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ABSTRACT

This is a study which examines the roles and responsibilities of Deans, specifically focussing on the Deans in the Faculties of Education at three Ontario Universities - Brock University, the University of Western Ontario, and the University of Windsor. This study examines the roles of Deans in the context of leadership and as a management position. The initial belief of the researcher was that Deans acted as middle managers at their institution besides being role models, scholars and leaders. Data were collected through interviews with the various participants and through the examination of the official job descriptions at each institution. Concepts such as leadership, motivation, empowerment, and management are discussed in relation to the position of Dean. The research concludes that a Dean is a leader in higher education who is responsible for a variety of issues. Besides academic related responsibilities such as faculty development, program development and research, a Dean is also responsible for a wide range of administrative tasks including financial management and obligations to external groups. As a role model and scholar, the Dean must ensure that all areas have sufficient energies devoted to them. This creates a heavy burden on Deans as they have a great deal of responsibilities to manage while still maintaining their role as a scholar. The researcher concludes that the position of Dean requires additional support from the institution. This support could be in an Associate Dean or an Executive Assistant with training and support mechanisms on an ongoing basis.
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CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND

Introduction

Universities are independent institutions which shape and reflect local communities and society at large. This is a time of change and challenge within education. Decreased funding and budget uncertainties make it difficult for administrators to balance the programs and course offerings of the university and the competing demands of running the institution. As with any organization, there is a need to reflect on past practices to ensure that they are still working for the organization.

Over the past 15 to 20 years, there has been a growth in leadership development in the private sector. Studies on management in organizations have investigated the practices of administrators and the effect of individuals and institutional structures on the success of the organization as a whole. Areas which have been examined include power and influence, roles and responsibilities as well as management versus leadership. While a university is an institution of academic learning and educational development, it is also an organization which must remain financially viable. The success of the institution and its “clients” relies upon the effective management of the organization by the staff and administration of the institution.

Background of the Study

Higher education is essential in today’s society. There is an increasing number (Province of Ontario, 1996) of students who are attending institutions of higher learning within the province; this, in combination with changes within secondary education in the Province of Ontario, has had and will continue to have a great impact on institutions of higher learning. There is a greater need for these institutions to examine their
institutional practices. A drive to attract a greater number of high achieving students in addition to a greater level of funding from both the government and the private sector has spawned the growth of numerous programs and projects (such as computer and business-based degrees) (Stats Canada, 2001) which has not been addressed in terms of additional administrative support. This begs the question, how is leadership defined in an institution of higher education? Moreover, how does the role of the University Dean influence decisions made at an institution of higher learning? Historically, Deans were influential in the decision making process at institutions of higher learning (Walker, 1999). With universities increasingly aware of their financial needs, this study looks at the current roles and responsibilities of the Deans and the power that they hold in leadership in the institution. The decisions being made in institutions of higher education are not always based on academics but are also financially based. How does this affect the role of the Dean and his or her powers within the institution? Are Deans with greater control over financial and budgetary processes and procedures more effective in their positions as they relate to accountability?

Statement of Problem

This study examines the leadership roles and responsibilities of Deans in three institutions of higher education. This study specifically focuses on Decanal functioning in the Faculties of Education at Brock University (St. Catharines), the University of Western Ontario (London), and the University of Windsor (Windsor). The study identifies what Deans do, why they do it, and how they might affect the institution regarding academic leadership, administrative leadership, and direction of institutional
focus. Within this context, the following general questions are asked: 1) What are the perceived roles and responsibilities of University Deans? 2) How do these perceived roles and responsibilities differ from the official roles and responsibilities outlined by the three institutions? 3) How does the role of Dean fit into the system of leadership at these three institutions of higher education?

Specific Research Questions

1. What is the main role of Deans at these three institutions of higher education?
2. What are the responsibilities of Deans at the three institutions being studied?
3. Where does this role fit into the big picture of administrative leadership at these three institutions of higher education?
4. What responsibility does the Dean have in regard to budgeting at the three participating institutions?
5. What level of accountability does the Dean hold within the three institutions?
6. How independent are Deans from Senior Administration at the three institutions being studied?
7. What perceived changes (if any) at the three participating institutions are seen as necessary in order for the position of Dean to be more effective in the eyes of the participants in the study?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine Decanal functioning, to identify it, and to determine its effectiveness and efficiency in the context of university administration.
This study examines the roles and responsibilities of Deans at three institutions to determine what it is they do and to further define their mandate within the institution.

Definition of Relevant Terms

A Dean is defined as a person holding a position as the head of a given faculty or college at an institution of higher education who reports directly to the Vice President (Academic) or equivalent.

A faculty or college is defined as a broad area of study at an institution of higher education. An area of study would include subjects such as law, education, social sciences, engineering, arts, and sciences.

A definition of leadership that everyone can agree upon is a difficult task. For the purpose of this study, leadership is defined as a synergistic relationship with a group or organization in which an individual (leader) is responsible to and for a given group of individuals (followers).

Management involves the maintenance of a department or organization and thereby ensuring its regular operation.

The Importance of the Study

This study reviews and reflects upon current practices in three institutions of higher education. There is increasing competition in the area of education. The researcher believes that privatization and the deregulation of programs at various institutions has put additional pressure on publicly funded institutions to meet the needs of clients and ensure that the university functions as a business as well as an institution of educational development.
Assumptions/Scope and Limitations of The Study

This study is limited as it only examines the roles of Deans in Faculties of Education and only within the context of their functioning at three Canadian institutions in Southern Ontario. The information obtained was collected from the participants through a single interview. Furthermore, the participant group itself was narrowly focussed, only drawing from the Deans, Associate Deans, Departmental Chairs, and Vice Presidents (Academic). The researcher interviewed neither faculty, staff, students nor Presidents as a part of the participant group even though they would have valuable information to contribute to the study. Due to these restrictions, the information obtained may not be applicable to institutions elsewhere or to other types of post-secondary institutions.

Outline of Remainder of the Study

Chapter two examines related literature, specifically, the concepts of leadership in general, leadership and management in educational institutions, and the role of leadership in higher education.

Chapter three identifies the methodology of the research undertaken in this study. It identifies the type of study, the respondent selection process, the administration of the study, and the method of analysis. The researcher achieved data collection primarily through one on one interviews with the participants.

A review of the official, related documents and the results of the research form the basis of chapter four. The results are presented on common themes identified by the participants. Similarities and differences in official and perceived roles and
responsibilities are vital to an understanding of the conclusions which are drawn in this study. The variances among the three institutions as well as the variances between the official job descriptions and the perceived roles and responsibilities will be the main focus of the analysis of the data collected.

Discussion, recommendations, and conclusions based on the research are presented in chapter five. Connections between leadership and Decanal roles and responsibilities will be drawn. The researcher will discuss the impact of these connections in light of similarities and differences between perceived and actual roles and responsibilities of University Deans.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This literature review discusses current views on leadership and administration as well as educational leadership at post secondary institutions. Leadership is a complex social phenomenon. It is difficult to define exactly what leadership is as it is a different concept to different people. This review is not an attempt to define leadership but rather an attempt to frame leadership in education. Warren Bennis (1997) put it best when he said, "Leadership is like beauty: it’s hard to define, but you know it when you see it" (p. 1). Leadership within institutions of higher education is extremely complex and important to society as a whole. Education requires more than simple training. Indeed, education is important to issues in the development of humanity. Those who lead institutions of higher education have a greater responsibility to society as a whole. Postman (1995) said that schools connect us to our past, that they bring together society and that they educate us academically as well as assisting in our moral development. This puts those administrators responsible for education into positions of greater responsibility and power. This status, however, does not necessarily make them leaders; a leader is simply more than a title - it is a reflection of the person in the position.

What is a Leader?

It is difficult to find a consensus on the definition of leadership and of a leader. There are many different schools of thought on the subject. Gardner (1996) defined a leader thus: as a skilled speaker, someone who takes a keen interest in and has an understanding of people, a person who can see the big picture, a person who possesses a great deal of energy, has a great deal of linguistic and personal skills, and has the ability
to take risks and challenge authority. This wide definition is an excellent example of the diverse responsibilities that leaders must face in their role. Gardner expanded upon this definition by adding that this person must have an institutional base plus the opportunity for reflection. Such an individual’s life has had a rhythm of successes and failures which have given him or her a great deal of self awareness. This list of characteristics displays just how complex is the task of determining the definition of a leader. The responsibilities of a leader vary and, at times, are of a considerable magnitude. Leaders have many obligations, and the obligations that they have to themselves are often not as important as those obligations that they have to different people, many of whom often have competing values or interests (Lashway, 1996). Leaders not only embody the message they advocate; they teach, not just through words, but through actions (Lashway, 1996). A leader is a role model for those around him or her. Being a role model is difficult and stressful and further adds to the high expectations placed on those people in leadership positions. The literature in this area suggests that it is important that leaders acknowledge an understanding of the past, demonstrate clarity in terms of the present, and provide hope for the future. This means that they are responsible for “seeing the big picture” and keeping everything in perspective for the group.

It is necessary for leaders to have balance, empowerment, passion, and vision; in short, they must be confident, committed, and competent. Leaders do not often “fit in” and it is this difference which lends them their strength. Leadership is about relationships and building teams. According to Lashway (1996), “Real leaders concentrate on doing the right thing, not on doing things right” (p. 3). A person does not necessarily become a
leader by having the “right traits.” Different situations require different attributes of leadership (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Thus, as situations change, the definition of leadership also changes. This further compounds the task of defining a leader.

Although a leader exerts an influence upon those around him or her, it is important that the intentions of the leader are in concert with the intentions that the situation requires, as it shapes the organization and how the members feel and react to the leadership within it (Duke, 1998). Komives, Lucas and McMahon (1998) counter this statement by Duke indicating that it is not reflective of times of change. When a leader has been charged with initiating change within a group, their intentions will often be in direct conflict of the prevailing culture of the group and the situation at hand. They state that change often leads to unpredictability which is not often embraced within human nature.

Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998) define a leader as a “person in a leadership position who has been elected, selected or hired to assume responsibility for a group working toward change” (p. 11). Such leaders take responsibility for decision making and action and are viewed as people who actively engage with others to accomplish change, by taking the initiative and making a difference in moving the group forward. They are guided, for that matter, by principles which represent the universal beliefs about right or wrong (Duke, 1998) or what should be considered right and wrong. In the researcher’s opinion, the pervading moral code of society has not always driven the actions of leaders. There are examples of leaders in history which demonstrate that often leaders will work against the moral code, but they are still considered leaders as
there are followers within the group who agree with their intentions. Leaders influence others to follow a course of action through persuasion or role modelling (Pfeffer, Julius & Baldridge, 1999; Robles, 1998). This influence is constructed upon the personal relationship the leader has with the members of the group, as each other's beliefs influence the leader and group members (Duke, 1998). The influence of the group often has a strong impact on a leader and how they perform within the group. Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998) believe that the relationships within the group often have the biggest impact upon how the group functions. When a leader is in name only and is not seen as a role model or is not respected by the group, the group will not function properly. They define this control as “referent power.”

All leaders need a mission, a vision, and a level of trust for others. They must be able to manage crises, encourage risk taking, and listen to others. Leaders are experts who know what is important at any given time, and they can be teachers and mentors to those around them (Satterlee, 1997). Accordingly, leaders require a great deal of communication and interpersonal skills. Bass (1990) believes that leaders must be developers of people and builders of teams (cited in Hoy et al., 1996, p. 395). Similarly, an effective leader must be an effective manager (Martin, 1993). And, of course, leaders must exhibit strong management skills. For example, in order to facilitate group development and team building, a leader must have the management abilities to keep the group together and functioning as a viable unit.

Not all managers, however, can be considered leaders. The researcher believes that this is true and emphasizes the previous point that effective leaders must possess
managerial skills. Kouzes and Posner (1987) identified five fundamental practices of leaders: 1) they challenge the process, 2) they inspire a shared vision, 3) they enable others to act, 4) they model the way, and 5) they encourage the heart. It is precisely because a leader must be many things to many people that he or she has such a difficult path to forge. Finding a definition which adequately addresses all of these roles, responsibilities and obligations is a profound challenge. The researcher feels that the literature does demonstrate that all leaders must be managers on some level; however, not all managers are by consequence leaders.

Leadership

Leadership is the activity of being a leader. If a leader has specific, identifiable characteristics, then leadership must arise from those ideals. Duke (1998) stated that trying to separate leadership from the context in which it is occurring is analogous to identifying the food one wants for dinner while ignoring where it is to be consumed. Leadership is often based on the situation in which it occurs. Certain variables occur which could dictate the traits the leader must exhibit in order to be effective.

Duke (1998) further elaborated on four sets of criteria that one must consider when examining leadership. These are the conditions which necessitate leadership and their presence or absence in any given situation, the leaders’ intentions and what they should be in a given leadership situation, as well as the ways in which leaders should conduct themselves as they try to realize their mission or goals. Gardner (1996) believed that leadership is time-specific, place-specific, and context-specific. As such, the definition of leadership sounds similar to the earlier discussion of a leader as there is not
one specific way in which to define leadership, but both are contingent upon these variables and how they act together.

Perceptions of required characteristics of leadership will vary according to past experiences as well as the current circumstances and the future aspirations of those involved. In addition, their diverse beliefs and values at any given place or time will also have an impact on the perceptions of leadership (Duke, 1998). These variables would account for the vast array of leadership theories that have been put forward. Leadership itself may be considered an observable phenomenon (Kouzes et al., 1989). The following is a very brief examination of some of the different perspectives of leadership in recent years.

Leadership theories can be broken down into two general areas: transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership involves one person taking the initiative of contact with others in order to make a valued exchange of contributions (Duke, 1998). There are several theories which fit into the transactional leadership area.

The interactionists view leadership in a traditional manner. The leader is viewed as the initiator, the primary influence, and director of the group (Duke, 1998). Although leadership refers to the interaction that the leader has with his or her followers, this leadership only exists when it is acknowledged and conferred by the members of the group itself. Leadership, then, is viewed as a formal process in which the person who assumes the position of leader has the power, which is contingent upon the commitment that the group has toward the leader. In the researcher’s opinion, the notion of an
acknowledged leader is very important. A leader who is not given that responsibility by those they are leading will not be effective in what they attempt to achieve. They will lack support, the ability to control the group, and to persuade change as the followers will not have a vested interest in what the leader is trying to achieve.

From a transactional leadership perspective, the leader is viewed as a manager of a group (Kouzes et al., 1989) who facilitates the group’s success and/or failure. Transformational leadership occurs when leaders and followers transcend their own immediate self interest to engage with each other. This interaction allows leaders and followers to spur each other on to higher levels of motivation and morality (Duke, 1998; Robles, 1998). It is a relationship more than a position of authority. Transformational leadership defines the need for change and helps to inspire new visions, and to develop a commitment to these visions. The followers themselves become leaders within the group (Hoy et al., 1996). Transactional leadership is very regimented and closed whereas transformational leadership is about building a functioning and cohesive team or unit. This study will look at the role of the Deans at Brock, Western, and Windsor to see if they act as transactional or transformational leaders, or whether the situation may dictate which role they need to assume at any given time.

There are different theorists who can be recognized as advocates of transformational leadership. Senge’s (1990) systems theory saw the human actor as a part of the feedback process, not standing apart from it but rather as a leader with followers who act as active participants, each continually influencing and being influenced by the other. Leadership is viewed as a part of the group process, both of
which are constantly growing, changing, and evolving in reaction to the environment. This view of leadership as a reciprocal process is very compelling as all members of the group, despite their role, must contribute on some level in order for the group to function. Even those who fail to do their part still push the group forward in their development, even if the development focuses on rectifying the situation regarding the non-productive group member. The reconceptualists view leadership as a collection of individuals with a unique set of experiences who have distinct ways of thinking about and making sense of leadership (Duke, 1998). Roles will change according to the experiences of the group, and no formal leadership positions are adhered to. This definition would be accurate in a situation where change is constant but not necessarily in a formalized group setting such as in the business world. Such a structured environment would not allow for informal leadership when a hierarchy is clearly in place.

From the feminist perspective, leadership is viewed as a "web of relations" with a leader who occupies a central point from which all others radiate. The bonds among all those involved are forged through relationships which develop, exist, and change over time based on the sharing of information, on a willingness to listen, and on a commitment to involve, and empower others throughout the organization (Rees, 1999). The view of leadership as a web is the most striking. The interconnectedness of all group members indicates how fragile the team or group can actually be; however, these bonds can also be an indication of strength and commitment to the team.
Transformational leadership is a reflection of the postmodernist school of thought. Postmodernists regard leadership as a social construction. According to this theory, leadership is subject to different meanings depending on the prevailing beliefs and circumstances of the situation. Kouzes and Posner (1987) outline that leadership is not always constant within the group but is a variable which is always in constant flux. This is an expansion of leadership theories based on a modernist perspective where theories looked at how and in what context leadership occurred. Postmodernist theories take this examination to the next level where leadership is examined through reflection and acknowledgement of individual traits that impact upon the development of leaders and leadership.

These theorists have attempted to define leadership in many different ways. Recent definitions look at leadership as more than simply a position but as a process involving skills and abilities of the participants, and the leader (Kouzes et al., 1987). Essentially, from the transformational perspective, leadership is about the interaction of people with different levels of motivation and power in any given situation (Duke, 1998). The people in the group make the biggest impact on how the group functions. Overall, leadership empowers, it motivates, and it generates change (Robles, 1998). It is a powerful phenomenon within a group. Komives et al. (1998) defined leadership as a “relational process of people together attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good” (p. 11). This definition best conveys the belief that leadership is a relationship. In other words, it is a connection between the leaders and the participants or followers (Komives, 1998; Kouzes et al., 1987; Robles, 1998). It
is inclusive of all people and their strengths and differences. The model of leadership put forward by Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998) is called the Relational Leadership Model. This model or approach is "inclusive of people and diverse points of view, it empowers those involved, it is purposeful, and builds commitment toward common purposes, is ethical, and recognizes that all four of those elements are accomplished by being process oriented" (p. 68). The researcher views this theory of leadership as one of the strongest theories reviewed, as it best characterizes the concept of leadership. It manages to take all the relevant concepts discussed in this study and draws the correlation between all those concepts within the group setting.

Mead and Park developed the Role Theory which states that society itself is a socially constructed phenomenon that arises out of the interactions of individuals (cited in Duke, 1998, p. 167). These individuals occupy roles which represent sets of expectations, all of which are a function of the context of a situation and the individual understandings which are present. Leadership is a social construct, and a group will function within the given content. This theory does not allow for the growth and education of group participants. The theory does not indicate that the group evolves as the members grow, change, and learn from their situations or through the influence of external forces as discussed by other theorists.

Gardner (1996) looked at leaders through the cognitive perspective, how they solved problems, and arrived at their decisions. Cognitive psychologists are taking a greater look at leaders and how their personal values and beliefs impact upon their leadership along with the contextual factors of the situation (Duke, 1998). This research
is important in understanding how leaders develop and how they maintain their longevity. As situations change, leaders should change. There are fundamental leadership traits that are exhibited regardless of the situation, which allows for an explanation as to how leaders maintain their positions for extended periods of time. A leader must have strong cognitive abilities. As discussed earlier, a leader must have the ability to see "the big picture" and use that knowledge to help the group along. This is only achieved through strong decisions which are made while still being able to maintain the loyalty of the group itself.

From the contingency perspective, Hoy and Miskel (1996) allude to four main criteria: the traits of the leader, the characteristics of the situation, the behaviours of the leader, and the effectiveness of the leader. All of these variables work together to moderate the relationship which defines the leadership of a group. This theory is similar to what the previous three theories have discussed.

Leadership is a process. In 1994, Yukl defined leadership as a social influence process in which one person exerts intentional influence over others to build activities and/or relationships (cited in Hoy et al., 1996, p. 374). As leadership is a process, the leader then must facilitate the process through effective communication, empowerment, motivation, and the other characteristics discussed previously. Effective leadership must be clear in its expectations, goals, and recognition which is facilitated through clear communication and feedback amongst the group (Clement & Rickard, 1992). Basic communication skills, in the researcher’s opinion, are vital as the leader must be able to
share their vision with the group, as well as listen effectively to those in the group and give a clear picture of what is happening in order for change to be successful.

Leadership in today's world requires a great many skills. These skills include conflict management, team building, networking, and relationship management. Being a visionary simply is not enough (Satterlee, 1997). A leader must be able to motivate people to adopt that vision and turn it into reality. The leader must have characteristics which allow him or her to meet all the needs and expectations of the group. The leadership characteristics possessed by a truly effective Dean will help that individual understand his or her role and how to function in relation to others in the university.

Gardner (1996) alluded to leadership as consisting of more than personal gifts and ambition but, rather, that it is also influenced by the circumstances as well as the audience being led. Leaders must be able to allow people to grow and learn, to take leadership opportunities on their own (Lees, Smith & Stackhouse, 1994). Komives et al. (1998) broke leadership down into three areas: knowing, being, and doing. Knowing not only yourself, but how change occurs, and that others view things differently is essential. Being ethical, principled, open, and caring and exuding the characteristics of a leader are equally important. Finally, doing and acting in socially responsible ways, that are consistent and congruent to what you are saying are the hallmarks of a true leader. This is reflective of transformational theory as all concepts are part of developing strong relationships with the group and allowing them to grow and develop as opposed to transactional theory which is a more dictatorial leadership role.
The Relational Model of Leadership is similar to value-based leadership which is considered a normative phenomenon, a function of moral authority working in combination with ethical conduct and the culmination of the values of those being led (Duke, 1998). Leadership is "in the eye of the beholder;" that is to say, those in the audience, the participants or followers, must believe in what the leader is telling them (Duke, 1998; Kouzes et al., 1987). There cannot be a leader without followers who believe in the vision that the leader professes.

Leadership is what brings meaning to the collective action of human beings (Duke, 1998) and that which can lead an organization to success or failure (Bass, 1990 as cited in Hoy et al., 1996, p. 373). Organizational leadership is often considered to be the same as management, but there is a difference between the two: "Leadership comes out of the heart and management comes from the head" (Lees et al. 1994, p. 54). Being a manager often means following policies, procedures, and processes. Leadership adds the human element to management. An effective leader is a person who can emphasize and feel along with his or her constituents. The researcher believes that a leader who may not be a strong manager (i.e., not following a procedure properly) but still has that vital human element can be a good leader, even a strong leader, if there is an accepted justification for the lack of managerial skills. This could be attributed to a strong relationship with the group who may "forgive" shortfalls. Leadership allows people to put aside their own individual concerns and do what is best for the group (Satterlee, 1997). The basic distinction between leadership and management, then, is that management simply gets people "to do," while leadership is about getting people to do
what they sincerely want to do (Kouzes et al., 1987). While managers maintain, leaders are often the innovators (Satterlee, 1997). Leadership with vision and innovation is important because it generates involvement and empowers others to adopt and implement the vision (Clement et al., 1992). While an important aspect of the job of a Dean revolves around policies and procedures, does the role of the Dean of Education at Brock University, the University of Western Ontario, and the University of Windsor include the concepts of innovation and vision? The perception of the Dean may include these roles whereas the official job descriptions may not.

Leadership in Higher Education

According to one American theorist, traditional leadership in institutions of higher education has come from one individual who maintained a strict control over the institution and shared few leadership responsibilities (Walker, 1999). This is certainly not true in today's society where this view could only be seen as dictatorial leadership, and it would not be accepted by anyone working within the field of education. As today's society changes and grows, the demands on the education system are growing with it. Being in a position of authority can be difficult as leaders in the education field are faced with competing demands and minimal resources (Clement et al., 1992). Peter Emberly has argued that universities are caught between two extreme forces, namely that of the "corporate right" and the "cultural left" (Carson, 1999). The researcher believes that this pull will be increasingly evident in education as more external partnerships and the increasing impact of financial support become more important. Obviously, educational leaders must design and provide experiences and environments in which the
desired learning content is available, supported, and reinforced. Leaders in universities have had to develop strategies and managerial techniques to deal with financial limitations and cutbacks, shrinking enrolments, rising tuition, and public demands for accountability within a deteriorating image of education as a whole (Carson, 1999; Walker, 1999). While Canadian post-secondary education is encountering an upswing in enrollment due to secondary school reform (Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities, 2000), the issues of rising tuition and accountability are still putting enormous pressures on administration. The researcher believes that these issues will continue to grow as education becomes more consumer driven.

The three main attributes of leaders in higher education today, according to Clement et al. (1992), are integrity, commitment, and tenacity. They must be able to handle everything that is thrust upon them in their respective leadership roles. The competing demands of being an administrator as well as being "human" make it difficult for leaders in higher education to make the hard decisions. There is a feeling by some that a university is beginning to resemble a corporation focussed on operational goals and administration rather than on education (Carson, 1999). Certainly, the decision making environments in post secondary institutions are unique. They tend to be multidimensional, reflecting interdependence, diversity, and varying paradigms of authority (Pfeffer, Julius, & Baldridge, 1999). Decision making ability and power lie in many different hands with varying perspectives and backgrounds. The environment is often non-hierarchical with authority diffused throughout. The faculty are afforded much more authority and influence in the decision making process in higher education.
than they would be in similar positions in the private sector (Robles, 1998). All of these factors make decision making in post secondary institutions unique from other leadership areas. This makes the demands of leadership in this sector more intense. University leaders are increasingly looking to the private sector for funding as well as guidance and expertise in management and organizational structures and stability. They are developing more entrepreneurial skills and links with business and government in order to augment academic programs and areas of research (Carson, 1999). All of these links are ultimately intended to improve the university while ensuring its future viability.

Leadership in education today requires a person of moral integrity and probity, someone who can articulate a vision consistent with values legitimized by the wider academic community: political and social skills, the ability to be flexible, sensitive, empathetic to the needs of others, and humble (Pfeffer et al., 1999). This may be asking a great deal of our administrators; yet a lot is being asked of the educational system today, and we need leaders who can respond to the needs and demands of the public. Given the increasingly political nature of education, are Deans losing touch with their students? To answer this question, the Deans’ day to day contact with the student population will be looked at in relation to their administrative roles, which may mean much greater contact with staff and upper administration than with students.

Roles of Leaders in Higher Education

Within the Province of Ontario, leaders in higher education have a great task to fulfill. According to the Provincial Government (1996), higher education should
...allow as many students as possible to achieve their educational goals, the post-secondary system should continually monitor its ability to offer the broad range of programs students require. It should also try to anticipate and respond promptly to new educational demands generated by emerging opportunities and fields of study, or by changes in employer and workforce requirements. (p. 1)

This is a challenge for educational leaders who find themselves torn between their roles as educators and administrators. The role of Dean is a difficult one to define. Certainly, the Dean acts as a liaison between central administration and his or her respective faculties, but because there is no standard job description for the position, no consensus on teaching assignments, and varying degrees and qualifications among those who hold the office, one must conclude that there is no such thing as a standardized “Dean” (McGrath, 1999). The range of roles and responsibilities of a Dean will vary according to institutional size, sponsorship, geographic location, university mission or presidential preference (Martin, 1993).

Studying leadership within the context of higher education is made even more difficult by the systems of control, the conflicting responsibility of administration versus education, the uneven application of authority between positions (even between persons in the same positions), in addition to a strong resistance to traditional leadership models found within the realm of higher education (Birnbaum, 1989, cited in Lees et al., 1994, p. 4). Within Ontario, an additional hurdle encountered by Deans within the Faculties of
Education is their connection to the university in addition to the strong and somewhat demanding connection to both the College of Teachers and the Ministry of Education. Administrative structures vary from institution to institution. There is no such thing as a standardized university administration either. Within institutions of higher education, one view regards governance more closely resembling a parliamentary body where the executive, legislative, and judicial branches are intermingled as opposed to resembling a corporate, hierarchical structure (Barr & Associates, 1993). While this example is clearly based on an American system, the point is still valid. Institutions of education do not resemble any corporate structures. The interconnectedness that the researcher views within the system makes for a longer, more consultative decision making process and greater incidents of discussion, negotiation, and compromise. The position of Dean represents the central link between senior administration and the academic departments. This would make it seem as though the Dean is both an extension of the presidency and an extension of the faculty (Wolverton, Wolverton & Gmelch, 1999). Deans, therefore, represent a critical link in the academic decision making process.

A 1992 study by Birnbaum found that 44% of respondents named the Dean as an important leader on campus (cited in Martin, 1993, p. 3). The role of the Dean in non-academic matters is similar to that of middle managers who have a great deal of responsibility in their positions without having the ultimate or final authority. Even though Deans must implement policy, they are not always a part of the decision making process. Although consulted, they may not have their voice in the final decision depending on the situation at hand and their personal and professional level of influence.
The Deans seek out input from their constituents on issues as well as giving their own perspective for the senior administration; the final decisions, however, are left to senior management which provides support services and other administrative duties linking vertical and horizontal levels of an organization hierarchy (Barr et al., 1993). Deans are often confronted with situations where they must balance conflicting roles and values systems (Martin 1993; Wolverton et al., 1999). They realize that a good business decision may not always be a good academic decision. For example, cutting a program faced with low enrollment is a good business decision, while academically the program may contribute to the overall richness of education in the department and offer classes which are of interest to a limited number of faculty and students. In essence, they are stuck in the middle, trying to serve two different masters. Middle managers tend to manage information and funds, thereby exerting a great influence on the culture of the organization (Barr et al., 1993). They determine where the priorities lie for the institution, and they have the ability to select which information is given and which is dismissed. They can have an impact on the direction in which the institution may move. Certainly, these are roles that the Deans fill: budgeting, hiring, dismissing employees as well as countless meetings which often fill their plates (Learning & Hickcox, 1999).

Deans obviously hold an important leadership position in the institution as a whole; they have a broad understanding of the university while remaining involved in teaching and learning (Martin, 1993). In higher education leadership, there is a complexity between administrative and professional authority (Lees et al., 1994). Deans must find a way to balance the demands and expectations of the central administration
with that of their respective faculties while also battling to find ways in which to balance their professional and personal lives (Wolverton et al., 1999). The scope of authority, their supervisory responsibilities, as well as issues of staff development, often cause a great deal of role conflict for the Dean (Barr et al., 1993). McGrath (1999) points out in his study that there is no indication in recent years that the office of the Dean is becoming purely an administrative one. This means that Deans are still tied to their roles and responsibilities as members of the faculty while trying to fulfill their Decanal roles and responsibilities. Martin (1993) alluded to the three major roles of a Dean: a) to find a common ground within his or her respective area in order to develop goals and institutional planning, b) to generate new initiatives as well as to keep current projects going while ensuring retention of staff, and c) to ensure that all efforts are completed in the most efficient manner possible. This appears to be consistent with the role of a middle manager as discussed earlier. This role, however, is often influenced by the social norms of the institution as well as those inherent in the Department, not to mention how the Dean’s personal abilities interact in this environment (Wolverton et al., 1999). The Dean’s role is an interactive process of finding a common ground of those in their respective areas (Barr et al., 1993). They are leaders in that their role dictates that they must be able to empower, inspire, and communicate. They must be able to assist others in building their own potential, to develop vision and innovation, and to ensure that the team works together to achieve those visions (Gmelch, 2000). The job dictates that the person who fills the position must have those human qualities which make a leader more than a manager.
The roles and responsibilities of a Dean sound very much like the roles and responsibilities of a leader as discussed previously. The roles within higher education are very much controlled by the relationship that the formal leader has with the faculty and staff (Lees et al., 1994). If the relationship does not develop along with the formal leadership, does that Dean actually function as a true leader? Studies have shown that effective Deans first and foremost must represent the inherent culture of the institution (Martin, 1993). The other roles of visioning, communication skills, and commitment are defined by the values and beliefs that are a part of the system already in place. The ability of a Dean to act as a spokesperson and advocate on behalf of his or her fellow faculty members only serves to give him or her a great deal of power and influence among peers (Mintzberg, 1983, cited in Wolverton et al., 1999, p. 81). Overall, the role of the Dean is that of an academic manager (W. Dill, 1980, cited in Martin, 1993, p. 2). The Dean is given the ability to be a leader by virtue of his or her position; however, a Dean may not be an effective leader if he or she is not able to use those leadership skills in concert with effective management skills, all of which must be in harmony with the inherent values and culture of the institution.

The image of today’s Dean is someone in an executive role. Such an individual is considered to be politically astute with a certain knowledge and economic savoire faire (Wolverton et al., 1999). In trying to define their own roles, Deans may define themselves is a variety of ways, all of which are impacted upon by their roles as either administrators or faculty members, or a combination of both roles (Wolverton et al., 1999). Studies have been done regarding the roles of Deans, and one major conclusion is
that there is a great deal of role conflict and role ambiguity for Deans; this ambivalence takes its toll in terms of reduced job satisfaction, commitment, and effectiveness, all the while resulting in high turnover, low productivity, increased stress, and finally burnout (Wolverton et al., 1999). The main source of power that a Dean does hold is in his or her ability to empower people and resources within his or her own areas. Deans have a great deal of facilitative power within their roles, which helps to ensure that they can work with others to ensure that their tasks are completed (Rees, 1999).

Conclusion

Leadership is an important part of any organization, institution, and society as a whole, yet it is almost impossible to define. Leaders exist within institutions of higher education at all levels, from the President to Department Heads and Chairs. All of these people have a great deal of responsibility to the institution and to the students who attend classes and wish to further their education. Within this hierarchy, the Deans play a vital role. They act as middle managers in non-academic related matters and in a more upper managerial role when academic matters are at hand. They are responsible to senior management as well as to their faculty, staff, and students. They must find a common ground which works for everyone. This function is crucial in the examination of how the decanal system works and the limitations which are imposed on those in that position.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Description of Research Methodology

This is a descriptive study using qualitative methods in order to collect data regarding the roles and responsibilities of three Deans of Education at three post secondary institutions. The data collected included information on the roles, responsibilities, and impact of the Deans on both their Faculty and their institutions as a whole. In addition to the three Deans, other participants in the study included the Department Chairs in the Faculty of Education and the Vice President (Academic) at each participating institution. Some of the data collected were quantified to add sharpened focus to the study. However, the majority of the data were collected through qualitative means.

Selection of Participants

Participants were Deans, Department Chairs, Associate Deans, and Vice Presidents (Academic) from the Faculty of Education at the University of Windsor, the University of Western Ontario, and Brock University. Statistics found on the websites of each institution on April 17, 2003, indicate that the University of Windsor is a mid-sized academic institution with $120 million budget, a full time student population of 10,000 students, 410 faculty members and eight Faculties. The University of Western Ontario is a large academic institution with $311 million budget, a full time student population of 23,000 students, 1,181 faculty members and 12 Faculties. Brock University is also a mid-sized academic institution with a $112 million budget, a full time student population of 7,600 students, 385 faculty and six Faculties. For the purpose of this study, as defined in the first chapter by the author, a Dean is defined as “a person in a position who is the
head of a given faculty or college at an institution of higher education who reports
directly to the Vice President (Academic) or equivalent”.

At institutions of higher learning, it is important for senior administrators to
ensure that the needs and concerns of the students are met while ensuring that the
financial feasibility and marketability of the institution as a “business” are maintained. All of this is done while trying to balance the competing concerns of an institution of higher education.

The institutions of the University of Windsor, the University of Western Ontario, and Brock University were chosen as comparison institutions for the following reasons. They are somewhat similar in their academic composition, especially their Faculties of Education. Both Brock and Windsor are similar in terms of institutional size, and they are both considered to be smaller institutions in the province based on their size of enrollment. The University of Western Ontario provides an interesting contrast to the other schools as it is a larger institution with greater funding. In relation to institutional size and program offerings overall, Maclean’s magazine has put these three schools each in different categories for their annual Universities rankings. Despite this difference in institutional size, Brock, Western, and Windsor are similar in relation to their Faculties of Education. All three schools have similar program offerings and degrees at the undergraduate and graduate level, as well as a similar number of students and faculty members. Geographically they are all located in southern and southwestern Ontario. All three schools have another connection through the joint PhD program in Education that they run together in conjunction with Lakehead University in North Bay, Ontario. These
are the main reasons for the selection of these particular schools for the study in question.

All participants in the study will receive feedback on their contributions through an electronic copy of the final paper.

Ethical Considerations

As one of the committee members was deemed a very useful source of information for this study, the unusual step of including him as a respondent was made. So that objectivity in the analysis, reporting, and examination process was assured, the thesis supervisor and other committee member were charged with the responsibility of monitoring the process.

In addition, since the pool of participants was small, the researcher made a decision not to include any direct quotations from any participants. This decision was made to protect the identity of the participants and to allow them to feel comfortable in openly sharing their views and opinions. While sharing positive quotations may not be an ethical issue, using direct quotes which could be seen as negative in nature could be potentially damaging to a participant. In order to ensure that this study remained balanced in its perspective, the researcher believed that it was best not to include any direct quotations at all.

Administration

The data were collected primarily through one-on-one interviews with the Deans of the Faculty of Education at the University of Windsor, the University of Western Ontario, and Brock University. In addition, interviews were conducted with the Vice
President (Academic) of each institution as well as with Department Chairs and Associate Deans in the Faculty of Education at all institutions. Initial research and information collection were achieved through University calendars and websites as well as through the collection and analysis of any relevant university documentation such as official job descriptions. Prior to interviews, participants were asked to fill out a short intake survey to gather basic information. The interview questions and intake surveys are appended to this document. The interviews ranged from 30-45 minutes in length. Data collection was undertaken at the convenience of those people being interviewed, and all interviews were conducted in the participants’ office during a five-month period from March to July 2002.

Evaluation and Analysis

The data were examined for similarities and differences in roles and responsibilities of the positions. Common themes amongst the participants were examined for their relevance to this study. The information reviewed included professional as well as personal experiences of the participants. Data were sorted and arranged into like categories based on the interview questions and were examined based on similarity of topic as well as the current position held by the participant. The major component of the research completed in this study was qualitative in nature. The interviews occurred from March to July 2002. There were initially 12 possible participants who were identified at the institutions being studied. Of those 12 possible participants, 10 agreed to participate, and were interviewed by the researcher. There was one possible participant who declined to participate in the study and one possible
participant whom the researcher was unable to contact after numerous attempts. It should be noted that the tapes of two interviews were damaged and the data was irretrievable. Of those two interviews, only one participant agreed to being reinterviewed by the researcher. The results of the nine completed and transcribed interviews are the basis of this study. All the interviews lasted for 30-45 minutes. Once the interviews were transcribed, copies were forwarded to the individual participants to be reviewed for sensitive or confidential information. A few minor edits such as correcting spelling and grammatical errors were made to half of the transcriptions by the participants. The participants often gave specific examples of duties and roles which the Dean fulfilled. In an attempt to create a greater understanding of the data collected, the researcher categorized these tasks or roles into six distinct categories: leadership, research initiatives, faculty development, external relations, program development, and student services, and administrative or managerial responsibilities. These categories were chosen by the researcher based on similar areas of expertise outlined in the official job descriptions from each institution as well as the similarities each area had with various categories enumerated in various leadership theories. As research progressed, these categories also naturally developed upon examination of the job descriptions and within the interviews themselves. The researcher thought that they were appropriate groupings as each area requires a different focus and demands different skills on the part of the Dean. It should be noted that the researcher distributed intake surveys to all participants prior to their interviews, however, these surveys were not completed or the
information collected was rudimentary therefore the information was not used in the study.

Methodological Limitations

Limitations on the collection of data include limitations of the sample and of the instrumentation. The participants are members of a specific group, all of whom are highly educated. They all belong to the academic world, so any results would not necessarily be applicable to other studies of leadership. As the data collected are from only three institutions, it will be difficult to use the information gathered for any generalizations on the roles and responsibilities of Deans outside the three participating institutions. In addition, the data were collected solely through a single interview with each participant and through a review of the official job descriptions for each position. The participants were also limited as only the Faculties of Education in the participating institutions were examined. The participants included the Dean, Associate Dean, Departmental Chairs, and Vice Presidents (Academic) and not any Faculty, staff or students at the institutions being studied.

While direct quotations were not used in the study due to the ethical issues discussed previously, the researcher did benefit greatly from the qualitative nature of the study. The interviews allowed for the interviewer to ask probing and clarifying questions to ensure that the data collected was relevant and beneficial. In addition, antidotal stories and dialogue allowed the researcher to gain insight and perspective into the roles and responsibilities which had a significant impact on the researcher’s ability to categorize the data collected. This categorization allowed for some quantitative
reporting on the data collected which also enhanced the researcher’s ability to support the findings of the study.

As institutions of higher education are dynamic and ever changing, it is anticipated that the role and responsibilities of the Dean and the direction and mission of the institutions studied will evolve and change which will have an impact on the final results of the study.

Assumptions

It is assumed that the data collected are accurate and that the answers given by the participants are consistent amongst the group being examined. It is also assumed that there will be notable or recognizable similarities and differences in the roles and responsibilities of the Deans at the University of Windsor, the University of Western Ontario, and Brock University as the institutions are in three different areas of the province, each operating under three different administrative systems. There will also be differences in terms of how individuals view the position of Dean. This may be explained through personal experiences, biases, and the basic understanding of the role itself.

Restatement of the Problem

This study examines the leadership roles and responsibilities of Deans in three institutions of higher education. This study specifically focuses on Decanal functioning in the Faculty of Education at the University of Windsor (Windsor), the University of Western Ontario (London), and Brock University (St. Catharines). This study identifies what Deans do, why they do it, and how they might affect the institution with regard to
academic leadership, administrative leadership, and direction of institutional focus.

Within this context, the following general questions are asked: 1) What are the perceived roles and responsibilities of University Deans? 2) How do these perceived roles and responsibilities differ from the official roles and responsibilities outlined by the three institutions? 3) How does the role of Dean fit into the system of leadership at these three institutions of higher education?
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The data collected in this study included interviews and a review of the official job descriptions for Deans at the institutions studied. There were notable similarities between the two sets of data which are further discussed in this and the following chapter. The official job descriptions will give a context for the discussion of the interviews, which will follow later.

Official Job Descriptions

Each institution has a job description of some form which is available for the public to view on each institutions’ website. Brock University and the University of Windsor both have official roles and responsibilities for the Deans as approved by Senate which are official university documents. At the University of Western Ontario, they officially list the roles and responsibilities as a part of the strategic plan for the University and not as an official Senate document. All three of these documents differ in their basic formats. However, the roles and responsibilities are consistent among all three documents and the data collected by the researcher in this study.

At the University of Windsor the role of the Dean is broken down into two main areas: academic duties and administrative duties. Each of these areas is broken down into more specific responsibilities that the Dean must fulfill. Academically, the Dean at the University of Windsor is responsible in the academic area for academic leadership, being a part of the College Coordinating Council, sitting on Senate, overseeing programs, and research, being a liaison between their Faculty and other Faculties, demonstrating an awareness and understanding of governmental policies, providing academic counselling, implementing academic policies, approving budgetary allocations, and carrying out other
null
academic duties as assigned. In addition Deans are also responsible for being
administrative spokespersons of their Faculty, sometimes representing the university on
behalf of external organizations; they also act as members of provincial and federal
Councils and as the administrators of any applicable collective agreements. Other duties
can be summarized as follows: allocation of finances and budgetary matters, space
allocation, renovations, implementation of personnel policies, assignment of duties, and
human resource issues, and other administrative duties as assigned. The official roles and
responsibilities at the University of Windsor are the most specific of the three
institutions studied.

At Brock University the Dean has seven responsibilities: to oversee the academic
program including responsibilities to Senate; to promote, facilitate, and review teaching
and research which includes faculty tenure, promotion, and salary; to supervise faculty
and staff within all departments of the faculty; to administer the faculty budget; to advise
faculty, staff, and students; to represent the Faculty within and outside the university;
and to perform other duties as assigned by the Vice President (Academic).

Finally, at the University of Western Ontario, the official roles and
responsibilities of the Dean are not delineated in a Senate document but are a part of the
strategic plan for the university. The document is broken down into five areas: academic
(development, coordination, and implementation of educational and research plans of the
faculty); administrative (budget, finances, annual plan, collective agreement);
professional (official representative of the faculty within and outside of the university);
university (senior administrator who assists in setting strategic direction of the
university, implementation of policy, fundraising, alumni, decision making processes at the University); and professorial (involved in teaching and research). It is interesting to note that the job descriptions often reference the role the Dean assumes in various University groups such as Senate yet the participants never mentioned these groups. The researcher believes that this was just an oversight and not a role which is not being fulfilled by the participants. Although the format is different for each institution, the official roles and responsibilities of Deans at the three institutions studied are representative of the findings of the researcher. The document provided by the University of Windsor is the most comprehensive with detailed job duties and expectations, while the document from Brock University is very similar in structure and content with fewer details than Windsor’s description. The document from the University of Western Ontario breaks down the duties of a Dean into five specific areas and gives general ideas related to the specific duties of the Dean while leaving additional responsibilities and duties open to some interpretation. The document from the University of Western Ontario is not a traditional job description and reflects a postmodernist method of presenting a job description. All three descriptions cover the areas of discussion that will form the basis of chapter five. In the most basic terms, according to the job descriptions, the Dean is the academic leader of their respective Faculty. They are ultimately responsible for anything and everything that occurs in and related to their Faculty.

When looking at the organizational charts of the three institutions studied, the role of Dean is at the level below Senior Management, namely the President and Vice
Presidents of the University. The Deans report directly to the Vice President (Academic) of the institutions studied. In terms of the active role of the Dean within the institutions studied, the role that the Dean played varies and appears to depend on the agenda of the Senior Management at the institution.

It is interesting to note that the official job descriptions of the Dean at all three institutions appear to indicate that the Dean plays a role as both a decision maker and a part of senior administration, especially at the University of Western Ontario. This policy does not appear to be as widely practised as the job descriptions appear to suggest. From the research conducted, it can be concluded that this discrepancy may be attributed to several factors. Certainly, the agendas of the President and Vice Presidents play a role in the amount of decision making power that the Dean may have at a senior level. However, timing, workload of the Deans, and the demands of their faculty also appear to be contributing factors. The Deans have a large commitment that they must fulfill to their faculty. There are decisions that must be made quickly at a senior level, and given the workload and demands on all levels of senior administration at the institutions studied, the Deans believed that any lack of consultation on their part was due to the fact that it was difficult if not impossible to get all of the Deans as well as the rest of senior management together to be able to discuss and deliberate on issues in order to make decisions. Deans are involved in making larger plans and in developing the strategic plan of the institutions studied. This variance in responsibilities will be discussed further in chapter five in relation to a Dean’s role as a decision maker.
Role of the Dean

The participants in the study discussed five distinct roles that the Dean has to fulfill: administrator, leader, professional, faculty developer (including furthering the research agenda of the Faculty) and program developer/student services (see Figure 1). Seven of the nine participants, all the “other” participants and two Deans and two Vice Presidents (Academic), discussed one of the main roles of the Dean as being that of an administrator. Specific examples of administrative duties include financial responsibilities, funding, and acting as the “chief administrative officer” or as a middle manager on campus. Seven of the nine participants (all the Deans and Vice Presidents (Academic) plus one “other” participant) also discussed the role of the Dean in terms of ensuring the development of Faculty career paths, tenure, and promotion. This also included the role of the Dean in furthering the research completed within the Faculty. The Deans and Vice Presidents (Academic) generally viewed faculty development and research as the main role of the Dean. Four of the nine participants (two Vice Presidents (Academic), one Dean and one “other”) described the Dean as a leader within both the university context and within the Faculty itself. The Vice Presidents (Academic) were the participants who generally saw the Dean fulfilling this role. Words such as “role model” and “scholar” were used to characterize the role of the Dean as a leader. Another four of the nine participants (two Vice Presidents (Academic), one Dean and one “other”) named a role of the Dean as a professional responsibility for the accreditation of teachers. Again, those in the Vice President (Academic) position had a greater consensus in identifying this category as a role that the Dean fulfilled. This role of
professional responsibility to the Faculty and the university was specifically discussed in the context of ensuring quality programs and preparation of both undergraduate and graduation students within the field as future educators.

The final role discussed was that of program development and student services. Two Deans and two Vice Presidents (Academic) listed this as a role for the Dean to fulfill, all of whom were Deans or Vice Presidents (Academic). Overall only one participant in the study (a Vice President (Academic)) enumerated all five areas when asked about the role of the Dean. Four of the participants only focussed on two of the roles of the Dean and three participants only discussed one of the above listed roles of the Dean. Those participants in the position of Dean or Vice President (Academic) all believed that a role of the Dean is to ensure the development of the faculty and the research agenda while participants not in that position did not emphasize that role. The results were also similar for the role of the Dean in program development and student services. The Dean's role as an administrator received a greater emphasis by those participants not in the Dean or Vice President (Academic) position. In general, those participants in the position of Dean or Vice President (Academic) saw the role of Dean in a broader context than the Departmental Chairs, who focussed more on the managerial functions of the Dean.

When asked how the current Dean had fulfilled the role, several different areas of focus emerged. Five of the participants (all the Vice Presidents (Academic) and two Deans) believed that the current Dean was focussing on faculty development. This included the tenure and promotion process, faculty development as well as overall
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relationships between faculty members. Program development and student affairs were
given recognition as a major area of focus of the current Dean by all the Vice Presidents
(Academic), one Dean and one “other” participant. Specific examples in this area
included course offerings, student services, commitment to the pre-service and graduate
programs, managing growth in the program as well as supporting teaching and learning
initiatives in order to improve the quality of both teaching within the faculty and the
programs offered to the students. Four participants (one Vice President (Academic), one
Dean and two “other” participants) focussed on the administrative or managerial areas
such as vision, development of new technological advances, and the need to follow the
university’s mandate as part of the current Dean’s focus. Two Vice Presidents
(Academic) and one Dean also indicated that the current Dean had a research-based
focus. Research was defined as support of faculty to conduct research and publish
within the assurance that funding and resources were available to faculty members in this
area. Only one “other” participant believed that the current Dean had been focussing on
external relations and development during his or her term by being active both within the
university community and within the province in the Dean’s group. The Deans who
participated in the study placed a greater emphasis on faculty development and program
development while the other participants in the study did not focus on one particular area
of the Dean’s role.

Challenges of the Role of Dean

When the participants discussed the greatest challenge of being the Dean, two
main themes emerged: coping with the resistance to change and overall funding and
budgetary issues. Resistance to change went hand in hand with the inherent notion within the Faculty that they were a teacher preparation school. According to those participants interviewed, the universities studied had a goal for the Faculty of Education to increase its focus on research, yet faculty members were resistant to that change. Faculty members need to be convinced that change is necessary in order to move the Faculty forward. Comments were made indicating that newer faculty members were much more apt to have a positive outlook toward change while senior faculty members were termed as "the old guard" and were seen as the most difficult faculty members to work with in the areas of change and development.

Lack of funding and the impact that the level of funding had on the level of research and the quality of programs offered was a constant obstacle that a Dean must address. Lack of funding also affected the number of course offerings and the cancellation of courses as well as having a big impact on the quality of programs. The two additional challenges of time management and research agenda management were only identified by the Deans who participated in the study.

Prior View of the Role of Dean

All participants felt that their view of the Dean prior to being in their current role was unchanged. However, the magnitude of the role that they played was amplified. For all of the Deans plus one Vice President (Academic) and one "other" participant, changes in their perceptions were attributed to the fact that they did not realize or appreciate how much of an external role the Dean had to play within the university context as well as outside the university as a whole. The external role included
involvement with senior administration and other Deans in decision making as well as working with the Ministry and the College of Teachers. All three of the “other” participants also felt that they did not have a full or complete understanding of the constraining forces that the Dean had to work with, including the independent nature of faculty members as well as working with other Deans and Faculties on campus.

When asked about the current Dean and the role that the Dean had undertaken, all participants agreed to different degrees that the current Dean was fulfilling the role differently than the previous Dean. One participant felt that, although the changes were minor, over the course of time they had proven very dramatic for the Faculty. For all three institutions studied, at least one participant identified the current Dean as being more faculty-focussed, that a great deal of time and effort was put in by the Dean to ensure that faculty members were developing and receiving sufficient support. This sense of commitment included cultivating relationships with faculty members as well as acting in a mentoring role to help them in their career paths; a mentoring role was designed to keep tenure track faculty on course.

All of the participants in the study believed that the role of the Dean was both that of a leader and of a manager. The managerial roles and the leadership roles, however, were very different according to the participants. Being a manager was defined in terms of fiscal and budgetary management, human resource activities such as hiring and promotion, public relations and delegation. Leadership functions were defined in more general, non-specific terms or behaviours. Concepts such as pushing the unit forward, meeting the aspirations of senior management, vision, foresight, mentoring, and
role modelling were used to describe leadership functions of the Dean. One Dean elaborated on his/her own personal view of management vis à vis being an administrator. This person’s view was that a manager had inherent leadership functions such as visioning and providing direction, that a manager creates and initiates whereas an administrator acts as a bureaucrat, simply following through on policies, procedures, and projects that were put in place by others in a leadership or managerial role.

Relationships with Faculty, Staff and Students

When asked about methods of communication used to maintain contact with faculty members, a large number of different methods were listed. Most methods depended upon the person in the position and his or her personality as well as the type of communication required. Several different types of formal communication methods included hosting faculty meetings or retreats, sitting on committees or task forces, and through regular performance appraisal meetings or “one-on-ones.” In addition, informal communication was maintained by having an open door policy, use of e-mail or telephone, as well as occasionally visiting faculty in their offices or seeing them in the lunchroom.

Contact and communication with staff was basically achieved through day to day interactions. Communication with staff was seen as being almost exclusively achieved through informal methods (interaction in the lunch rooms, on coffee breaks or in the office), in meetings, via telephone or email. Participants in the study did not discuss any real, formal means or methods of interaction with the staff in their faculty, although one participant mentioned having staff meetings occasionally with non-teaching staff.
The contact that the Dean had with students was varied. Most Deans dealt with students in three different areas - Students’ Council, students encountering difficulties, and through course work (teaching or supervision of graduate students). While most Deans were seen as having an open door policy, the lack of time that they spent in the office and the varying schedules of students did not allow for a great deal of informal interaction. One Dean mentioned that he/she often encountered students off campus at places such as the grocery store more often than on campus.

The Deans who participated in this study all advocated the concepts of support, independence, and listening in some fashion to empower their faculty and staff. None of the participants had a plan or purposeful method of empowerment for their faculty and staff. Support was used to stand behind the decisions that faculty and staff made and to give them a voice to act on their own ideas. The concept of freedom was meant in terms of giving faculty and staff the ability to act on their own, to treat them as competent individuals and to allow them to act autonomously. A final concept used to empower faculty and staff was listening, specifically, listening to faculty and staff and their ideas and being open to those ideas to allow for growth and change.

When asked how they motivate and inspire their faculty and staff, the Deans in this study gave a wide range of responses. One Dean believed that he/she motivated and inspired his/her faculty and staff simply by empowering them to do their jobs to the best of their ability. Another participant believed that this was an area that could be improved upon by increasing social and personal interaction with faculty and staff members and that a better job could be done in this area if the Dean had a personal
relationship with those who worked for him or her. Another participant did not believe that he/she motivated or inspired anyone and the faculty and staff did their jobs as well as they did because the annual merit process was what motivated and inspired them.

When the Deans in the study were asked about maintaining an inclusive environment within the Faculty, it became apparent that no deliberate steps were taken by any of the participants. An inclusive environment, as defined by the researcher, was one that was open and welcoming, an environment where all thoughts and opinions were considered equally by all employees, regardless if they were faculty or staff. One Dean believed that he or she made no distinction between academic and non-academic staff, which helped to cultivate the open environment, while another believed that mixing well with everyone worked toward developing an inclusive environment. The third participant believed that simply finding out the interests of others and engaging them in that specific area one could cultivate an open atmosphere within the Faculty.

Responsibilities of the Dean

The day to day responsibilities of the Dean as enumerated by the participants can be broken down into five distinct areas: administrative duties, dealing with faculty, external role, programs and student needs, and budgetary or fiscal responsibilities (see Figure 2). Seven of the nine participants (two Vice Presidents (Academic), two Deans and three “other” participants) listed administrative duties as being one of the major responsibilities of the Dean. This was one of the major focuses of those participants not in the role of Dean or Vice President (Academic). Specific examples included day to day decision making, attendance at meetings, interactions with upper administration,
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committees, handling e-mail, and trouble shooting. Similarly, five participants, mostly Associate Deans and Department Chairs, believed that faculty issues such as handling personnel issues, meeting with faculty and assigning and monitoring workload took up a vast component of the day to day responsibilities of the Dean. In addition, five participants (one Vice President (Academic), two Deans and two “other” participants) also discussed programs and student needs as a major responsibility that a Dean must fulfill. Quality assurance through the evaluation and monitoring of teaching and learning as well as finding time to stay in touch with the students were considered to be very important on a day to day basis for the Dean. Four participants (one Vice President (Academic), one Dean and two “other” participants) discussed the external role of the Dean as a major responsibility. The external role was seen as a public relations function which included working with the Ontario Association of Deans of Education, acting as a liaison to the College of Teachers, as well as maintaining relationships with other Faculties on campus, with other Faculties of Education in the Province as well as with local school boards, schools, and board officials. Budget and fiscal responsibilities were listed by four participants (one Vice President (Academic), two Deans and one “other” participants) as a part of the Dean’s day to day functions. The participants in the study who were not Deans or Vice Presidents (Academic) placed a greater emphasis on the Dean’s responsibilities in the areas of administration and dealing with faculty where the other participants consistently addressed all areas of responsibility on the same level. The Deans in the study identified administrative duties as one of their major responsibilities, while the Associate Deans and Department Chairs saw administrative
and faculty concerns as the major focus of the position. The participants in the Vice President (Academic) position addressed almost all areas of responsibility equally.

Challenges of Responsibilities

Of all of these responsibilities, participants were asked to discuss which they believed were the most challenging for a Dean to fulfill. The Vice Presidents (Academic) and two of the Deans believed that dealing with faculty and maintaining relationships were the most challenging areas for the Dean. The participants believed that this was mostly due to the belief that most academics are very independent in nature and that this autonomy makes it very difficult for the Dean to monitor or guide research initiatives and projects, and even puts the Dean under a great deal of criticism and pressure. As discussed by one of the participants in the study, one of the most common difficulties for the Dean lies in “transforming the attitude of the faculty from trainers of teachers to scholars generating new knowledge.”

The second most challenging area for Deans involved budgetary matters. Four participants (two Vice Presidents (Academic), one Dean and one “other” participant) felt that the Dean was often in a difficult position as he or she had to make what money he or she was given cover all the costs required to maintain the operation. Balancing the budget in the face of financial restrictions was seen as one of the most difficult facets of a Dean’s mandate. Two Deans believed that finding time to do all the work, especially all the paperwork, and finding time outside of that to do some long term planning and goal setting presented a particular challenge to a Dean. One Dean also believed that developing the research agenda within the Faculty was a particularly challenging area for
a Dean. These day to day challenges were consistent with the inherent challenges of the position itself, as discussed earlier with the participants.

**Problem Solving**

The participants were asked about the role of the Dean in terms of problem solving. All participants believed that problem solving was a major component of the Dean’s responsibilities as a lot of issues and situations arose that were unanticipated. One participant labelled problem solving as a major function of being a Dean, and another participant believed that, due to lack of time to do any long term planning or preparation, the majority of the problem solving for a Dean tended to be reactive instead of proactive.

**Major Themes**

Lack of time was seen as a major theme in terms of the roles and responsibilities of the Dean. All participants in the study referred to administrative duties such as e-mail, paperwork, and meetings (referred to by two participants as “administrivia”) as the most time consuming responsibilities of the Dean. Often the amount of paperwork was seen as taking away valuable time from the Dean, time that could be better spent in other areas. In addition, two participants saw personnel issues as time consuming. One Vice President (Academic) felt that dealing with student concerns took up a great deal of the Dean’s time, and dealing with budgetary issues was also seen by one participant as taking up a majority of the Dean’s time. All participants made comments regarding either the inherent lack of time available or the heavy workload that the Dean had to fulfill.
When asked where they would prefer to spend their time, the Deans enumerated four areas: (a) working on faculty development, (b) working with graduate students and teaching, (c) program development, and (d) long term planning for the Faculty. Two of the three Deans would have preferred to spend more time on faculty development, while each of the other three criteria were seen as areas to focus on by only one Dean each.

Accountability

Accountability to the University was seen as all encompassing and included the overall performance and operation of the Faculty of Education. All of the Vice Presidents (Academic), all the Deans and one “other” participant listed budgetary and financial management of the operation as one of the top areas of accountability to the University while an additional five participants (one Vice President (Academic), three Deans and one “other” participant) believed that the courses and programs offered and taught were of the utmost importance to the University as a whole. In addition, six participants (two from each category) believed that faculty development including hiring, promotion, tenure, and professional development were a major concern for the University.

The research agenda including the quality and amount published within the Faculty was seen as an area of accountability for the Dean with another five participants also listing administrative duties such as enrollment and management as another area of accountability to the University. Only the Vice Presidents (Academic) and one Dean considered the external component of relationship maintenance and interaction with the education community to be important to the University, while one Vice President
(Academic) and one Dean felt that the Dean was held accountable by the University specifically as a leader.

Budgetary Roles and Responsibilities

When asked about budgetary responsibilities, all participants said that the Dean had total control of the budget for the Faculty of Education. The Vice Presidents (Academic) and the Deans then qualified their answer by saying that the Dean had total control over all money outside of salaries. In addition, those participants pointed out that the University had an annual budgetary planning process which set out the money for the Deans, after which the Deans had full discretionary power over the money that was allocated to their Faculty. The money allocated, outside of salaries, was often used at the Dean’s discretion. One participant also pointed out that money was allocated at their institution to the various Departments and that the Chairs had control over the money; however, the Dean did have the ability to veto or alter allocations as he/she deemed appropriate. The money allocated to the budgets for the Deans did not include plant operations (unless there was a satellite campus), so building maintenance, utilities, and housekeeping were not concerns that the Dean had to deal with in terms of budgetary matters.

Potential of the Position

One hundred percent of the participants did not feel that the position of Dean was being used to its full potential. Six of the participants (two from each category) believed that the position of Dean as a management position occupied an awkward middle ground within the university hierarchy. Deans were seen as needing to please many people both
above and below them, and while they are often asked for opinions on major decisions, they were not in most cases the decision makers as they had to support those decisions even when they did not necessarily agree. Their positions were seen as busy and demanding, so much so that the structure of the university itself impeded the progress that a Dean could make.

Outside of the role of being a middle manager, one Dean believed that the Dean should be more involved in community and public relations work, including securing outside funding for their Faculty. One Vice President (Academic) believed that the Dean could be used more effectively in the areas of scholarship and research, while a third participant also believed that the impact of the Dean depended on the person in the position itself and that this Dean’s vision would impact his or her own potential. A final Vice President (Academic) believed that the potential of the Dean was impeded by the entrenchment of old school values within the faculty itself and that having faculty with a more positive outlook on change would make an impact on the effectiveness of the Dean.

When asked about changes to the position of Dean, several participants could not provide an adequate answer. Three participants believed that the creation of an Associate Dean position would be beneficial to the Faculty. Two Vice Presidents (Academic) believed that the Dean should be given more authority, and that this authority should be tied in with increased accountability. This new-found responsibility would serve to increase the importance of the Dean’s role within the Faculty and the institution as a whole.
Contributions of the Dean

Despite some of the negative aspects of the role of Dean, when asked about the contributions made to the Faculty by the current Dean, eight of the nine participants believed that the current Dean in their Faculty had made great internal contributions to the Faculty. These included stability, re-invigourization, self confidence, leadership, vision, and direction for the Faculty as a whole. In addition, five participants (two Vice Presidents (Academic), one Dean and two “other” participants) believed that the current Dean had made great external strides for the Faculty including improved relationships, a better public image, and a greater understanding of the Faculty within the university environment. Three participants listed the creation of a PhD program as a great contribution to the Faculty and one Dean felt that the increased and improved research agenda had been a great benefit that the Dean had bestowed upon the Faculty of Education.

In terms of contribution to the University as a whole, Deans were seen as having a great impact (see Figure 3). The main areas in which Deans were seen as having the biggest impact were on committees. All participants (except for one Dean) saw the Dean as actively contributing to the overall governance of the campus through their voices on committees and within other university groups. In addition, one Vice President (Academic) and one Dean saw the Dean as contributing to teaching and learning on campus, while another three participants believed that the Dean had raised the profile of the Faculty of Education on campus. Additionally, one participant saw the Dean as a
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great advocate of graduate students and research on campus, contributing to the university as a whole.

Most participants in the study saw the Dean playing a vital role within the big picture of their institution. The role of the Dean was seen as important in the following areas: the implementation of the university’s strategic plan, in public relations, in developing the external image of the university, as an academic leader fundamental to the academic operation of the university, as a leader and manager for the campus, and as a key player in the senior management playing a part in the University’s mission.

Overall, the Vice Presidents (Academic), one Dean and one “other” participant believed that the Dean was instrumental in the management of the institution, while three participants also saw the Dean as important in the external role and public relations of the institution. In addition, two Deans and one “other” participant also saw the Faculty of Education as a large revenue source or “cash cow,” bringing in additional funding for the university. Only two participants saw the Dean as simply a middle manager in the big picture of the institutions being studied.

When asked if there were any additional thoughts on the role of the Dean, four participants offered additional comments. One participant pointed out that the Dean was still an academic. He or she was still actively involved in teaching and research, just as other faculty members were, a point which could often be forgotten. A second participant brought up the elusive question of “who do they really work for?” in pointing out that the Dean had a dual role on campus with many people to please.
Another area which initiated discussion was the role of the Dean in developing the technology in their Faculty. The participant believed that the Dean needed to show leadership in the development of additional qualification courses and distance education courses through technology. This participant believed that it was critical that the Dean actively explore this area for greater advancements for his or her respective Faculty. It was interesting to note that this was the only time in the study that any of the participants really alluded to or discussed continuing education as a part of the role of the Dean. A final participant discussed the overall lack of appreciation and understanding of the role of a Dean. The participant believed that faculty members did not respect the great amount of responsibility that a Dean had, and it was only once one was outside the university community that a greater appreciation for the Dean could be found.

The consistent themes that arose in the interviews lend credence to the idea that the role of the Dean was similar in the institutions studied. There were also some discrepancies and differences in what the participants had to say about the roles and responsibilities of the Dean. In general, those participants who had never filled the position of Dean had a narrower view of the position. The Deans and Vice Presidents (Academic) who participated in the study had a greater understanding and an overall broader perspective on the roles and responsibilities of the Dean. The next chapter will examine the findings from the interviews as well as the official documentation of the roles and responsibilities of the Dean from each of the institutions studied in an attempt to develop a larger understanding of leadership in higher education and to draw
conclusions regarding the position of Dean and the role played in each of the institutions studied.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

In the previous chapter, several themes regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Dean became apparent. These themes support the fact that the roles and responsibilities of the Deans at the institutions studied appear to be very similar. However, there are some distinct differences in the focus on those roles and responsibilities. Earlier in this study, three research questions were asked. Those questions were: What are the perceived roles and responsibilities of University Deans? How do these roles and responsibilities differ from those outlined in the official job descriptions at each institution? How does the role of Dean fit into the system of leadership in these institutions of higher education? These questions will be answered in the following section by specifically looking at the role of the Dean, the responsibilities that a Dean has, the big picture as it relates to the position of Dean and how financial responsibilities, accountability, and independence are a part of the Dean’s roles and responsibilities.

The Role of the Dean as a Leader

The role of the Dean is arguably that of a leader. According to Lashway (1996), the Dean fulfills many of the core functions that theorists indicate are traits of a leader, including being a role model and a person who embodies what he or she advocates. A Dean, therefore, is a person who sees the big picture, someone who helps to keep perspective for the group. The research identified in chapter two defined a leader is several different ways. There were common aspects to all of these definitions. A leader is a person in a position of power and authority with the ability to effect change through motivation and inspiration of those around them. Traditional leadership theories support
the concept of the Dean as leader simply by virtue of the fact that he or she is in a position of authority; more recent theories attribute leadership to the qualities of the person in power as well as the characteristics of the other members of the group. One obvious conclusion to be drawn from the research conducted is that Deans are leaders within higher education. They act as role models, mentors, and decision makers within their respective Faculties and have varying levels of influence within the institution itself. It is important to remember that leadership is also dependent upon the time, place, and context in which it is happening. There are several theorists, such as Duke (1998), Gardner (1996) and Hoy and Miskel (1996), who base their theories on this very factor.

Leadership, as it relates to the role of the Dean within higher education, appears to be defined in authoritative terms. This is the same definition of leadership as proposed by Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998) in chapter two in which they state that a leader is a person in a leadership position who has been elected, selected or hired to assume responsibility for a group working toward change. They also indicated that a leader has the responsibility for decision making and action. An underlying theme in the interviews was that of change, growth, and positive development, all of which indicates a propensity for working for change.

The research conducted indicates that the main roles of the Dean include being an administrator, a leader, a professional in the area of education, and someone responsible for faculty development. The Deans in this study fulfill the five fundamental practices of a leader theorized by Kouzes and Posner (1987). The Deans interviewed challenge the process through new initiatives and by constantly looking to improve their
Faculties. They enable a shared vision within their Faculty, both by articulating the vision of their institutions and also through the programs and initiatives that they develop. They also enable others to act. While this may be difficult at times with some members of faculty, the Deans are able to challenge their faculty members to complete research and to take on new challenges outside of their teaching requirements. The Deans in the study also act as role models; not only are they able to fulfill a challenging role as Dean, but they also find time to work with students, to do some teaching and research while in the position of Dean. Finally, in their own way, they encourage their staff. While one Dean may have felt that they were not motivators for their staff and the other two Deans interviewed did not actively pursue staff motivation as a task that needed to be fulfilled, other participants saw them fulfilling that role. Lees, Smith, and Stackhouse (1994) stated that leadership comes from the heart and that management comes from the head. Being a manager means following policies, procedures, and process, whereas leadership adds the human element. Simply by being leaders, the Deans are able to motivate their staff and add that element of being “more than just being a manager” to the Faculty. In fact, Gmelch (2000) states that, by being leaders, their role dictates that they must be able to empower, inspire, and communicate. They must be able to assist others in building their own potential, to develop vision and innovation, and to ensure that the team works together to achieve those visions.

The credibility of the leader is predicated on the integrity of the person holding the position. As discussed in chapter two, leaders influence others to follow a course of action through persuasion and role modelling (Pfeffer, Julius et al., 1999; Robles, 1998).
The Deans at the institutions studied are identified, for the most part, as having those aforementioned characteristics. Although they were not directly interviewed, the researcher believes that those faculty members identified as “difficult” members of the faculty to work with may not view the Dean as a leader, thereby creating the tension between some faculty members and the Dean. By failing to see the Dean as a leader, the researcher believes that “difficult” faculty members are much more likely to question their decisions and the direction that they may be trying to set for the Faculty as a whole. This perceived lack of support may also be attributed to characteristics that the researcher feels is inherent in education. Faculty often encourage students to think independently, to speak out, and to challenge themselves and others. It would seem that the faculty members may behave in this manner as they are lifelong academics.

Regardless, this lower level of support makes it a greater challenge for the Dean to try and effect change in the Faculty and make overall improvements. All of the research collected fits the definition put forth by Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1999) that a leader is a person who is elected, selected or hired to assume responsibility for a group working toward change. Change is an inevitable part of the education field. Continual growth, development, and research constitute a large part of what happens on a university campus.

The Role of the Dean as a Decision Maker

From the researcher’s perspective, the Dean did not believe that he or she had much, if any, influence in administrative decisions made at the institutions studied. The Deans studied appeared to have limited influence, acting more as sounding boards or as
agents who implement decisions that senior management have already made when it relates to non-academic related areas. Although there was some evidence that Deans did play an active and vital role on university committees, in general, they believed that they were rarely involved in the major decision making processes. One participant stated that “too often I think that Deans are used as the first attempt by the senior administration to sell an idea rather than being included in the development of an idea.” In this type of organizational structure, the Dean acts as a liaison with central administration and his or her respective faculties. This was also the case in previous research where the Dean was seen to be both an extension of the Presidency and an extension of the faculty (Wolverton et al., 1999); here the Dean played a critical link in the academic decision making process. As stated above, the Deans play an important role in the implementation of decisions that are made by Senior Management and which must be passed on to the faculty as a whole.

While the Deans studied play a varying role in the formal decision making processes at their respective institutions, they certainly have the opportunity to influence their Faculty and the institution on an informal basis. Martin (1993) identified the three major roles of the Dean: (a) to find common ground within his or her respective areas in order to develop goals and institutional planning, (b) to generate new initiatives as well as to keep current projects while ensuring retention of staff, and (c) to ensure that all efforts are completed in the most efficient manner possible. It is the belief of the researcher that, because the decisions being made in today’s institutions of higher education are not always academically founded, there are decisions which relate to the
financial viability of the institution, and the decision making power of the Deans at institutions of higher education has therefore been affected. While the evidence is limited based on the research collected, it appears that some of those interviewed believed that most of the major decisions are made at a Senior Management level and that Deans essentially operate as sounding boards on the level at which implementation occurs. Obviously the influence and impact that a Dean has on these larger decisions revolves around the Dean and their level of influence within the institution (both personally and professionally) as well as the decision being made and how it would impact that particular faculty. This, in turn, could be an area for future research, depending on the structure of the institution and the views held by Senior Administration. Individual agendas also play a big role in this area. Throughout the institutions studied, decision making ability, and power lie in many different hands with varying perspectives and backgrounds. It was also evident in this study and in Robles (1998) that faculty are afforded much more authority and influence in the decision making process in higher education than they would be in similar positions in the private sector.

In his 1999 study, Walker identified that, traditionally, leadership in institutions of higher education comes from one individual who maintains a strict control over the institution and shares few leadership responsibilities. From the research collected and in the researcher's opinion, this is not true, as there are a great many demands put on today's institutions of higher education. Presidents rarely make decisions on their own. At the very least the Vice Presidents are actively involved in the decision making
process. Other interviewees contended that many decisions are made in a consultative manner which involves committees of Deans and other stakeholders on campus and in the community. All of the institutions studied have an approval process for large decisions which involves their Board of Governors or some other governing body.

Carson (1999) believed that a lot of the pressures on upper administration were due to universities being caught between the two forces of corporate right and cultural left. Education can be defined as either a business or a basic human need for development, which puts universities in the very difficult place of defining their very values and mission. Deans occupy an important leadership position in the institution as they have a broad understanding of the institution while remaining involved in teaching and learning (Martin, 1993).

Relationships with the Dean

The relationships that the Deans have with those around them is extremely important in determining the level of success that they have. Relationships, and the level of influence that a leader or a person in a position of authority wields, are core components to most leadership theories, as mentioned in chapter two. As previously discussed, leaders exert an influence on those around them, they shape the organization and how its members feel and react to the leadership within it, and the amount of influence that a leader has is dependent upon the relationships within the organization (Duke, 1998). Based on the research conducted, there is an obvious relationship between the Deans and the members of their Faculty. As alluded to earlier, there are institutional norms which appear to give the faculty members more power in making
decisions than would be the case in other industries. This makes it a necessity for the
Dean to have a strong relationship with faculty members as the faculty members have a
great deal of power and the ability to make implementation difficult if they are not
supportive of the Dean and the Dean’s decisions and vision.

There is also evidence of a good relationship between the Dean and the students
on a basic level, although with the increasing time constraints on the Deans they may be
losing some of that contact. One area within the Faculty where there appears to be a
need to build relationships is with regards to the staff. While the researcher can only
make some assumptions as to the reasons for the apparent lack of relationships, the staff
component at the institutions studied appears to be based on an informal relationship
consisting of regular day to day interactions. There did not appear to be any
consultation, involvement or formal structures in place at any of the institutions to
involve staff in the development of the Faculty. This was not an unusual response from
any of the participants; almost every participant indicated that there was little to no
formal contact with staff members. In response to this question, one participant indicated
that their contact with staff members was limited to “wandering down the corridor and
talking to people that they needed to speak with” in addition to running into people in the
lunch room and on coffee breaks. This did not include faculty members with whom the
Dean tended to have regular and consultative contact in a formal and informal setting.

Outside the Faculty, it is just as important that the Dean has a strong relationship
with other administrators as well as with his or her own staff. In addition, the Dean also
has a demanding obligation to the College of Teachers and the Ministry of Education.
All of these relationships, both internal and external, require a great deal of communication and interpersonal skills on the part of the leader (Bass, 1990).

Moreover, the Dean needs to be able to facilitate group development and team building through management and leadership skills. These opportunities to develop strong relationships should occur on both a formal and informal level at regular intervals throughout the year.

The Research as it Relates to Current Theories

In chapter two the researcher discussed transactional and transformative leadership theories and how they applied to this study. Transactional leadership theories were defined by Duke (1998) as taking place when one person initiates contact with others in order to make a valued exchange of contributions. In this theory, leadership is viewed traditionally in that there is one defined person who is responsible for the group. According to the structures and organizations studied, it appears that this is the type of leadership found at institutions of higher education. There is a definite and defined hierarchy with the person(s) at the pinnacle making the decisions and keeping the organization going. This system is perpetuated by the interaction with followers, which is conferred by members of the group who accept the leadership and grant the leader power. Based on this theory, then, it would be rare and unexpected for a faculty member, for example, to challenge a decision made by the President of the University, but it happens frequently in an academic setting. It is almost expected that the faculty member may disagree with the President or any member of the administration. As discussed earlier, the researcher believes that this is a reflection of the nature of
education itself which teaches students to challenge concepts, be critical thinkers, and encourages independent thought and expression.

In chapter two, transformative leadership was defined as leaders and followers transcending their own immediate self interest to engage with each other. From the interviews conducted, this also occurs occasionally within institutions of higher education. An example of this can be found at the Faculty of Education at Windsor where the Dean actively seeks out leaders in the group and engages the entire faculty in discussions on the future of the Faculty. This approach also represents an application of Senge’s systems theory in which there is an active feedback process involving members of the group. Where transformative leadership is concerned, the leader is part of the group process which constantly grows, changes, and evolves. This type of leadership process allows for change and growth within the Faculty and for the development of greater, stronger relationships in opposition to a hierarchy. As the situation within the Faculty changes, the informal leadership within the Faculty will change in order to address the situation.

The Financial Responsibilities of a Dean

The effectiveness of Deans vis à vis their control over financial and budgetary processes and procedures is difficult to discern from the research conducted. Most Deans only have budgetary control over their Faculties after budgetary processes and university systems have been approved. This appears to leave a very small portion of the overall budget of the Faculty in their hands as discretionary funds. The Deans do have full responsibility and accountability for their own finances outside of the university
processes which have been set for all areas of the institution. One Dean, when asked about their control over their budget, stated simply that “once salaries come out there is not much left to work with.” They went on to explain that the University controls salaries based on contracts and collective agreements made in negotiations with the unions, and they (as Dean) control the discretionary funds that are left over. Financial limitations and cutbacks, rising tuition and public demands for accountability are still major concerns for the Dean and for his or her Faculty; thus with all of these pressures on the Deans, they are finding that their discretionary funds are shrinking, which makes it more and more difficult for them to balance the financial needs of their Faculty. The role of Deans as middle managers seems to indicate that they manage information, manage funds and have a great deal of influence on the culture of the organization (Barr et al., 1993). In addition, the management of funds, budgeting, hiring, dismissal as well as countless meetings (Learning et al., 1999) are all important aspects that determine the level of accountability that the Dean has within the Faculty of Education.

Accountability, while extremely important in a financial respect, is also key for all areas including programming, student services, and faculty development and growth. Beyond the financial mandate of the Faculty, as stated in their interviews, the Deans have total responsibility and control over those areas of the Faculty.

The Official and Unofficial Roles and Responsibilities of the Dean

There is little difference between the perceived roles and responsibilities of the Dean and the official roles and responsibilities as outlined by the three institutions in the study. Each of the job descriptions touched upon the key roles and responsibilities
discussed to this point: program development, research, budget, faculty development, community liaison, administration, and professorial responsibilities. The main difference between the official documents and the perception by the participants can be found in the amount of time allotted to each area and the ability of the Dean to manage all the responsibilities that they have been given. All three Deans participating in the study indicated that they would enjoy having more time to spend on areas such as student development and research but often those areas took a back seat to the more demanding responsibilities of financial obligations and research. In addition, the job descriptions mention administrative responsibilities, but they are not defined in terms of specific areas and duties. The participants often felt that the administrative duties were tedious and took a great deal of time, time which could be used for other, more important work.

Major Themes in the Study

While the researcher has identified a few major areas of challenges for the Deans interviewed, the Deans themselves found that their biggest challenges were a lack of time and an excess of work: the need to cope with the resistance to change, which is a part of the Faculty, as well as the financial challenges of today’s world, proved especially problematic for these individuals. These challenges constitute the major themes which developed as a part of this study.

The most common theme running throughout the information collected by the researcher is the lack of time that the Deans have on a day to day basis. This is not as big a concern for the Dean at the University of Western Ontario, which may be attributed to the fact that there is an Associate Dean of Education at the University of Western
Ontario who helps to alleviate some of the time constraints that this Dean feels. While there is an Associate Dean at Brock University, the role fulfilled by the Associate Dean is not the same as the role of the Associate Dean at the University of Western Ontario. The Associate Dean at the University of Western Ontario is a more student-services-based role, while the role at Brock is more like that of a Dean at a satellite campus. The role of the Associate Dean could take on many forms but, in essence, would act to ensure that all of the roles and responsibilities that the Dean is required to fulfill are being adequately served. As all institutions work differently and there are often few similarities between campuses, the role could be different depending on the institution. In fact, an Executive Assistant could also fill some of the roles that the researcher believes that an Associate Dean could fulfill. The main difference in the positions is that the Associate Dean is an academic colleague who could assist with areas requiring an academic background, a person who could be a sounding board and another source of educational support. One participant expressed the desire for such a colleague, someone with whom they could sit down and discuss a new idea or program and then that colleague could take those ideas, give them form and substance, and put them in a report for additional development. The researcher believes that this role is needed and desired, whether it is filled by an Associate Dean or some other position. The position would act to fill some increasing gaps in the level of service that the Dean cannot provide on his or her own.

All participants identified time constraints and the growing demands of the administrative side of the position as major challenges for the Dean to overcome. The
Deans interviewed all felt that the administrative demands took away from areas to which they wanted to devote themselves, such as, faculty development, working with students, academic pursuits, program planning as well as long term planning and goal setting for the faculty as a whole. Gardner (1996) believed that a leader must have an institutional base as well as an opportunity for reflection. The Deans in this study often felt that they were so bogged down with day to day minutia that they did not have the opportunity to take time to reflect. This state of affairs can only be a detriment to the Faculty as well as to the institution as a whole. An easy solution may be for the Dean to simply “find the time” to do the planning and visioning required for the Faculty; this, however, is difficult. Lashway (1996) believed that leaders have many obligations, and those obligations to themselves are often not as important as the leader’s obligations to many different people, many of whom have competing values or interests. Finding time to do the long term planning and visioning is simply not the solution. There needs to be some permanent adjustments or changes in the role of the Dean which would allow for that time to be a regular part of the Dean’s schedule.

Another major theme is the level of accountability that the Dean has in his or her position. The Dean is ultimately responsible for the overall performance and operation of the Faculty of Education. This includes the budgetary and financial management of the faculty in addition to the research agenda of the Faculty of Education. The role of the Dean is vital to the structure of the institution. Nevertheless, it appears to the researcher that the position of Dean is losing some of its stability as there is too much for the Dean to do in the time that he or she have and the additional demands and pressures
on the Deans to get things accomplished and forcing them to focus on the administrative demands of the position. In other words, Deans are losing contact with their faculty, staff, and students, and without formal structures in place to help facilitate this contact and communication, there may be some definite difficulties which develop.

At the three institutions studied, there are three different structures within the Faculty of Education, specifically in regards to the position of the Associate Dean. At the University of Western Ontario, the Associate Dean functions with a student service focus. The Dean acts as the main administrator for the Faculty, working directly with the faculty members and senior management while the Associate Dean works with the students and oversees program requirements within the Faculty. At Brock University, while there is an Associate Dean position (please note, this has changed since the time that interviews were conducted), the role is as more of an adjunct Dean or a Dean of a satellite campus as opposed to being a role dedicated to student services. These responsibilities include facilities management as well as the normal academic operations of the campus. Finally, at the University of Windsor, there is no Associate Dean position, which leaves the Dean to fulfill the student services role of the Faculty in addition to all of the other administrative roles that the position of Dean entails. While each institution is different, and each requires its own system of operation to function, from the interviews and the researcher’s observations of the three Faculties, it would appear that having an Associate Dean dedicated to the student services functions of the Faculty is an excellent method of ensuring that the needs of the students within the Faculty are met. The needs of students are a priority, and their needs can be
unpredictable in terms of timing. As there is already a large workload on the Dean, it is difficult to be able to find time to focus on students and program needs while trying to work with the faculty members as well as acting as a senior manager on campus.

The role of Dean is to be both a leader within his or her Faculty as well as to manage the functions of the Faculty. Both roles are crucial to the efficient functioning of the Faculty. The Faculty, furthermore, cannot successfully educate students for any length of time, no matter how strong the Faculty members. Without proper administration, and without a strong academic component, the Faculty simply becomes a business without a heart for teaching and learning. The Dean acts almost at a micro level in the institution, fulfilling roles that are important to different areas in the institution. This workload creates a great deal of role conflict and role ambiguity for Deans, which in turn takes a toll on job satisfaction, stress and effectiveness, and commitment which results in high turnover, burnout, and low productivity (Wolverton et al., 1999). While the position of Dean is not the most senior position in the management of post secondary institutions, he or she is vital to the leadership of the institution. The position of the Dean fits into the structure of the University in an almost reversed hourglass shape of responsibilities. The responsibilities that a Dean has on a day to day basis are also responsibilities in which most universities have a specific person or department designed to handle on a regular basis. For example, a Dean is responsible for areas such as human resources, alumni, development, and support, finance, counselling, student services in addition to teaching and academic matters. It is necessary for a Dean to be
more than simply an academic because the other aspects of the position are vital, demanding and often more time consuming than academic matters. The Dean acts as a hub or connector between the various faculties in the institution by linking the teaching and learning components of the institution with the administration and the business of being an institution of education.

Contribution to Research and Practice

This study represents a contribution to the further development of research on leaders and leadership as well as providing some additional insight into educational leadership. The study, moreover, provides a perspective on the position of Dean as it applies to Faculties of Education and where improvements in the position can be made through recommendations from an outside, independent perspective. The roles and responsibilities of Deans in Faculties other than education, while somewhat different from those of the Dean of Education, are similar in many ways. Further research projects could include an examination of other middle management and/or senior management roles at institutions of higher education. These studies could be achieved by examining the roles and responsibilities of Deans in other Faculties at various institutions. There will be some differences in roles and responsibilities due to the nature of the individual Faculties. For example, unlike in other faculties, the Deans of Education have a role in the accreditation of teachers.

Findings and Recommendations of the Researcher

Throughout this study, it was evident to the researcher that the demands placed on the Dean were significant and growing. This fact was acknowledged in the interviews
conducted. However, none of the participants had any concrete ideas about how to cope with these demands nor any suggestions for change. One of the most logical answers to cope with the growing demands on the Dean is to mandate the position of Associate Dean. From the researcher's perspective, the Associate Dean as it is structured at the University of Western Ontario, to act in a student support role, can be effective for ensuring that student needs are met and in alleviating some of the Dean's time commitments in order to give the Dean more time for long-term planning and visioning as well as to give the Dean greater ability to monitor finances.

Another noticeable area for change is within the Faculty itself. It is important to acknowledge the impact that faculty members have on the functioning of the Faculty and to find ways of working more effectively with those faculty who have different opinions or those who are not as receptive to growth and change. Dealing with faculty members takes a lot of time and can be a huge challenge, especially if they are resistant to change. One participant in this study even identified faculty members as "notoriously individualistic." A good manager acts as a coach for his or her staff, ensuring that they are achieving what they need to in order to advance their own careers while ensuring that the needs within the Faculty itself are being met. In the opinion of the researcher, having a Faculty which is divided into departments, and which has a strong departmental chair, would certainly help to give more attention to the faculty members and ensure that their needs are being met.

As discussed in the literature review, while a manager is not a leader, a strong leader must exhibit managerial skills in order to be effective. After completing the
interviews and reviewing all the data collected, it is the opinion of the researcher that the Deans who participated in this study are leaders on their respective campuses. They effectively demonstrate many of the traits of a strong leader while managing their faculties, effecting change and developing the future growth and development of not only their faculties but their respective institutions as a whole.

The role of the Dean can be viewed as occupying a middle management position in which the level of work has become overwhelming and almost too much for one individual to handle on his or her own. In traditional theories, the leader is considered to be at the top or pinnacle of the group or organization. In reality, leadership is spread throughout the organization at various levels and in varying degrees. While the Vice President (Academic) is the supervisor for the Dean, the level of practical application of management requirements are left with the Dean; thus, the Vice President (Academic) has experience in those areas but does not assume any current responsibilities. An area for future study may include examining how Deans go about learning their duties and responsibilities. Training or orientation is often provided for new faculty members, but what type of training and orientation are provided for Deans? What topics are included and is this enough training or should there be more? These topic areas were not covered in this study but could be used as the basis for future work.

The researcher feels that, in a middle to upper management type position, it is difficult for Deans to find their place and their voice, especially as their time is consumed by other things and they rarely have the time to properly plan and develop a vision. From the data collected, the researcher believes that the Deans have varying
levels of authority and responsibility which may cause some difficulty in their positions. Deans are subject to the plans of senior management, and, while they have the ability to plan and make some long range visioning for their own Faculty, those plans are subject to what the senior management has planned for the institution as a whole. A decentralized campus would offer the Deans a much stronger decision making ability and effectively increase their power on campus. One of the institutions studied has made such a move since the research on this study has been completed. This has made the role of the Dean an even more crucial role on that campus.

Is the Dean a leader who has too much on his or her plate, so much so that he or she becomes ineffective in carrying out the most basic duties? From the interviews conducted, the researcher believes that this is a real possibility. There are several recommendations which could combat some of these obstacles a Dean faces. These solutions may include mandating the position of Associate Dean, offering various levels of training and ongoing support mechanisms for the Dean, as well as providing a strong, effective support staff within the office of the Dean to carry out the day to day functions of the Faculty, which would then leave the Dean in the position of being able to fulfil some of the intangible duties that the position demands.

It may be necessary for senior administration to realize that the role of the Dean is not necessarily simply a role based on academic success; while that is a vital aspect to the position of Associate Dean, there needs to be support for the other roles that the Associate Dean fulfills within the Faculty. With the size of post secondary education growing at unprecedented rates, it is difficult to assume that Deans can have such a
broad base of knowledge. In short, they cannot be experts in all of these areas as it is a wide range of needs they are expected to fulfill. One possible solution to this dilemma is to separate the non-academic role from the academic role of the Dean as a way of simplifying things for them. For example, it appeared from the interviews conducted that the Dean at Brock University relies heavily on his Executive Assistant in the areas of budgeting and finance to ensure that those areas are constantly monitored, as he recognizes that he is not able to keep a constant eye on that specific area. This solution would give Deans the opportunity to be educational or academic leaders. They would have a “manager” of the Faculty or an Executive Assistant who can worry about some of the day to day paperwork or administrative responsibilities that take up too much time and which do not allow some of the important (but not urgent) work to get completed. The institutions studied have already recognized and moved ahead to address some of these issues. Changes have already occurred to put support persons in place such as Associate Deans and Development Officers to ensure that the Deans are able to effectively fulfill their roles on campus.

Conclusion

The roles and responsibilities of the Deans in the Faculties of Education at Brock University, the University of Western Ontario, and the University of Windsor are demanding, challenging and vital to the efficient functioning of their respective Faculties and institutions as a whole. The role of the Dean is multi-faceted, in that there is an expectation that the Dean needs to be “all things to all people.” He or she is required to be an administrator, a manager, an expert in finances, student services, and in human
resources. It is an extremely demanding position. There needs to be a strong, effective support system in place in order for Deans to function in an efficient manner. Due to the inherent demands on the time of the Dean, it is crucial that they have the support and training in order to be efficient and effective in their position. These demands on the Deans have been recognized by the institutions studied. In the two years since the initial research began for this study, the institutions involved have taken steps to increase the responsibility and support of the position of Dean. One institution has decentralized their administration leaving the Deans with significantly more responsibility including increased financial and budgetary responsibilities. The position of Associate Dean has also changed at one of the institutions studied. Another institution has created a new position to assist the Dean with some of the demands of their responsibilities. As mentioned previously, institutions of higher education are dynamic and ever changing, which leads to an exciting and ever changing dynamic on campus. Those men and women who work as a Dean must be able to not only understand the academic component of the faculty and institution, but they must also be able to fulfill the administrative aspects of the position. A Dean is not simply an academic position but an upper management position in an organization whose business is that of education. It is those challenges which make the position of Dean a sought after and rewarding position.
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APPENDIX A: INTAKE SURVEY OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Please list your degrees received as well as which institution you attended.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. Please list any management or leadership roles held in the past (ie Department Chair, Dean), length of time you held the position and at which institution.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. Please list the institutions that you have been employed at, in what capacity and for what length of time.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Why did you decide to get involved in educational administration?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Questions for Deans

1. What do you see as the role of a Dean?
2. How have you defined your role?
3. What is your greatest challenge in your role?
4. Why do you find this to be a challenge?
5. What did you see as the role of the Dean before you took this position?
6. Has your perception of the role of the Dean changed at all?
7. How has your role as Dean changed since you have taken this position?
8. Do you consider this position as that of a leader or a manager?
9. How do you maintain contact/communication with your faculty?
10. Do you feel that you have enough contact with faculty?
11. How do you maintain contact/communication with your staff?
12. Do you feel that you have enough contact with staff?
13. How do you maintain contact/communication with your students?
14. Do you feel that you have enough contact with students?
15. How do you empower the people that you manage?
16. How do you motivate or inspire the people that you manage?
17. How do you ensure an inclusive environment in your faculty?
18. As a Dean, please define your responsibilities.
19. Identify the areas of responsibility that are the most challenging and comment on why.
20. Do you consider problem solving to be a major responsibility of your position?
21. What do you spend the majority of your time working on?
22. What do you wish you spent your time working on? Why?
23. What does the University hold you accountable for as Dean?
24. How much control do you have over the finances (budget) in your Faculty?
25. Do you feel that the position of Dean is used to its full potential?
26. What changes would you make in the position?
27. What do you feel is your biggest contribution to your faculty?
28. What do you feel is your biggest contribution to the university as a whole?
29. How does your position fit into the “big picture” at this institution?

Questions for Department Heads, Associate Deans and Vice Presidents

1. Please define your responsibilities in relation to the Dean.
2. What do you see as the major roles of the Dean in your Faculty?
3. How has your Dean defined his or her role?
4. What did you see as the role of the Dean before you took this position?
5. Has your perception of the role of the Dean changed at all?
6. How has your perception of the role of the Dean changed?
7. Do you consider the position of Dean as that of a leader or a manager?
8. What do you see as the major responsibilities of the Dean in your Faculty?
9. Identify the areas of responsibility that you believe are the most challenging for your Dean and comment on why.
10. What does your Dean spend the majority of his or her time working on?
11. How does your Dean maintain contact/communication with his or her faculty?
12. Do you feel that your Dean has enough contact with faculty? Why or why not?
13. How does your Dean maintain contact/communication with his or her staff?
14. Do you feel that your Dean has enough contact with staff? Why or why not?
15. How does your Dean maintain contact/communication with his or her students?
16. Do you feel that your Dean has enough contact with students? Why or why not?
17. What do you feel the University holds the Dean accountable for?
18. How much control does your Dean have over your budget?
19. How much control does your Dean have over the finances in your Faculty?
20. Do you feel that the position of Dean is used to its full potential?
21. What changes would you make in the position?
22. What do you feel is your Dean’s biggest contribution to your faculty?
23. What do you feel is your Dean’s biggest contribution to the university as a whole?
24. How does the position of the Dean fit into the “big picture” at this institution?
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