develop leadership skills in an authentic ‘real-world’ context.
- expand their awareness and understanding of the relevance, complexity and perspectives of leadership;
- engage in leadership activities that they might not otherwise have encountered; and
- create a professional product that was valued in its own right and not just as a component of the larger project.

**Context**

Scholars were introduced to the notion of organising the roundtable at the leadership retreat. Scholars assumed responsibility for and collaboratively negotiated the design, purpose and outcomes of the roundtable.

The scholars regularly communicated with each other and as a group in regard to their organisation of the roundtable through face to face meetings, email, telephone, teleconference and videoconference. The scholars also met the day prior to the roundtable to finalise administrative and organisational details for the event.

**Program of Activities**

An explanation of the purpose of the roundtable and the intention of this activity being to further develop scholars’ leadership capacity was communicated to scholars at the leadership retreat in stage 1. The design and explicit outcomes of the roundtable event were not elucidated, scholars were empowered to collaboratively construct and decide what these would be.

However, evaluations from stage 1 indicated that scholars were often not aware of what a roundtable was and that they found designing these constructs extremely difficult. Subsequently in the second stage of the project, scholars were provided more information about what a roundtable event might involve, the purpose of the event was made clearer and some models of possible roundtable activities were presented.

Three stage 1 scholars attended the 2008 leadership retreat and provided: a synopsis of the 2007 roundtable, an overview of challenges and considerations and suggestions based on their experience for organising the event.

In organising the roundtable scholars collaboratively:

1. Identified scholars in each institution to act as key liaisons. The primary duty of these individuals was to ensure ongoing communication between the institutions and scholars;
2. Ascertained the tasks and sub-tasks that were required to organise the roundtable and determined the associated timelines for achieving these; and
3. Negotiated individual responsibilities for the identified tasks and sub-tasks.

Scholars in stage 1 recognised the critical need for an additional face to face meeting to progress the organisation of the roundtable. So, in the second stage of the project an additional formal face to face meeting was introduced enabling the scholars to discuss and plan their organisation of the roundtable. This additional activity was referred to as the leadership workshop.

The scholars coordinated the roundtable at multiple levels ensuring there was ongoing monitoring, reflection and evaluation of the ensuing organisation. The institutional groups met regularly to plan and manage organisational tasks.
The institutional liaisons regularly communicated the developments from institutional meetings to each other confirming that all the negotiated tasks were being addressed and that there were no overlaps in the various undertakings. There were regular teleconference and videoconference cross-institutional meetings arranged to discuss and progress organisation of the roundtable.

**Success Factors of this Activity as Reported by Scholars**

Negotiation and clarification at the retreat and workshop of:
- the focus and outcomes of the roundtable;
- a preliminarily list of the tasks and sub-tasks and associated timeframes and deadlines for these; and
- roles and responsibilities in the organisation of the roundtable.

The opportunity to design the roundtable to meet the collective needs of the group.

“We had a bit of a pressure cooker happening in preparing for the roundtable but this brought us together and without too much difficulty we were able to pull together a cohesive and professional roundtable.” (2007 Scholar)

**Key Challenges Experienced by Scholars**

Understanding the purpose and benefits of this activity. It was only after the facilitation of the roundtable that scholars appreciated the leadership capacity development that they had achieved as a consequence of engaging in this activity.

The timing of this event. Many scholars felt the event was conducted before they had sufficient opportunity to progress their faculty-based project to a point where they had adequate information to report on and discuss with roundtable delegates.

The opportunity to determine the design of the roundtable. While the benefits of this were appreciated it was also perceived as a challenge because many of the scholars had no point of reference or previous experience of a roundtable.

Ensuring balance and equity in the roles and responsibilities negotiated for the organisation of the roundtable.

**Review and Improvement**

It would have been beneficial to have had a collection of models for what a roundtable event could be and an explanation of the distinction between a roundtable and conference/symposium/workshop.

Have a face to face debrief on the day immediately after the roundtable to reflect on lessons learnt and document strategies for future use.

Facilitate the roundtable later in the year enabling more opportunity to progress the project sufficiently.

**Links and Resources**

A detailed overview of the roundtable event, associated resources and evaluation is available on the GREEN website [www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership](http://www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership)
Facilitation of the national roundtable event was intended to continue the scholars’ development of leadership capacity through the practice of leading that was initiated in the organisational phase of this event. It required the scholars to collaboratively facilitate the actual event and saw each of them undertaking varying roles and responsibilities in this facilitation.

For many of the scholars this was their first opportunity and experience in facilitating an event that transcended the faculty or institutional environment.

Context

In Stage 1 the Assessing Student Learning: Using Interdisciplinary Synergies to Develop Good Teaching and Assessment Practice roundtable was held at the Sydney Masonic Centre, Sydney New South Wales on Tuesday September 4, 2007.

Forty-three delegates including eleven of the twelve Scholars, project leaders from the two participating universities (University of Wollongong and University of Tasmania), the external evaluator, the project manager, representatives from the steering committees and stage 2 participating institutions (Flinders University and La Trobe University), and key academics from universities across Australia and New Zealand attended the event.

In Stage 2 the Culture of Assessment in Higher Education roundtable was held at the Novotel, Brighton Le Sands, Sydney, New South Wales on Thursday September 18, 2008.

Forty-nine delegates including the thirteen scholars, project leaders from the participating universities (University of Wollongong, Flinders University and La Trobe University), the external evaluator, the project manager, representatives from the steering committees and potential stage 3 participating universities (University of Canberra and James Cook University), and key academics from universities across Australia and New Zealand attended the event.

Program of Activities

Roles and responsibilities in the facilitation of the roundtable event included:

1. Establishing and managing the budget and financial administration for the event.
2. Management of invitees including: preparation of the official invitation, identification and generation of a list of delegates to be invited; dissemination of invitations, collection and collation or replies and follow up on outstanding responses;
3. Organising event venue and catering;
4. Finalising the program agenda and related activities including negotiation of roles and responsibilities such as roundtable facilitator, chairing sessions, welcoming delegates;
5. Ascertaining and preparing the materials for the event and to be disseminated pre and post event (e.g. abstracts detailing the scholars’ faculty-based projects, posters over-viewing the projects, handouts for the various sessions, PowerPoint presentations.)
6. Determining evaluation strategies and related responsibilities (e.g. prepare and produce required evaluation resources, collation of the evaluations after the event);
7. Clarifying follow up activities and responsibilities (e.g. collation and dissemination of notes/transcripts from the day, instigation of mechanisms to promote ongoing communication and collaborations).

Feedback from delegates attending the 2007 and 2008 roundtables indicated that scholars efficiently managed time and that the contributions of scholars were facilitated effectively. Qualitative data indicated the professionalism of the event and the high standard of organisation.

A more detailed evaluation report for each of the roundtable events is available on the GREEN website: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
Success Factors of this Activity as Reported by Scholars

Negotiation and distribution of roles and responsibilities.

A second face-to-face meeting mid-way through the project was an important component in the organisation as well as additional videoconferencing meetings.

“Good sharing of roles and responsibilities.” (2008 Scholar)

Key Challenges Experienced by Scholars

Ensuring that scholars’ roles in facilitating the roundtable and the associated responsibilities don’t diminish or negate opportunities for networking and engaging in dialogue that might be integral for establishing future connections and collaborations.

“My role [in the facilitation of the event] was actually a constraint to networking opportunities – the only time I had for this was the poster session.” (2008 Scholar)

Space issues – the room was a little cramped and the small group activities were noisy at times because they were all conducted in the one room.

“Small group discussions needed to be in separate space. Difficult to maintain the discussion over general room noise for the full hour.” (2007 Roundtable Delegate)

Management of small groups and ensuring the gathered small groups in the breakout sessions aren’t too large to achieve the intended outcomes and purpose of the session.

“The thematic groups were a little large for good discussion.” (2008 Roundtable Delegate)

Ensuring the event program met the intended purpose and outcomes of the roundtable but didn’t compress too much into the available time.

Allowing adequate opportunity for discussion and feedback on the authentic projects.

Fully accessing the expertise and knowledge that the attending delegates offer.

Evaluating the impact of the event.

“Perhaps more information given in advance of what would be the expectations of invitees and what would be the anticipated outcomes from the event.” (2008 Roundtable Delegate)

Review, Improvement, Follow Up

The question was raised about how the most impact from the roundtable could be achieved. To this end the suggestion was made that perhaps the roundtable could have some tangible outcomes established that relate to dissemination into the wider higher education community.

“Could the roundtable have some strategic outcome. For example we might have agreed that from the day there would be some specific statement that was made that would be sent to the Minister for Education.” (2008 Scholar)

Each of the scholars identified key delegates in the context of their faculty-based projects to invite to the roundtable. A suggestion was made that there should be some formal mechanism during the course of the roundtable for each of the scholars to get input and feedback from the invitees they had specifically targeted.

The poster session was facilitated to enable this but a number of the scholars felt that this still did not achieve this crucial outcome. An alternate strategy proposed was for the provision to be made in the agenda for each scholar to sit down with the specific people they invited and get targeted feedback around their faculty-based project.

Another suggestion proposed to facilitate the feedback of targeted invitees was to email the delegates prior to the roundtable with details of the faculty-based project and the desire for their feedback.

Links and Resources

A more detailed overview of the Roundtable event, associated resources and an evaluation of the event is presented on the GREEN website:

www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
The intention of this activity was to provide the opportunity for scholars to:

- establish and foster an identity as a leader in learning and teaching outside their institution;
- engage in leadership practice; and
- explore potential cross-institutional collaborations and networks.

Context

There were a number of ways in which scholars were able to participate at the roundtable including:

- Roundtable facilitator;
- Session chair; and
- Formal presentation

“Presenting at the roundtable was a bit of a confidence boost.” (2008 Scholar)

Program of Activities

In stage 1, roundtable delegates were sent an agenda and overview of each of the scholar’s projects, which was the basis for their roundtable presentations, prior to attending the event.

The Assessing Student Learning: Using Interdisciplinary Synergies to Develop Good Teaching and Assessment Practice roundtable agenda included:

1. A keynote presentation: Great designs: What should assessment do? By Professor David Boud, Professor of Adult Education at the University of Technology, Sydney;
2. Presentations by each of the Scholars on their faculty-based projects;
3. The opportunity over morning tea and lunch for delegates to discuss poster presentations with scholars;
4. Identification and synthesis of key challenges, identified in the scholars’ faculty-based projects and for assessment in the future;
5. Identification and discussion of key issues and challenges for assessment in higher education and possible strategies for addressing these; and
6. Opportunities for further research and investigation of the challenges and issues for assessment in higher education.

Feedback from delegates attending the 2007 roundtable reported that:

- The roundtable met their expectations;
- The roundtable sessions were useful in facilitating discussion on a range of issues to do with assessment of learning within universities;
- They would consider collaborating with scholars on future projects and initiatives; and
- There were too many individual faculty-based project presentations and that these presentations were too rushed.


In stage 2 the scholars’ faculty-based projects were organised into thematic groups. These groups were:

1. Strategies for dealing with factors affecting the implementation of improved assessment practices;
2. Sustainable assessment: Designing assessment that meets the needs of the present and also prepare students to meet their own future learning needs; and
3. Assessment and outcome alignment: How do we know it when we see it?

The Culture of Assessment in Higher Education roundtable agenda included:

1. A World Café forum to explore issues and challenges for assessment in higher education;
2. A poster session whereby delegates moved around the posters and discussed with scholars their project, its status and outcomes;
3. The facilitation of activities designed to promote discussion and explore the thematic focci of the projects; and
4. Discussion of the challenges and opportunities for assessment in higher education.

Feedback from delegates attending the 2008 roundtable reported that:

- The roundtable met their expectations;
- The roundtable sessions were useful in facilitating discussion on a range of issues to do with assessment of learning within universities;
- There were adequate opportunities for them to contribute, network and exchange ideas;
- There were a range of ideas, themes and issues covered;
- The sessions were highly interactive;
- They would consider collaborating with scholars on future projects and initiatives; and
- Occasionally groups were too large and noise levels made it difficult to hear clearly.

A more detailed evaluation report of this roundtable is available on the GREEN website: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership

Activity 4 National Roundtable: Presentation

Success Factors of this Activity as Reported by Scholars and Roundtable delegates

Opportunity to discuss issues with the ‘experts’ and those with significantly more experience.

“I really appreciated the words of wisdom from senior academics and policy makers. I really need some of the political and experiential nous that is available from people who understand how higher education and the schools and disciplines really work.” (2007 Scholar)

The roundtable enabled the facilitation of discussion on a range of issues to do with assessment of learning within universities.

The opportunity to meet and engage with like-minded academics from other institutions.

“The discussion on the range of assessment related perspectives was revitalising. The opportunity for such involvement is the type of professional development that underscores change.” (2007 Roundtable Delegate)

The opportunity to get feedback on individual faculty-based projects.

The profile in teaching and learning presenting at the roundtable initiated for scholars.

The potential liaisons, networks and collaborations that were initiated.
“The opportunity to invite and meet important people from higher education and to be able to target people we wanted to invite in a sense the bigwigs in assessment and higher education to the roundtable was great.” (2008 Scholar)

Gleaning ideas for the future development or progression of faculty-based projects.

The program of activities enabled valuable discussions to transpire, the possibility of future collaborations to emerge and identification of potential projects to commence.

“Clever planning, which avoided a common trap with such days of descriptive presentations AND also avoided the equally common ‘talk-fest’ of forums.” (2008 Roundtable Delegate)

Presenting at the roundtable increased confidence of scholars in the context of the higher education community.

“Confidence in my ability to actually stand up in front of a group of people that probably know a hell of a lot more than me about teaching and assessment, and make sense and have them receive it positively.” (2007 Scholar)

Sharing good practice and diverse innovative strategies for change in assessment in higher education.

“The roundtable was a very good exercise for building confidence in my ability to lead change. “ (2008 Scholar)

Key Challenges Experienced by Scholars

Presenting to a group of peers and leaders in assessment in higher education.

Review and Improvement

The suggestion was made to disseminate a list of the roundtable participants’ names and institutions to enable follow up.

Records of discussions and decisions during the roundtable be made available to attendees after the event.

Links and Resources

A more detailed overview of the roundtable events, associated resources and evaluations is available on the GREEN website: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
Activity 4 National Roundtable: Presentation

“The World Café] was a great way for setting the scene for the rest of the day. The discussion was lively and active. I was a little intimidated by the knowledge expertise at the table.” (Roundtable evaluation 2008)

 “[The World Café created] really good engagement. Great ideas. I will use this technique with staff in departments. Excellent!” (Roundtable evaluation 2008)

 “[The World Café] was brilliant! Interactive, refreshing!” (Roundtable evaluation 2008)

 “[The World Café] was a great way of generating discussion and sharing ideas. It also ‘exposed’ the scholars to a wide audience and allowed them to develop and display their skills in group facilitation.” (Roundtable evaluation 2008)
Mentoring and coaching relationships were encouraged across both stages of the project. The purpose of these relationships was to enhance the growth and development of the scholar in regard to their leadership and personal maturity.

This growth and development was fostered by reflective practices and dialogue that transpired in the formal and informal mentoring and coaching meetings. These relationships also enabled scholars to gain a deeper understanding of leadership in the higher education context.

Context

The mentoring relationship was not intended as an instructional exercise rather it was presented as an opportunity for scholars to engage in informal dialogue with a person they trusted and felt safe confiding in. The mentoring relationship was proposed as an opportunity to focus on reflection and clarification of leadership development and plan for the future growth of leadership potential.

The coaching relationship was seen as more strategic and related to improving scholars’ knowledge and understanding of leadership in the higher education context with an ultimate goal of enhancing their leadership practice.

Program of Activities

A range of mentoring and coaching relationships were embraced by scholars including:

- Strategic coaching with a leader from the senior executive in each institution;
- Mentoring relationships with institutional leaders; and
- Peer mentoring through the institutional and cross-institutional networks.

It is noteworthy that some scholars established mentoring relationships outside of those promoted in the DLP, these were typically with friends or trusted colleagues.

“My mentor was excellent she picked up straight away if there was something that I needed to talk about, reflect on and work through, she didn’t ever do that hand patting; she always addressed my question and not by giving me a straight answer but by telling me about an experience she’d had or a reflection she’d undertaken or just a very gentle and open discussion. This helped in dealing with the challenges I was experiencing throughout the project.”

(2007 Scholar)

Success Factors of this Activity as Reported by Scholars

Whilst this activity was intended as an informal and needs based one, some scholars indicated they would prefer to see it formalised. Some suggested ensuring meetings with the strategic leadership coach and mentors were structured, that is they should have a clear goal and purpose, an idea of the desired outcomes for the meeting and where possible an agenda.

The ability to choose own mentor was seen as essential.

Having a mentor from the same institution, who is trusted and respected, encouraging, willing to learn and share constructive comments.

“We [mentor and scholar] had regular meetings where I could raise specific issues with my project but what was even more valuable was her advice in relation to other issues that I was dealing with in my faculty as we were going through the curriculum and administrative changes. She even provided really good advice as I prepared for an interview for a leadership position within my faculty. I have continued the mentor-mentee relationship even though the project has finished.”

(2008 Scholar)

Having guidelines on how to make good use of these coaching and mentoring relationships.

Resources developed to support mentoring are presented on the GREEN website:

www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
Key Challenges Experienced by Scholars

Scheduling of mentoring meetings. This was the responsibility of the scholar but in many instances this was not managed and consequently the mentoring relationship did not eventuate. Some scholars indicated they found it daunting to approach and establish a relationship with a senior person.

Appropriate and suitable matching of scholar and mentor.

“I found it easier to find a mentor who was more at my level but just a little ahead of me than someone who was more senior to me.” (2008 Scholar)

Finding the time to engage in mentoring and the institutional and cross-institutional meetings.

Staff turn over, in a couple of instances a mentor either left the institution or went on extended leave which ceased the mentoring relationship.

“Perhaps a bigger stable of mentors so if one drops out you can get another one.” (2007 Scholar)

Review and Improvement

It was suggested that it may have been worthwhile to have had training for mentors.

Another proposition presented was that if the mentoring and/or coaching relationships were significant in the development of leadership capacity then there should be a session at the retreat that focused on these constructs and presented strategies for the effective facilitation of them.

At times the seniority of the assigned mentor intimidated the scholar, as a result the scholar would often feel like they were imposing asking for a meeting and thus wouldn’t approach or ‘bother’ their mentor. Conducting an orientation for all the scholars and their mentors that concludes with the scheduling of meeting dates for the duration of the program would address this shortcoming.

“I just couldn’t bring myself to impose on them … I’m just too shy and it seemed a bit fake to me to be approaching these more senior people.” (2008 Scholar)

A further suggestion was to provide the mentors with a synopsis of the benefits for them of engaging in a mentoring relationship.

The possibility of interviewing mentors as part of the project evaluation process was also suggested as a useful means of generating important insights that could assist in progressing the mentoring and coaching activity.

Links and Resources

Resources and materials to support mentoring and coaching are presented on the GREEN website:

Reflective practice is an active process of reviewing experiences in order to inform and improve future practice. It involves conscious and thoughtful deliberation of past events, assessment of the actions and engagement with others that transpired in these events, and contemplation of how to improve future practice in light of this assessment.

Context

Scholars were encouraged to regularly engage in reflective practice. Many of them reported that it was something they did automatically while others indicated that it was only in dialogue with others that they employed this tool.

Sessions on reflective journaling, as a means of formally engaging in reflective practice, were presented at the leadership retreats. It was suggested that reflective journal musings could be used as a springboard for discussions in mentoring and coaching relationships and could also be shared with other scholars in meetings or via email.

While scholars were not compelled to engage in reflective journaling, it was suggested as a sound strategy for their ongoing leadership capacity development. However, interviews with scholars indicated that very few of them regularly engaged in reflective journaling.

Despite the fact that very few of the scholars engaged in reflective journaling all of them reported engaging in reflective practices. Most commonly this was an outcome of conversations or due to a requirement for them to provide a formal or informal faculty based-project update or report.

Many of the project activities evoked reflective practice including the institutional and cross-institutional meetings, the mentoring and coaching meetings, the leadership retreat and workshop, the roundtable event and preparation of progress reports and roundtable posters.

Success Factors of this Activity as Reported by Scholars

Keeping a record of events and activities that transpired throughout the implementation of the faculty-based project.

“I’ve been keeping constant records of everything that’s been done and writing up as soon as I’ve completed activities.” (2008 Scholar)

Developing conference or journal articles, creating the project poster and preparing presentations were all identified by scholars as effective springboards for reflective practice.

“I have also been writing up a manuscript for a paper I am going to be delivering at a conference next year, this has also been a useful means of reflection.” (2008 Scholar)
**Activity 6 Reflective Practice**

**Key Challenges Experienced by Scholars**

Finding the time to engage in formal reflective practices such as reflective journaling.

“Reflective journaling is a challenge because it’s just not part of your day to day thinking, and operation.” (2007 Scholar).

**Review and Improvement**

While the value of reflective journaling was unquestionable the impetus for it was not compelling as such a suggestion was made that an obligatory requirement to engage in reflective journaling might ensure scholars engage in this worthwhile activity.

“I think it would be a good thing to make the journal a more formal requirement of the project but in saying that I think there would be a lot of flack from scholars if you did make it a more formal component of the project.” (2007 Scholar)

Explore the use of an online tool for reflective journaling.

Demonstrate at the retreat different methods and strategies for reflective practice.

**Links and Resources**

Resources and materials to support reflective practice are presented on the GREEN website:

www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
Cross-faculty, institutional and cross-institutional communication and collaboration provided an opportunity for scholars to engage with each other. This engagement largely focused on sharing knowledge, understandings and experiences of leadership in regard to leading a faculty-based project.

The strength of this network resided in the fact that while the scholars were at varying stages of their career and had different experiences of leadership they were all engaged in a similar process of implementing a faculty-based project. As such the scholars were often experiencing challenges and issues related to both the process of leading change initiatives and also to influencing change without positional leadership authority.

“The ongoing communication with other scholars was great and I enjoyed the collegiality and mentoring that came out of this interaction.” (2007 Scholar)

The scholars regularly met to discuss the implementation of their projects. The dialogue that transpired in these meetings fostered leadership development through:

- Understandings and knowledge that were gained from scholars’ shared experiences, challenges, achievements and practice in leading a faculty-based project. Often the strategies that one scholar shared about managing a challenge informed another scholar’s future management of a similar challenge; and
- The discussion of strategies for leading a faculty-based project.

**Context**

Cross-faculty and institutional networks were established in each of the participating universities prior to the leadership retreat. These networks comprised the institutional scholars and institutional leader. Regular formal and informal meetings of these networks transpired over the course of the project.

“Connection with scholars was inspiring.” (2007 Scholar)

Cross-institutional networks were established at the leadership retreats. These networks comprised the institutional scholars and leaders from each of the participating universities. Face to face, teleconference and videoconference meetings of this network transpired over the course of the project.

**Program of Activities**

The cross-faculty and institutional network of scholars met regularly to discuss:

- the status, progress and developments in the implementation of their faculty-based projects;
- issues relevant to leadership in the context of the institutional setting and climate; and
- Organisational details for the facilitation of the roundtable.

“The regular meetings that occurred were good opportunities to touch base with people who have similar values, challenges and contexts.” (2008 Scholar)

Cross-institutional meetings, after the leadership retreat, predominantly discussed details regarding the organisation and facilitation of the roundtable. From May these meetings transpired on a monthly basis. Two web-based tools designed for Australian higher education communication and collaboration were trialed with the 2007, then the 2008 scholars. Neither was greatly utilised by either group, other than as a repository for sharing resources.

Time poor academics indicated that the learning curve was too steep to make them useful and where they could not see real benefits, they were not prepared to allocate the time required to learn to use them efficiently. Email communication proved to be most effective as a means for scholars to share personal reflections on their leadership development and implementation of their faculty-based projects.
**Success Factors of this Activity as Reported by Scholars**

Set a schedule of formal and informal meetings early in the year so that time is set aside to engage in collaborative and team building activities.

Ensure there is an imperative for scholars to attend the cross-faculty/institutional meetings and clearly communicate this to them.

Require a firm commitment from all scholars to actively and regularly engage in cross-institutional communication.

Ensure the tool used to facilitate online communication and collaboration is robust and intuitive to use.

Establish communication protocols for organising and facilitating the cross-institutional meetings.

Strive to create a culture of sharing and communication throughout the project.

“There is a tendency in universities to think that you work in silos and the opportunity to break that down is not a bad thing.” (2008 Scholar)

**Key Challenges Experienced by Scholars**

Attending the scheduled meetings – time and work commitments often presented obstacles for attendance.

Apparent lack of engagement by scholars in the cross-institutional communication and collaboration.

Establishing contact with individuals from the other universities.

“The retreat and videoconferences made it easier for contact with the wider group but not so useful for individual contact.” (2008 Scholar)

**Review and Improvement**

Incorporate sufficient budget funds to establish an institutional site explicitly for the project which includes an opportunity for communication tools such as blogs, chat space, and resource sharing that can be used by the institutional groups. Ensure staff development activities are established and a real purpose for using the tools is identified.

Some scholars reported that they presented within their institutions and within their faculties on their faculty-based projects to keep their staff informed on progress. A suggestion was also made that the cross-faculty/institutional groups should deliver presentations on their faculty-based projects at the beginning and end of project implementation to institutional forums.

Although there was some sharing of generic assessment resources there was opportunity for more resource sharing across disciplinary boundaries. Establishing a culture of this and possibly even some imperative for this (e.g. a project repository) might address this deficit.

Some of the faculty-based projects were not completed by the roundtable which was the last formal meeting scheduled for the cross-institutional group. Scholars felt it would be beneficial if they could learn about the outcomes of other scholars’ faculty-based projects.

**Links and Resources**

Resources to support cross-faculty, institutional and cross-institutional communication and collaboration are presented on the GREEN website:

www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership
This activity is in a sense an extension of the mentoring and coaching activity. It refers to the tutelage that occurred in the second stage of the project between the stage 1 and stage 2 project participants. The explicit purpose of this activity was to promote the growth and development of the second generation of participants through discussions with the stage 1 participants. Figure 1 illustrates the cascading model.

Context

The cascade model was intended not only to assist the growth and development of the stage 2 participants but also to provide the scholars from stage 1 with another opportunity to develop national leadership skills. This model also expanded the cross-institutional network of leaders of teaching and learning and provided a critical mass for extending this network within and across institutions throughout Australia.

“One of the main things was to prepare people for what was ahead and that worked well I think we were all well prepared in terms of having the scholars from last year attend and that carried on through the whole project.” (2008 Scholar)

Program of Activities

The cascade model was initiated in stage 2 (see Figure 1). The stage 1 scholars and project team members liaised with stage 2 scholars and project team formally and informally throughout the duration of the second stage.

These stage 1 participants provided insights on their experiences, successes and failures as a guide and basis from which the stage 2 participants could develop and improve actions and implementation of the project. Three of the stage 1 participants attended the leadership retreat held at Barwon Heads Victoria from 17th – 20th February 2008 to establish a relationship and mentor the stage 2 scholars.

“One of the major factors is that there are people that you are working with that know what is going on, and it helps to have those who have been through the process or who are studying this process and to make you aware of things that you may not be aware of.” (2008 Scholar)

Review and Improvement

It was suggested that past scholars could share more of what they did in the implementation of their faculty-based project.

“Maybe some sharing from past scholars or those who have done similar projects, what they have done, how they did it, some of the tricks they used, the outcomes they achieved, consequences they experienced, strategies they implemented, how they convinced people to change - better exposure to someone who has battled hard.” (2008 Scholar)
Activity 8 Cascading

Figure 1 Distributed leadership for learning and teaching

**Development and Implementation stage**

**Informed by evaluation process**

**Cascade stage:** Mentoring two additional universities to adapt resources and implement process
Publications that have evolved from the project include:


One aspect of dissemination occurred through presentations:


One aspect of dissemination occurred through presentations (cont.):

- Lefoe, G. (2007). Distributive leadership: Developing the faculty scholar model. Presented to La Trobe University’s Academic Committee on October 23.
- Marcus O’Donnell - Developing Creative Curriculum; Adrienne Huber- Integrating Assessment in a Community of Practice; Margaret Wallace - Worry Less Learn More; Katina Michael - Total Curriculum Management; John Littrich - Synthesising Graduate Qualities. Poster sessions: Spotlight on Learning and Teaching …the UOW way www.uow.edu.au/cedir/spotlight/posters/index.htm

Resources to support assessment development resulting from the project include:

- Research from the authentic action learning projects of the scholars and fellows available at: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/asd/FacultyScholars/UOW037146.html
- UOW Scholars’ poster sessions of their respective projects at the Spotlight on Learning and Teaching …the UOW way (www.uow.edu.au/cedir/spotlight/posters/index.htm) held on November 22, 2007.
A group of new leaders of teaching and learning evolved

(More information about scholars’ projects can be found on the GREEN Website: www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership/index.htm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Margaret Wallace, (2007 Faculty Scholar)</td>
<td>Faculty of Health &amp; Behavioural Sciences, University of Wollongong.</td>
<td>Worry less. Learn more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Littrich, (2007 Faculty Scholar)</td>
<td>Faculty of Law, University of Wollongong.</td>
<td>Synthesising graduate Qualities within the LLB curriculum: Assessment, outcomes and the “ethically informed” graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Katina Michael, (2007 Faculty Scholar)</td>
<td>Faculty of Informatics, University of Wollongong.</td>
<td>An integrated curriculum using distributed content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Adrienne Huber, (2007 Faculty Scholar)</td>
<td>Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong.</td>
<td>Integrating assessment in a community of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Glenn Mitchell, (2007 Faculty Scholar)</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, University of Wollongong.</td>
<td>Graduate qualities, learning and assessment: A false dawn, adding value to the university degree or the re-branding of tertiary education?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“There’s so much nowadays celebration given to research and research funding that to actually have a project that has allowed so much concentration on teaching and learning and how we do what we do and also training people to have the skills to be leaders in a positive way is a really good thing.” (2007 Scholar)
Part 3 A Snapshot of the Distributive Leadership Project

“I don’t think I would have even considered taking on anything like this … but this has really forced me to look a bit wider and grow as a member of the university.” (2007 Scholar)

Mr Marcus O’Donnell, (2007 Faculty Scholar), Faculty of Creative Arts, University of Wollongong.

Project: Journalism student as reflective practitioner.

Dr Natalie Brown, (2007 Faculty Scholar), Centre for Teaching & Learning, University of Tasmania.

Project: Supporting assessment in the professional experience context.

Dr Lisa Butler, (2007 Faculty Scholar), Faculty of Law, University of Tasmania.

Project: Review of the international student support program in the Faculty of Law.

“I will look back one day and recognise that this was a highlight in my career, I was so fortunate to end up on this program.” (2007 Scholar)

Dr Greg Hannan, (2007 Faculty Scholar), School of Psychology, University of Tasmania.

Project: Assessment of honours research programs: Towards an integrated unified approach?

Dr Noel Meyers, (2007 Faculty Scholar), Faculty of Business, University of Tasmania.

Project: Beyond mapping: Embedding graduate attributes at a faculty level.

“I now see myself within the faculty as having an understanding of my ability as a leader and acknowledging and understanding what leadership means in the field. I had previously always thought of leadership in higher education as hierarchical but I now view leadership differently as being more collaborative and collegial.” (2008 Scholar)
Part 3 A Snapshot of the Distributive Leadership Project

Dr Heather Monkhouse, (2007 Faculty Scholar), Conservatorium of Music, University of Tasmania.

Project: Performance assessment of classical woodwind instruments in the Australian tertiary sector.

Ms Jo Osborne, (2007 Faculty Scholar), Faculty of Health Science, University of Tasmania.

Project: Exploring assessment issues in ‘common learning approaches’ developed for the Faculty of Health Science.

Mr Michael Bull, (2008 Faculty Scholar), Faculty of Social Sciences, Flinders University.

Project: Alignment of assessment methods and learning objectives: Systemic influences.

"Involvement in the project has opened up my interest in being involved in the teaching and learning area." (2008 Scholar)

Professor Elizabeth Handsley, (2008 Faculty Scholar), Faculty of Education, Humanities, Law and Theology, Flinders University.

Project: Matchmaking: Improving the alignment between assessment methods and stated learning outcomes.

Dr Steve Parker, (2008 Faculty Scholar), Faculty of Health Sciences, Flinders University.

Project: Assessing alignment: Constructing an evaluation tool.

"There is cultural capital that comes with the title scholar. This gave me confidence to go forward and claim a role as a leader." (2008 Scholar)
Dr Jamie Quinton, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
Faculty of Science & Engineering, Flinders University.

Project: Improving the alignment between assessment methods and stated learning outcomes (in the Sciences).

Mr Jeffrey Barnes, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
School of Law, La Trobe University.

Project: Progressive development of legal skills fostering staff cooperation in the assessment process.

Ms Ana Maria Ducasse, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
Spanish Program, Historical and European Studies, La Trobe University.

Project: Toeing the line: Mapping graduate attributes on to speaking and writing assessment in the humanities and social sciences.

“[I felt that I had confirmation of myself as a leader from my involvement and experiences in the project and from the significant people in the project.” (2008 Scholar)

Dr Elizabeth Johnson, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
Faculty of Science, Technology and Engineering, La Trobe University.

Project: Assessment modes in Science: Formal examinations and the assessment of generic skills.

Ms Lotte Latukefu, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
Faculty of Creative Arts, University of Wollongong.

Project: Peer assessment in creative arts subjects: Descriptors of quality developed in collaboration with students to assist peer assessment.

“In addition to identifying oneself as a leader, within any context that the leadership itself is demonstrated in, the ability to engage other people in moving things forward and helping others develop their leadership capabilities and see it as something one doesn’t own but that leadership comes from engaging others.” (2008 Scholar)
Dr Glyn Thomas, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
Faculty of Education, La Trobe University.
Project: Assessment for future learning: Improving students' abilities to monitor quality.

Ms Alison Bell, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences, University of Wollongong.
Project: Assessment of professional competence of occupational hygienists in higher education courses.

Mr Matthew Oates, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
Faculty of Health Sciences, La Trobe University.
Project: Peer assessment in first year undergraduate students.

Mr Mark Loves, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
Faculty of Law, University of Wollongong.
Project: Project pandora: Student teaching and learning (resources) toolbox.

Dr Holly Tootell, (2008 Faculty Scholar),
Faculty of Informatics, University of Wollongong.
Project: Total curriculum management: Assessment and culture change.

“I was quite amazed at how well we worked together and trusted each other and treated each other with respect. We built a rapport with each other and as a group that saw us wanting to do right by each other and wanting to do well as a group. There weren’t any egos among the group. It was good that the overall project invested in us establishing relationships with each other and as a group at the retreat. We all got to know each other and being able to engage in eating, drinking and especially the quiz night was really important for the relationship building. We aren’t in competition with each other and I never felt there was any sense of rivalry or empire building or personality clashes or anything like that.” (2008 Scholar)

“I think the experience and participation in the program was certainly useful when I applied for a leadership position in my faculty and was successful.” (2008 Scholar)
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“I have a better sense of myself as a leader than I did before this project. I really wasn’t sure I could be a leader whereas now I know what attributes I have. I have a sense of what skills I need to continue to develop to be a good leader and I have an appreciation that leadership is not necessarily about the position you hold, or your personal achievements. Leadership is about finding ways of bringing about sustainable, enduring change to make teaching, learning and student assessment more effective.”

Faculty Scholar