INDIVIDUAL, INSTITUTIONAL AND LEADERSHIP FACETS INFLUENCING FACULTY CURRICULAR LEADERSHIP: A MIXED METHODS SEQUENTIAL, EXPLORATORY STUDY

A dissertation submitted to the Kent State University College and Graduate School of Education, Health, and Human Services in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By
Terri L. Christensen

May, 2014
A dissertation written by

Terri L. Christensen

B.A., University of Pittsburgh, 1998

M.A., Bowling Green State University, 2000

Ph.D., Kent State University, 2014

Approved by

_________________________, Director, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
James Henderson

_________________________, Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
Sonia Alemagno

_________________________, Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
Todd Hawley

Accepted by

_________________________, Director, School of Teaching, Learning & Curriculum Studies
Alexa L. Sandmann

_________________________, Dean, College of Education, Health and Human Services
Daniel F. Mahony
INDIVIDUAL, INSTITUTIONAL AND LEADERSHIP FACETS INFLUENCING FACULTY CURRICULAR LEADERSHIP: A MIXED METHODS SEQUENTIAL, EXPLORATORY STUDY (145 pp.)

Director of Dissertation: James Henderson, Ed. D.

The purpose of this exploratory, mixed-methods study is to describe the individual, institutional, environmental, and leadership variables expressed by individual faculty members and administrators regarding curricular leadership. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected in two exploratory phases, each building upon the previous to gain greater insight into the phenomena. Phase I, a series of focus groups with administrators, provided insight into a definition of curricular leadership from the administrators’ perspective. Responses were used to shape the survey administered to faculty in Phase II. Descriptive and univariate statistics were used to explore the patterns that emerged from Phase I and Phase II.

The results indicate that, despite the lack of a widely accepted definition of curricular leadership in higher education and the multitude of dimensions covered by this topical construct, many study respondents self-identified as curricular leaders. The study reveals that faculty members are driven by a personal desire to participate in curriculum development and course creation in the presence of three key elements: a supportive environment, clear and consistent institutional leadership, and individual drive.
The study concludes with an exploratory definition of curricular leadership in higher education as well as an analysis of and recommendations for understanding and engaging in the process.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Internal and external pressures have forced institutions of higher education to rethink undergraduate curricula. Reform efforts have come at the call of reports such as *The Challenge of Connecting Learning* (Association of American Colleges, 1990) and *The Dissolution of General Education: 1914-1993* (National Association of Scholars, 1996). Both studies cite a lack of accessibility, quality and coherence in curricula. Over the last century, efforts have been largely unsuccessful in producing sustainable, fundamental changes. Yet, with each passing year, hundreds of colleges and universities continue to spend enormous amounts of time and money investing in curricular reform. The questions surrounding curricular content (e.g., should universities have a common set of core courses) and educational process (e.g., what courses and how will they be decided) remain constant, with little indication of a swift resolution (Lattuca & Stark, 1994). Barnett and Coate (2005) argued that higher education has yet to factor curriculum into its policy formation or practices, thus resulting in curricula that lacks reflective design and a system that forces college presidents and provosts to assume more of a leadership role in curriculum reform (Briggs, 2007; Bennett, 1984).

However, the argument can be made that the locus of control of the curriculum should lie with the faculty due to their proximity to subject and student (Nussbaum, 2011). Leaders throughout higher education will tell you that “faculty own the curriculum.” By that, leaders are acknowledging that faculty, “by virtue of their
specialized knowledge, are the only appropriate body to define, present, advise about, and, as necessary, defend the curriculum” (California State University Stanislaus, 2010, p. 10). The disagreements surrounding curriculum ownership, accountability, and ultimately definition point to a curriculum leadership crisis among college and university administrators and faculty (Briggs, 2007).

Despite these prominent opinions, there is a dearth of extant research on faculty curricular leadership in higher education. Rather, existing research acknowledges the important role leadership plays in encouraging substantial curricular reform but focuses on the role deans, chairs, and directors play in curricular reform. This evident lack of research presents opportunities to expand the scholarship of curriculum studies and points to the disconnection that has potentially left higher education in a compromised situation. Without both a clear definition of curricular leadership and a common understanding of who is or should be leading curricular reform, it is nearly impossible to prepare the individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to lead this reform successfully.

Higher education is being asked to change in fundamental ways, including demonstrating greater responsiveness to the needs of diverse student bodies and greater efficacy in the use of scarce resources. Institutions of higher education have acknowledged the need for significant reform (Boyer, 1990), and most colleges and universities have undertaken efforts to rethink the ways in which teaching and learning are organized. Relatedly, national debate has surfaced over both curricular content and educational processes, yet little consensus has been reached as to what direction best optimizes student learning (Lattuca & Stark, 1994). Historically, higher education
curriculum has been seen as the vehicle to advance student learning and to properly address the challenges facing society (Barnett & Coate, 2005), yet curriculum reform is rarely informed by theory and almost never discussed with ideas for improvement in mind (Lattuca & Stark, 1994). Relatedly, curriculum reform at the hands of academic administrators continues with little regard for the scholarship of curriculum.

In the inaugural issue of the AAHE newsletter *Inquiry and Action*, Kay McClennen (2003) conveyed that strong leadership was the key ingredient to curricular reform. Taking a step back, the true challenge is to define what curriculum leadership means and, subsequently, the catalyst (i.e., level of curricular knowledge and resources) needed to prompt faculty, administrators, and scholars to take on curriculum leadership roles. It is nearly impossible to find a common definition and understanding of the term curriculum because institutions, faculty, and administrators define it in a variety of ways. As a result, higher education institutions define curriculum broadly in order to encompass the wide range of definitions (Lattuca, 2010). For example, faculty members tend to define curriculum as what students need to know or be able to do, while early definitions of curriculum focused on content, productivity, and learning outcomes – what we traditionally call the program of studies (Anderson, 1965). Seymore and Fife (1988) stated “professors and administrators define curriculum development as the framework for organizing courses or the addition, deletion, and changes regarding coursework within the academic unit” (p. 29). It is not surprising, then, that curriculum leadership has proven difficult to define.
Stark, Lowther, Sharp, and Arnold (1997) defined leadership as “the influence of an individual who strives to bring about change” (p. 112). Stark and Latucca (2009) posited that leaders need to understand “external pressures, trends in academic fields, and help support and facilitate change with instructors when needed” (p. 297). In addition, leaders need to be able to model the use of course evaluations to initiate and respond to change. Leaders embarking upon substantial systematic change “need to be cosmopolitan, focused on mission, sensitive to opportunities in the external environment, communicative, willing to take risks, and prone to asking difficult questions” (Seymour & Fife, 1988, pp. 14-17).

The literature acknowledges that leadership for curriculum planning occurs across administrative levels: the department chair, the dean, the vice president of academic affairs or provost, and the president (Stark et al., 1997). While curricular leadership can happen at any level, existing research shows that the department chair is in the best position to influence curriculum with the support of the other administrative levels, including the college dean and university president. In fact, Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch and Tucker (1999) stated that 80% of all key decisions are made at the department level, thus thrusting department chairpersons into roles that force them to serve as change agents, managers, quality controllers, and the individual who initiates improvements. Although all administrative levels have been charged to direct the college curriculum, most agree that faculty need to be engaged in the curriculum design process to achieve success (Briggs, 2007). The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) (1985) called for faculty to take “corporate responsibility” for ensuring “integrity in the
college curriculum”. In 1991, the AACU took that a step further, urging departmental faculty members to work together to improve liberal arts majors and arguing that a successful major is dependent upon a faculty member’s participation in the curriculum design.

Clearly, both the terms curriculum and leadership are challenging to define. But when the terms are put together in the context of higher education, they are even more difficult to elucidate. A number of curriculum studies surrounding the topic of curricular leadership and how this “role” plays out in higher education fall short of clearly describing what a curriculum leader does and the skills, abilities, and knowledge this person must possess to be successful (Stark, 2002; Stark & Lattuca, 2009). Existing literature examines leadership at various stages of curricular planning, including program-level planning (Astin, 1993; Boyer 1990; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Stark, 1998). It further examines leadership within the context of roles including department chairperson (Stark et al., 1997; Stark, 2002). In addition, various studies have examined the distinction between leader-initiated change and leader-supported change, the culture necessary for effective leadership, and the behaviors of leaders influencing curriculum (Stark et al., 1997; Stark, 2002).

Existing research points out the complexity of defining curriculum leadership and the need to narrow down the definition to allow for greater utilization. According to Stark et al. (1997), prior to the mid-1980’s “few researchers had explored the perspectives of college faculty in developing curriculum at any level” (p. 100). Recently, a number of studies have been conducted to understand faculty’s intentions in curricula planning
In all cases, the studies identified factors that influenced planning (e.g., faculty discipline, student characteristics, workload, interests, program goals, research interests), yet they fall short of identifying associated outcomes. Research that identifies planning characteristics is important, but faculty’s degree of effect is also quite important and should be examined.

The call for greater examination of faculty involvement in the curricular process has been echoed by higher education curriculum researchers. Stark (2002) said it best when she states: “Informed and energetic faculty leadership is needed to improve plans for student learning and to respond to accountability demands” (p. 59). Faculty members are central to the curricular change process and have been overlooked by the literature for some time. Furthermore, Stark (2002) noted that many questions are left unanswered, including: why some faculty accept a leadership role and others do not; why some who accept the role lead successfully and others do not; what curricular knowledge these individuals possess; and what characteristics identify curriculum leaders (Stark, Briggs, & Rowland-Poplawska, 2000). Overall, the field lacks a framework that explains the interaction between faculty and curricular matters.

**Conceptual Underpinnings for the Study**

While faculty leadership can be viewed through a variety of lenses, Martha Nussbaum’s (1997, 2011) conception of capability can be used as a framework to begin to understand why faculty members assume leadership roles in the higher education system. According to her research, capabilities are conditions for functioning, without which people cannot flourish in an uncertain world. Her view of higher education from a
capabilities approach asserts that all humans, and most specifically students, must be cultivated in the system “for the functions of citizenship and life generally” (Lozano, Boni, Peris, & Hueso, 2012). An argument can be made that faculty must be afforded opportunities to flourish to be motivated to undertake a leadership role. Supporting this notion, research conducted by Meacham and Ludwig (1997) indicated that faculty members are the most important resource in an institution of higher education, therefore providing organizational support for them—including resources to improve teaching and learning—is essential in their personal quests to create a sense of educational purpose. Likewise, researchers Bland, Seaquist, Pacala, Center, and Findstad (2002) explored the individual, institutional, and leadership variables influencing faculty research productivity. This model has provided an opportunity to examine curricular leadership through the lens of a validated tool that explores one of the most “cosmopolitan academic functions of academia—research productivity” (Fairweather, 2002, p.26). Political and local pressures for educational reform have emphasized teaching and learning. Yet in institutions of higher learning, this often takes a back seat to research. Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, and Staples (2005) extended their model to examine faculty intentions beyond research to those favoring planning and teaching can provide a universal view of a faculty member’s responsibilities—understanding that both are at the heart of academic work.

Within the Bland et al. (2002) model, it is revealed that the most successful research departments focus on three pillars whose interactions determine productivity levels. The three pillars describe the following variables at the following levels:
individual; institutional (college and department); and leadership. Each pillar depicts a number of variables that contribute to overall research productivity and success. In addition, this model defines which individual characteristics prompt a researcher to be highly productive (e.g., motivation, networking, mentors), the characteristics of a department that supports faculty in research productivity (e.g., faculty development, resources, culture) and lastly, leaders and what they do to facilitate a high level of productivity by the research faculty (Bland, 2002; Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2005).

Together, the theory of capability from Nussbaum (2011) and the model of faculty productivity by Bland et al. (2005) have never been applied in the context of faculty curricular leadership, until now. Using a combination of theory and model, this study tested the degree to which faculty capabilities are nurtured at the institutional level, the propensity for faculty to engage in a leadership role in the creation of curriculum, and, subsequently, explored the characteristics that define curricular leadership.

**Statement and Significance of the Problem**

Adding to the complexity of this issue, the role of a curriculum leader and that of a faculty member are not inherently the same. Faculty members must possess a comprehensive understanding of their discipline and the means for communicating these concepts to their students. A curriculum leader, on the other hand, is a person who engages in critical inquiry and theory into his/her practices rather than capitalizing on standardized methods of learning (Henderson, 2010). Faculty as curriculum leaders need a comprehensive understanding of curriculum theory and its application to facilitate a
better understanding about what is taught and how and why it is taught (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). In 2009, Stark and Lattuca wrote, “Faculty, administrators, and scholars need new ways of thinking about curriculum if they are to respond to current challenges and future demands for excellence in higher education” (preface). Currently, faculty rarely reference scholarship associated with educational research and curriculum theory, and therefore are not informed of the theoretical constructs while developing curriculum (Fraser & Bosanquet, 2006). This apparent lack of curricular understanding creates challenges because “…how we conceive of curriculum and curriculum making is important because our conceptions and ways of reasoning about curriculum reflect and show how we see, think and talk about, study and act on the education made available to our students” (Cornbleth, 1990, p.12).

Likewise, Fraser and Bosanquet (2006) contended that for any kind of informed curricular change to occur “it is essential that the academic community have the commitment to develop a shared language and understanding of curriculum” (p. 282). Finally, Nussbaum (2011) intimates that certain inherent personal and institutional capabilities must be present for individuals to desire to assume leadership roles and absent those a reluctance to assume a leadership risk will occur (Lozano et al., 2012).

Using a mixed methods approach supported by Creswell & Plano Clark (2007), the quantitative and qualitative exploratory studies made it possible to develop a deeper understanding of what motivates faculty to engage in curricular leadership and prompted questions for future research. Results of this study explore individual, institutional, environmental and leadership variables influencing faculty curricular leadership in the
context of Nussbaum’s and Bland et al.’s work and highlight the internal and external conditions required to motivate curricular leadership among faculty. In the first phase of the study, qualitative research questions examined the deans’ and department Chairs’ understandings of the resources and environmental conditions that must exist in order for faculty to be curricular leaders. Next, in the quantitative phase, an electronic survey was administered to explore how facets of individual, institutional, environmental and leadership characteristics impacted faculty engagement in curricular leadership. Together, these studies define curricular leadership and inform the conditions needed for faculty to become curricular leaders. It bears recognizing that the goal of this study is not to test the ideas of Martha Nussbaum (2011) or Carol Bland et al. (2002) or to develop a model of faculty curricular leadership. This will be left for future research.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this sequential exploratory mixed methods study was to describe the individual, institutional, environmental and leadership variables expressed by individual faculty members regarding curricular leadership and to consider motivational determinants in engaging faculty in curricular leadership roles.

**Research Questions**

Overarching Research Question: *What are the internal and external conditions required in an institution of higher education for faculty to be curricular leaders?*

Qualitative Research Questions:

1. What is curricular leadership on a university campus?
2. What are the characteristics of faculty who engage in curricular leadership?
3. What are examples of curricular leadership performed by faculty?

4. What are the characteristics of an environment that promotes curricular leadership?

5. What obstacles do faculty face who want to be leaders?

6. What rewards can be provided to faculty who are curricular leaders?

7. What issues related to students impact a faculty’s ability to be curricular leaders?

8. What is your role as a dean or department chair in facilitative curricular leadership?

9. What is the role of the university in facilitating curricular leadership?

**Assumptions and Limitations**

This research study is subject to a number of limitations due to the design. Because convenience sampling was confined to a relatively few number of research-tiered universities, as compared to the overall number of universities nationwide, the researcher cannot say with confidence the sample is representative of the faculty population as a whole (Creswell, 2002). In addition, one institution sampled limited a few demographic questions and limited survey distribution, causing a smaller sample to be collected than that at the other institutions. This limited the researcher’s ability to aggregate information to investigate how the surveyed ratios compared with national norming data.

From a qualitative perspective, it is important to note that the researcher has a professional acquaintance with the focus group participants. Through her professional
career, the researcher worked with the majority of participants. This personal relationship is important to acknowledge as it may have influenced the participation rate and quality of interviews. The researcher makes the assumption that the focus group participants will disclose information honestly without being biased by his or her peers and moderator. To minimize any potential bias, the researcher shared the focus groups notes with participants and asked for confirmation of themes and revisions in hopes they may elaborate on points that they may have been omitted or downplayed due to the presence of peers.

The exploratory nature of this research can be perceived as a constraint due to the limited scope, generalizability, and lack of predication ability inherent in the methodology (Fitzpatrick & Wallace, 2012). For instance, data was collected from three institutions that focused on research rather than teaching, thus limiting the scope; restrictions by administration on faculty involvement in one institution limited one sample size to 37, thus reducing generalizability; and the wide range of variables and de-emphasis on qualitative statistics stymied predictability.

Despite this fact, an exploratory approach to this study was necessary to better understand the phenomenon of faculty curricular leadership and to “...lay the groundwork for more systematic testing of hypotheses, and to determine the feasibility of a more in-depth study” (Fitzpatrick & Wallace, 2012)

One final limitation lies in the line of questioning. While much time was spent analyzing results to form a common definition of curricular leadership, this question was never explicitly posed to the survey audience. From the researcher’s perspective, it was
intentionally left out to gauge an accurate level of understanding of curricular leadership in higher education. As respondents posed many questions regarding the researcher’s definition of curricular leadership, this has interesting potential for further research, perhaps conducting post-study research groups to vet the definition as it was derived to ensure alignment with faculty perceptions.

**Delimitations**

Creswell (2003) defines delimitations of the research design proposed by the researcher. This study consisted of a number of limitations as it was confined to three public, research, intensive universities. Participants’ responses are reflections of, and confined to their, personal experiences as a faculty and administrators involving the self-assessment component. Finally, this study provides one perspective on curricular leadership at three research – intensive institutions – that of the faculty themselves, excluding other constituents internal and external to the institution.

**Definitions of Terms**

The following are definitions of major terms used in this study:

*Curriculum:* An institution’s educational program (Toombs & Tierney, 1991), including both in- and out-of-classroom experiences (Anderson, 1965). Curriculum is dynamic, allowing for reform in order to meet the needs of learners and society. Interpretations of curriculum involves “complicated conversations” (Pinar, 2011, p. 43).

*Curriculum Leadership:* Individuals who are dedicated to transforming curricular knowledge and practice through a disciplined study that references the relationship between democratic freedom and education (Henderson, 2010).
**Curriculum Stakeholders:** All persons, agencies, and organizations with an investment or ‘stake’ in the educational system and curriculum.

**Effective Leadership:** A person who facilitates group productivity through the coordination of common goals (Bland et al., 2005).

**Faculty Member:** An educator who works at a college or university.

**Leadership:** The influence of someone who sees to bring about change (Stark et al., 1997).

**Learning Outcomes:** What a student is expected to know, understand, or be able to do at the conclusion of a learning experience.

**Mixed Methods:** Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) defined mixed methods research as the following: “Mixed methods research involves both collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data” (p. 6). These two methods have different worldviews, assumptions, and methodologies; however, Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) content that the need exists for both approaches in some areas of study. “The combination of qualitative and quantitative data provides a more complete picture by noting trends and generalizations as well as in-depth knowledge of participants perspectives” (p. 33).

**Program Level Curriculum Review:** Curriculum planning at the academic unit level.

**Supportive Institutional Environment:** Organizations that have the following characteristics: Targeted recruitment and selection of faculty; clear goals that support the academic mission and values; a strong academic culture; a positive group climate; mentoring; frequent communication between faculty and professional networks;
sufficient resources; dedicated time; diversity of thought; adequate and fair salaries; and
decentralization (Bland et al, 2005).

Specific Individual Characteristics: Socialized to academic values; strong
motivation to create new scholarship, competence in academic area, well-developed
research skills, commitment to institutional and department initiatives, and strong
scholarly work habits (Bland et al., 2005).

Summary

According to Stark and Lattuca (1997), studies of curriculum have primarily
focused on campus-wide reform and course redesign efforts. These studies neglected to
focus on the leadership qualities and motivators of individuals that serve as a catalyst to
any type of reform. The limited literature that focuses on leadership explores
administrative positions and fails to examine the qualities necessary for curricular
leadership at the faculty level. The purpose of this study is to explore the individual,
institutional, environmental, and leadership facets that influence an individual faculty
member’s curricular leadership.

Chapter II provides a review of the literature, including the definition of
curriculum, faculty's curriculum understanding and variables influencing curricular
leadership; it also reviews the theoretical framework that underpins this study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Definition of Curriculum

The term curriculum first appeared in vernacular English during the sixteenth century (Huggett, Smith & Conrad, 2003). Within higher education, the term curriculum has been defined by a number of scholars, each approaching the concept from a different theory. From a conceptual standpoint, higher education often describes curriculum as a plan of study or the synergy associated with scholars engaged in coursework (Huggett, et al., 2003). This definition takes into account that the individual and the collective whole experience curriculum. The definition, however, is not universally accepted, forcing the term curriculum to be defined locally in light of an absence of a formal definition (Stark & Lattuca, 1997).

Historically, the approaches to defining curriculum have varied from posing questions to shape curriculum (Tyler, 1949) and developing models for structuring curriculum (Berquist, Gould, & Greenburg, 1981; Conrad, 1978; Dessel, 1968; Taba & Spalding, 1962) to, most recently, exploring the curricular design variables and how they shape the process (Conrad & Pratt, 1983; Stark & Lattuca, 1997). The lack of a widely accepted definition makes many theorists ponder the degree to which this concept is understood (Fraser & Bosanquet, 2006; Stark & Lattuca, 1997). However, with every approach, the definition becomes more sophisticated. The 1980’s was a pivotal time in curriculum history as scholars acknowledged student participation in the learning and
assessment process. This additional curricular design variable challenged the traditionally static view of curriculum to become more dynamic and fluid (Huggett, et al., 2003).

According to Schubert (1986), “A quick survey of a dozen curriculum books would reveal a dozen different images or characterizations of curriculum” (p. 11). Fraser and Bosanquet (2006) offered a few operational definitions to provide institutions a roadmap as they grappled with curricular reform. For example, John Dewey’s (1902) definition challenged educators to think about the experiences of the learner, defining curriculum as “continuous reconstruction moving from the [student’s] present experience out into that represented by the organized bodies of truth that we call studies” (p. 11-12). While Dewey (1902) provided a scholarly perspective, Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (1995) provided a critical theorist perspective stating that curriculum is “what the older generation chooses to tell the younger generation…[it] is intensely historical, political, racial, gendered, phenomenological, autobiographical, aesthetic, theological, and intentional. Curriculum becomes the site on which the generations struggle to define themselves and the world (pp. 847-848). Combined, these definitions provide a contextual basis that can be applied to higher education; however, researchers that examine higher education curriculum have attempted to develop an operational definition of curriculum specific to the field. For example, Radcliff (1997) defined undergraduate curriculum as “the formal academic experience of students pursuing baccalaureate and less than baccalaureate degrees. Such a curriculum is formalized into courses or programs of study including workshops, seminars, colloquia, lecture series, laboratory work, internships, and field experiences. (Radcliff, 1997, p. 6). This definition highlights the
student perspective, as undergraduates often define curriculum in terms of their learning experiences (Stark & Lattuca, 2009).

More recently, however, Wolf and Hughes (2007) defined curriculum as “a coherent program of study that is responsive to the needs and circumstances of the pedagogical context and is carefully designed to develop students’ knowledge, abilities, and skills through multiple integrated and progressively challenging course learning experiences” (p. 7). While they expand upon Radcliff’s concept of curriculum, they neglect to provide concrete examples of what curriculum is and should be to faculty, students, and administrators.

Finally, Stark and Lattuca (2009) concluded that most local (institutional) definitions of curriculum contained one or more of these elements: (a) a college’s or program’s mission, purpose, or collective expression of what is important for students to learn; (b) a set of experiences that some authorities believe all students should have; (c) the set of courses offered to students; (d) the set of courses students actually elect from; (e) the content of a specific discipline, (f) the time and credit frame in which the college provides education (Stark & Lattuca, 2009, p. 1; Toombs & Tierny, 1993, p. 176).

Collectively, these definitions exemplify the uncertainty associated with curriculum that stems from a lack of a universal definition. Unfortunately, the concept of curriculum has yet to achieve a universal definition or, at the very least, the vetting opportunity that academia traditionally requires (Toombs & Tierny, 1993). The absence of a universal definition does not prevent university stakeholders from making curricular decisions, based on a shared understanding of a similar definition of curricula (Stark &
Lattuca, 2009), but such a presumed common definition creates problems when constituents come together to discuss curricular reform. The lack of consensus creates displaced arguments, loss of faculty confidence, and a sense of uneasiness for faculty members to think beyond their coursework and examine curriculum holistically, suggesting that all curriculum planners should work to devise a common definition for operational purposes, thus eliminating many of the concerns and issues explored here (Toombs & Tierny, 1993).

**Faculty’s Curriculum Understanding**

The sentiment that faculty own the curriculum is echoed in books, articles, and institutional documents including college handbooks, faculty senate by-laws, and national documents published by the AAUP and ACE (Briggs, 2002; California State University Stanislaus, 2010, p. 10). The acknowledgement of faculty curriculum expertise often is touted as the rationale for faculty jurisdiction over the curriculum (Toombs & Tierney, 1991). Many institutions prefer that faculty members be immediately responsible for the curriculum; however, some institutions have developed committees and other mechanisms to address curricular concerns. Regardless, the faculty members’ specialized expertise is traditionally the guiding principle in “jurisdictional determinations” (Briggs, 2002, p. 7).

Prior to the mid 1980’s, few researchers explored the role of faculty in curriculum planning and their perspectives on the subject (Stark et al., 1997). Stark and Lattuca (2009) stated that faculty perceive curriculum to be comprised of separate educational tasks or processes, such as determining the credit value of a course, identifying a
discipline to be taught or studied, understanding how to address study learning problems, and, less frequently, specifying learning outcomes or assessment opportunities. Faculty often cite curriculum as the connection between the series of courses and the time and credit associated. Stark and Lattuca (2005) also quote Toombs and Tierney (1991) in stating, “These ‘structural’ elements, based on Carnegie credit units, are relatively recent additions to the curriculum and tend to be emphasized primarily in American colleges” (p. 324).

Beyond a faculty definition of curriculum, the role of faculty in development and delivery of information also is considered important. Stark et al. (1997) found several circumstances in which faculty plan curriculum: to teach specific modules, to develop course sequences within a department, and to create comprehensive curriculum plans for the college. Stark et al. (1997) also explored the phenomena further in order to better understand faculty intentions surrounding curriculum related decisions, including content and skills, teaching motivations, and influences on when to plan introductory courses versus advanced courses.

Interestingly, these studies uncovered great differences among disciplines and/or types of institutions and how they shaped faculty intentions. The curricular disparities were found to be so influential that the differences in institutional policies and procedures have been given little attention. The strong disciplinary connection not only shapes curricular decisions, but also is thought to shape faculty’s definition of curriculum. Faculty conveyed that they felt uncomfortable discussing disciplines outside of their own, thus explaining why curriculum is often defined in terms of a task or process—something
that is common in all fields (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). Consequently, numerous studies have cited ‘tinkering’ (e.g., curricular changes such as changes in course listings, calendar, number of credit hours) to be the most common form of curricular change, pointing out that curriculum reform is rarely part of a comprehensive, integrated educational philosophy (Ewell, 1997; Fraser & Bosanquet, 2006; Stark & Lattuca, 2009). Consequently, confusion and misunderstanding of curriculum at the faculty level points to a trend of faculty being asked to lead initiatives in which they are not trained.

Interestingly, the American public talks about improving curriculum in terms of improving student learning, assuming that something beyond the structural framework will be altered (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). This deviation from the faculty perception of curriculum not only demonstrates a need for a common definition of curriculum, but also signifies that a well-developed definition would serve as a response to the public and a way to guide discussions on improving student success. For example, Stark and Lattuca (2009) questioned how institutions of higher education can create the type of change the public is seeking when, in reality, faculty define curriculum in terms of a structural framework rather than as an overall learning plan. To make matters worse, faculty “as discipline experts, rarely access the bodies of knowledge associated with educational research and curriculum theory, and therefore do not necessarily ground their decisions about curriculum on the ‘careful systematic use of a well-defined set of ideas’” (Walker, 1990, p. 133).

Barnette & Coate (2004) noted “it is not necessarily evident from the burgeoning literature on teaching and learning in higher education that a detailed knowledge of
curriculum theory currently exists in academia” (p. 109). Some would argue that faculty may not even know what literature exists due to a common lack of curriculum training for academics. Furthermore, when guidance on curriculum issues is provided in faculty development sessions, those enrolled are mainly new faculty. Absent are the senior faculty and administrators who, by virtue of their experience and position, are more likely to be engaged in curriculum reform efforts (Barnette & Coate, 2004).

Based on this research that provides insight into a faculty member’s knowledge of his or her specific curriculum, Henderson (2010) explored the complicated factors influencing faculty understanding of curriculum structure. One such factor is distinction between curriculum management, instructional leadership, and curriculum leadership.

The functions of curriculum management and curriculum leadership are often characterized by level of authority. For example, curriculum management relies on “positional” authority, whereas curriculum leadership focuses on “moral” authority (Henderson, 2010, p. 221). Applying this framework to higher education would mean “that curriculum leadership is a collaborative undertaking involving administrative leaders, faculty leaders, student leaders, parent leaders, community leaders, and other potential leaders that have a stake in curriculum decisions” (Henderson, 2010, p. 221). In addition, curriculum leadership is quite expansive, including educational philosophy, policy, standards, program development, assessment, and cultural implications (Henderson, 2010). Instructional leadership, on the other hand, focuses on the advancement of the scholarship of teaching. These terms are far from absent in the K-12 world, yet they are virtually unknown in higher education.
Variables Influencing Curricular Leadership

In the wake of curricula criticisms within higher education, academic leaders have looked to faculty members to be more responsive, despite the practice of unwanted changes being imposed from internal and external stakeholders (Briggs, 2002). On many campuses, the result has been the formation of committees charged with exploring curricular reform. Committees often are charged with a specific reform measure, rather than being asked to lead campus wide efforts to ensure ongoing curriculum review (Briggs, 2002). The reason for this is that on-going curriculum review is difficult to initiate and sustain in light of the ever-evolving definition of curriculum, resulting in committee efforts that fall short of achieving the curricular reform that was originally envisioned (Arnold, 2004).

When exploring curricular reform, it is important to note the difference between making small curricular changes and engaging in comprehensive curriculum reform (Oliver, 2008). Institutions of higher education traditionally make small structural changes to the curriculum, which includes organizing courses or the addition, deletion, and changes regarding coursework (Seymore & Fife, 1988). Inherently, these changes typically occur at the course or department level. Comprehensive curriculum reform, or what Wolf and Hughes (2007) called “curriculum changes at the institutional level” (p.46), is less common because it calls for creating curriculum at the university level—often outside the typical university structure (Wolf & Hughes, 2007). For example, creating interdisciplinary courses may challenge the university budget model. Wolf and
Hughes (2007) argued that this type of reform is the least likely to be sustained because it often demands separate structures and processes that are difficult to maintain over time.

Research suggests that, each year, hundreds of faculty committees leave the curricular reform process feeling frustrated and disillusioned, despite good effort and substantial evidence demonstrating best practices (Ewell, 1997). Ewell (1997) posited that the discouragement stems from the presence of two key conditions that are symbolic of institutional change: institutions approach reform as a fragmentary process, both within and across institutions, and institutions implement reform without discussing and formulating an institutional vision for collegiate learning and the strategies that will promote it.

The first condition is symbolic of significant investments of time and resources traditionally in the areas of curriculum reform, faculty development, and educational technologies. While the investments are well intentioned, they often fall short of increasing student achievement because they are traditionally launched against the grain of existing structures and incentives (Ewell, 1997). The second condition demonstrates that sometimes institutions move forward with curricular initiatives without heeding research indications that it will glean only marginal results, at best (Ewell, 1997). These organizational realities cause frustration for faculty committees because of the amount of time and energy expended in the process. Schneider and Shoenberg (1999) summarized the process by stating, “Almost whatever plan for integrative, practice-oriented learning they [faculty] envision, there are structural features of the academic environment that work silently but powerfully to undo it” (p. 432).
Gordon Arnold (2004) noted that the perception of curricular failure is a result of both institutions and the public seeking comprehensive change. While scholars describe the predominant curricular reform practice as inadequate and fragmented, institutions are seeking “symbolic change” that will articulate the values of the institution, including overarching changes in general education (Arnold, 2004, p.573). To understand the disconnection, particularly when faculty are more comfortable with “structural changes,” Burton and McDonald (2001) believed institutions of higher education must examine critically the proposed models of change and establish a common framework that will provide a pathway extending beyond the structural issues of credit hours and syllabi, and instead focus on comprehensive curricular reform.

Several researchers have examined the concept of change in an attempt to identify an effective strategy for lasting reform. John Kotter (1996) outlined eight steps to implement sustainable change. His model suggests that an institution must first establish a sense of urgency, unify staff, and develop a clear direction. The next steps are to communicate the vision, empower people to take initiative, and remove obstacles. The final steps require merging, moving forward, and developing the mechanisms for sustainable change.

Peter Ewell (1997), on the other hand, examined literature on organizational re-structuring and continuous quality improvement to identify six properties of successful change initiatives in higher education:

First, change requires a fundamental shift of perspective. All levels of the organization need to reexamine what they do and the associated outcomes.
Second, change must be systematic, requiring institutions to conduct a detailed analysis of organizational values and incentives and how they ultimately affect student learning. Third, change requires people to relearn their roles according to the core values the institution aspires to. Fourth, change requires deliberate and consistent leadership, involving valuing contributions, creating synergies, and acknowledging successes. Fifth, change requires opportunities to measure progress and support developments. Sixth, and finally, change requires institutions to recognize and capitalize on “triggering events,” as they often serve as catalysts for change. (p. 4)

Both Kotter (1996) and Ewell (1997) outlined properties of change initiatives but neglected to discuss the catalyst for change. Many of the significant changes in the educational environment can be attributed to influences both internal and external to colleges and universities (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). External pressures come from many sources, including potential changes in the economy, political pressures, and influences from accrediting agencies. Internal influences, on the other hand, include resource allocations, discipline trends, and faculty expertise (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). Both internal and external influences need to be considered simultaneously, as they rarely operate independently (Stark & Lattuca, 2009).

Essentially, curriculum redesign mirrors that of American history, reflecting societal needs (Rudolph, 1977; Stark & Lattuca, 2009). In other words, curricular planning is complicated and integrated into the larger societal context, thus creating a complex and unpredictable process (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). Importantly, scholars feel
that successful curricular change “requires careful maneuvering among the myriad internal and external interests of an institution of higher education” (Kanter, Civian, London, Arnold, & Gamson, 1997, p. 135).

Literature on organizational change in higher education provides insight as to how institutions of higher education can prepare to engage in curricular reform efforts (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). External influences often are the impetus for change; however, colleges and universities are active recipients, for they have faculty and staff that evaluate, plan, and ultimately implement curricular changes (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). Several models address curricular change: (a) diffusion theories explore external influences; (b) planned change models emphasize goal-directed action; (c) political models explain the role of power in organizations; (d) social cognition models provide an understanding of how people acquire knowledge (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). Each model of change provides a different perspective on how change occurs and on the many variables at play in the process. The sheer number of models suggests that there is no one model that is complete or that will guarantee success. Rather the current literature implies that institutions of higher education need to find a model or set of variables that best fit the circumstances (Stark & Lattuca, 2009).

**Faculty and Curricular Leadership**

The purpose and meaning of curriculum development in American higher education has been debated over the last two decades (Briggs, 2007), with one clear point throughout the debate—in order to achieve curricular reform, faculty involvement is critical. To fully understand curricular reform, it is important to have a holistic
understanding of faculty members’ perceptions of curricular planning, the role they play, and the factors that influence curricular decisions. This information is of fundamental importance as institutions seek to create the optimal learning conditions of the 21st century.

Lattuca and Stark (1994) designed a study to better understand faculty perceptions of curricular reform and the factors influencing their decisions in course-level planning. They found that faculty members who developed curriculum for their courses were strongly influenced by past experiences, their discipline, and educational beliefs formed throughout their career. Not surprisingly, developing students as critical thinkers was cited as one of faculty’s main educational purposes. An additional study revealed that faculty conveyed a sense of loyalty to their discipline and felt it was important to assist students with seeking out professional or career development activities (Stark et al., 1997). Furthermore, this study found that institutional influences such as characteristics of students and college resources often shaped course planning decisions.

In another analysis, Stark et al. (1997) examined the beliefs and assumptions that shape faculty’s program-level curriculum planning. In program planning, faculty members were strongly influenced by many of the same elements as course-level planning: discipline, student characteristics, college goals, and resources. However, in comparison to college-level planning, faculty members were more concerned with institutional characteristics such as workload, research developments in the discipline, facilities, and enrollment. In an earlier study, Stark and Lattuca (1994) found that contextual factors such as college goals, student characteristics, and available services
were significantly less influential in curricular decision making than a faculty member’s discipline or educational beliefs.

A key factor that was not mentioned in course-level planning was the importance of leadership. The faculty interviewed by Stark et al. (1997) believed that leadership was essential at all levels and stages of curricular reform, and those who were perceived as leaders included faculty and administrators. A final observation showed that faculty members perceived communication as an essential component in course-level planning, feeling a responsibility to communicate course goals. But in comparison, few faculty disclosed efforts to communicate program goals to students (Stark et al., 1997).

Overall, faculty struggled to convey the details of their program-level academic plans, thereby admitting to minimal involvement in on-going curriculum reform efforts in their programs (Stark et al., 1997). Perhaps, faculty tended to see [program] planning as something that primarily resulted in major shifts or innovations and thus took place very rarely. Because planning was not a term they [faculty] used to describe their interaction, unless they had been involved in a major change effort, almost none were able to describe steps in the “normal” program planning process. (Stark et al., 1997, p. 110)

This same study revealed that another reason for minimal involvement may be that faculty are heavily invested in course-level planning and much less in program-level planning. Stark and her colleagues also hypothesized that course-level planning includes an evaluation component, whereas program-level planning does not. Finally, it also can be argued that faculty feel they have little influence within a larger program-planning group, thus minimizing their level of interest.
In a study by Briggs (2007), faculty readily identified themselves as educators, but few claimed expertise in the scholarship of teaching and learning, making curriculum collaboration an opportunity for curriculum reform. Briggs (2007) characterized curriculum collaboration as (a) working together on a task or project (e.g., syllabus, course materials, or programs), (b) assessing the curriculum and making changes accordingly; and (c) learning as a group. Faculty are thought to be involved in curricular collaboration when they are developing new courses, revising existing courses, and developing programs or course sequences.

The desire to maintain current and effective curricula that support student learning motivates faculty to participate in collaborative curricular projects (Christensen, 2012, unpublished raw data). Faculty participation indicates an intrinsic interest and commitment to student learning. Unfortunately, very few studies exist on faculty collaborations. According to Briggs (2007), this dearth of research is due to the lack of collaborative involvement in program level reform, yet an interest in curricular renewal development continues to fuel conversation.

**Exploring Curriculum Leadership**

Leadership is an essential ingredient in curricular reform. Curriculum leaders work to encourage change that responds to external and internal influences as well as addresses routine curricular reviews (Stark & Lattuca, 2009). Stark et al. (1997) noted that comprehensive planning rarely happens without a serious external threat; however, committed leadership can move an organization successfully through the curricular reform process without the influence of an external threat or crisis. Essentially, curricular
reform can only take place when a catalyst exists, leadership exists, and a supportive climate exists (Stark et. al., 1997). All three of these conditions allow curricular reform to move forward with planning that is responsive to the external influences. Despite the critical role of curriculum leadership, few researchers have examined the concept and means for its cultivation.

While higher education has many leaders that can effect change, not all leaders have the “authority, persistence, or expertise” to bring about curricular change (Stark & Lattuca, 2009, p. 297). Stark et al. (1997) defined leadership as, “the influence of an individual who strives to bring about change” (p. 112). Stark and Lattuca (2009) went on to say that curricular leaders need to understand external pressures, keep up with trends in academic fields, provide support and facilitate change with instructors when needed. Seymour and Fife (1988) suggested that curriculum leaders who are embarking upon substantial systematic change “need to be cosmopolitan, focused on the mission, sensitive to opportunities in the external environment, communicative, willing to take risks, and prone to asking difficult questions” (p. 14-17). Finally, curriculum leaders must be willing to create a supportive educational environment that embraces open decision making, widespread involvement from faculty, effective group processes, and decentralized decision-making (Stark & Lattuca, 2009).

The literature acknowledges that leadership for curriculum planning occurs on a number of levels: the program chair, the dean, the vice president of academic affairs or provost, and the president (Stark et al., 1997). While curriculum leadership can happen at any level, research shows that the program chair is in the best position to influence
curriculum when paired with support from higher administrative levels, including the college dean and university president. However, studies suggest that little information is available to guide chairs in their role as curriculum leaders. The literature on chairs’ roles in curriculum leadership tends to downplay the importance of the role in light of topics such as resource allocation, personnel management, and legal issues (Stark, 2002).

Stark, Briggs, and Rowland-Poplawski (2002) noted that rhetoric urges department chairs to exercise curriculum leadership, while chairpersons reported that such leadership is not a top priority. This is particularly interesting, as curriculum is at the core of the educational enterprise. Dressel (1968) indicated that “lack of leadership, lack of motivation, failure to use data or theoretical knowledge in curriculum decision making, and lack of accepted patterns for making program changes have long been identified as impediments to departmental curriculum renewal” (p. 85). Some would argue that this lack of curriculum attention is intentional because few departments are looking for a leader that focuses on curricular matters. Instead, faculty are looking for chairs that represent their outside interests in external forums and who protect them from external forces that will impose curricular changes (Stark, 2002).

Stark et al. (2002) examined how department chairs view their leadership role in curriculum and the contextual variables that influence the role chairs play. Seven categories of self-reported leadership roles were developed from the interview data: facilitator, initiator, agenda setter, coordinator, advocate, sensor, and standard setter. These roles are not mutually exclusive due to the roles chairs simultaneously play (Stark et al., 2002). See Appendix A, for an overview of the seven categories.
Stark (2002) also examined the influence of contextual factors on leadership roles. They found that department size affects the role of department chairs, especially when a program offers both undergraduate and graduate courses. In addition, institutional type affects the style of leadership department chairs provide. In larger departments, curriculum is typically the responsibility of associate deans or curricular committees, while chairs in research and doctoral institutions see their primary role as facilitators and advocates (Stark, 2002). Lastly, curriculum leadership also is influenced by institutional climate. The authors indicate that in departments emphasizing continuous planning in curriculum, it is implied that the chair is responsible for curriculum leadership efforts.

A chair’s perceived role is but one piece of the curriculum puzzle. Stark (2002) explored Quinn’s (1988) competing values model, a typology of management styles, to develop a leadership framework. The Quinn model was utilized because it had two dimensions, an internal-external focus similar to those that influence curricular planning, and a flexibility-control dimension that symbolizes the tension between faculty’s need for autonomy in curricular planning and the institution’s need for coordination in light of external pressures (Stark et al., 2002). Stark (2002) then constructed a survey of curriculum leadership activities. The survey found that department chairs reported their duties as predominantly coordinating curricular efforts, as opposed to initiating, evaluating, or monitoring curricular efforts against external agencies. Conversely, chairs reported that taking a leadership role outside of the institution and expanding their curricular expertise and the expertise of faculty members is an activity that they participate in less frequently. Chairs also reported that, once hired, they are unlikely to
seek professional development, despite expectations for them to act as curriculum leaders.

In the second phase of this study, Stark (2002) utilized the survey results to identify four leadership styles characterizing chairpersons who lead planning departments. The four styles are outlined in Appendix B. Chairs chose style “c” as the most effective style. This style strongly encourages faculty members to initiate curriculum leadership, leaving the chair with an active role. In addition, style “c” focuses on external factors, while emphasizing leaders' ideas and influential behaviors. Stark (2002) hypothesized that, while they believe they most closely aligned with style “c,” chairs may deemphasize the external leadership dimension to account for their various managerial activities. Also, Stark (2002) notes that the same chairs conveyed that faculty are responsible for the curriculum vision, aligning them more closely with style “a,” which empowers faculty to play an active role in curriculum decision making. Interestingly, chairs unknowingly view their leadership styles interchangeably, perhaps because the competing demands chairs face may not enable them to distinguish the leadership role they would like to play in contrast to the role they actually play (Stark, 2002).

The literature conveys the perception that chairs will be successful if they create a dynamic culture, supportive environment, and improve group communication. These may be key ingredients; however, chairs also must be able to draw upon their knowledge and expertise of curriculum development when articulating curricular expectations (Stark, 2002). A fundamental issue develops when chairs are unable to communicate their dean’s
expectations to faculty regarding curriculum leadership (Stark et al., 2000). The chairs in a study by Stark et al., (2000) conveyed that their dean was not knowledgeable or interested in curricular development in their particular fields. They expressed concern over the dean’s assumption that they would be attentive to curricular needs, while providing little to no oversight or direction. The researchers stated, “We remain struck by the idea that so few of them had ever had an actual discussion with their immediate superior about their primary tasks and, in particular, about curriculum leadership” (Stark et al., 2000, p. 4). The lack of communication over the curriculum leadership role is quite troubling because the number one responsibility of institutions of higher education is to engage students in the learning process, yet the means to develop the learning is overshadowed by traditional management issues.

Research conducted by Martha Nussbaum (1997; 1999; 2011) indicates that top-level faculty participation requires both institutional support and personal capabilities. Nussbaum’s (2011) capabilities approach suggests that colleges and universities, as social structures, have the function to provide faculty members with opportunities to mobilize their abilities, thus offering a possible solution to faculty reluctance to participate in leadership capacities at the curricular level.

Nussbaum (1999) defines personal capabilities as an individual’s abilities, knowledge and predispositions, and postulates ten “Central Human Functional Capabilities” (p. 42) that, if present, provide an individual an opportunity to live a fulfilling life. Table 1 provides an overview of Nussbaum’s ten essential elements for a good life:
Table 1

*Nussbaum’s Ten Capabilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Being able to live to the end of human life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily health and integrity</td>
<td>Being able to have good health, nourishment, shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily integrity</td>
<td>Being able to move freely, secure against violence, have sexual satisfaction, and control over reproductive health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senses, imagination, and thought</td>
<td>Being able to use senses, education, and expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Being able to have attachments to things/persons outside of ourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical reason</td>
<td>Being able to form a conception of the good and engage in critical reflection about planning one’s own life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Having social basis for self-respect and ability to live in relation to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other species</td>
<td>Being able to live with concern for/in relation to the world of nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Being able to laugh, play, and enjoy recreational activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over one’s own environment</td>
<td>Political choices that govern one’s own environment and material choices with being able to hold property, having right to seek equal employment, and exercising meaningful relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Nussbaum, 1999, p.41)

More than simply providing opportunities for individuals to perform certain functions, the capabilities approach challenges higher education to provide faculty with the power, rights and opportunities to realize their capabilities. Nussbaum (1999) states,
“Life that lacks any one of these capabilities, no matter what else it has, will fall short of being a good human life” (p. 42). Simply stated, absent the power to cultivate any one of these capabilities and, therefore, realize full professional and personal potential, faculty members will be limited in what they can and will achieve. Traditional organizational restrictions, then, can act to create a leadership void that limits the sense of shared purpose that should define higher education.

Despite these theories suggesting personal and institutional attributes for curricular leadership, a solid and widely accepted definition of the phenomenon does not exist leaving the door open for interpretations that may create discord among departments and colleges.

**Curriculum Reform and Faculty Research Productivity**

Historically, American postsecondary education has emphasized faculty’s responsibility for the college curriculum, but few scholars have been successful in documenting processes to realize this goal (Briggs, 2007). Research in the area of faculty curriculum reform is rather scarce compared to the 40 years of research on faculty’s research productivity (Bland et al, 2005). As institutions of higher education evolve, so have the expectations for faculty members to assist their colleges and departments to increase national standings and prestige as reflected in faculty-generated external funding, publications, and national visibility, thus undermining the importance of curriculum reform efforts. Studies have investigated research productivity of faculty and curriculum reform efforts of faculty, thereby creating various models or theories. But academia has remained rather silent about the fact that the findings from research
productivity measures may inform studies focused on faculty curriculum leadership roles. To date, these variables have been studied separately creating a lack of a holistic picture of faculty life.

Bland et al. (2002; 2005) have extensively examined faculty productivity and the associated variables. According to her findings, faculty research productivity is at its highest “when a faculty member has specific individual qualities, works in an institution that is highly conducive to research, and is led by someone who possesses essential leadership qualities and uses an assertive-participative management approach” (p. 226). Appendix C displays the model and briefly describes the associated individual, institutional and leadership characteristics in the model. Bland et al. (2002) characterized these three qualities as having a hierarchical order, meaning: (a) Individual characteristics are essential; however, their power varies depending upon the institutional priorities and culture; and (b) The qualities of the leader influence a faculty member’s overall productivity. This extensive work on research productivity provided a validated tool that could be adapted to examine the variables associated with faculty curricular leadership productivity in the current study.

Bland et al. (2005) set out to research these variables and how they interplay at research institutions. Her study confirmed that to have research-productive faculty, institutions of higher education must recruit faculty that are passionate about research, support these faculty with formal mentoring programs, cultivate certain individual and institutional characteristics, provide faculty resources (including time) to conduct
research and affirmed the importance of research-oriented leaders as helping to shape the culture of the institution (Bland et al., 2005).

Summary

To achieve curricular reform, faculty involvement is critical. The on-going challenge is that the term curriculum is contextual thus leaving the definition, knowledge required, and leadership roles up to interpretation by leaders and faculty at institutions of higher education. To fully understand and subsequently define curricular leadership, it is essential to have a holistic understanding of faculty’s perceptions of curricular planning, the role they play, and the internal and external factors that influence their participation in curricular decisions. The following chapter presents the methodology that was used to investigate the definition of curricular leadership and elucidate a variety of internal and external conditions that may compel faculty members to take on curricular leadership roles.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

Despite the growing societal pressure to reform undergraduate curricula, few researchers have yet seriously examined the internal and external variables influencing faculty curricular leadership in higher education. This sequential mixed methods exploratory investigation has illuminated both a definition of curricular leadership and elucidated a variety of internal and external conditions that may compel faculty members to take on curricular leadership roles.

This study utilized a mixed methods design, which is a procedure for collecting, analyzing and “mixing” both quantitative and qualitative data within a single study or series of studies to understand a research problem holistically (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Neither quantitative nor qualitative methods were sufficient by themselves to capture an initial understanding of curriculum leadership, particularly when exploring the complex nature of faculty’s role and perspective on curriculum planning. When used in combination, quantitative and qualitative design allowed for a comprehensive analysis by uncovering and answering questions that could not be addressed by one method alone (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Morrell & Tan, 2009).

Furthermore, the sequential mixed methods exploratory design was appropriate due to the lack of guiding theory and instruments within the realm of curricular design research in higher education. The design provided an opportunity to begin the study with an exploration of curricular leadership in higher education as a phenomenon, thus
providing an avenue for the discovery of an emergent framework and an opportunity to collect both quantitative and qualitative data useful for future research. For the purposes of this dissertation, the data will only look at patterns that emerge within individual, institutional, environmental and leadership domains expressed by individual faculty members regarding curricular leadership.

Researchers designing a mixed methods study take into consideration three key issues: timing decision, weighting decision, and mixing decision (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Timing decision refers to the relationship between the qualitative and quantitative data (e.g., timing of data set collection and the order in which the researchers use the data). The weighting decision refers to which data collection – qualitative or quantitative m – is given priority. Finally, the mixing decision refers to deciding how the quantitative and qualitative methods will be mixed (e.g., merging data sets, embedding data at the design level, connecting data analysis to data collection) (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

Following this model, the study consists of two exploratory phases, each building upon the previous one to develop a deeper understanding of the phenomena of faculty curricular leadership (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Phase I, a series of focus groups with deans and directors, allowed the researcher to gain a better understanding of how educational leaders define curricular leadership. The responses subsequently helped shape the survey utilized in Phase II. Phase II provided a glimpse into how faculty perceive curricular leadership through the lenses of individual characteristics, environmental support and leadership effectiveness. During interpretation of the data,
greater emphasis was placed on the qualitative results from both studies to identify the dimensions and questions that require further research.

**Research Design**

**Exploratory Focus Groups**

The first exploratory study involved a set of focus group questions designed to provide an initial operational definition of curricular leadership from an administrator’s point of view, a preliminary list of potential descriptors for curricular leadership, and information to guide the creation of questions for the quantitative phase of the study.

The term “focus group” was penned in 1956 to signify a circumstance in which an interviewer asks group-specific questions about a topic (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Krueger (1988), on the other hand, defines focus group as a thoughtfully planned discussion designed to increase understanding of an area of interest in a comfortable, non-threatening environment. Historically, focus groups have been viewed as purely qualitative tools; however, focus groups have evolved to provide broader applications for researchers (Jarrell, 2000). Krueger (1988) advocates utilizing focus groups in the initial stages of a study to develop questions for surveys that are clear, concise and easily understood. A carefully crafted focus group question enhances the quantitative data and provides a more holistic view of the situation being studied (Jarrell, 2000).

The focus group method was particularly useful in this study in exploring participant insights on curricular leadership in higher education and the impetus behind their thoughts, thus providing information on which to build questions for the quantitative portion of the survey. In particular, the researcher conducted two focus groups of
academic leaders from a large, public research university in the Midwestern, United States. The participants’ positions ranged from deans to chairs and directors, with a cumulative average of 20 years of academic leadership experience. The participants were asked to sign consent forms stating that they voluntarily agreed to participate.

Focus group participants were recruited through personal invitations via email. The topics of the focus group questions fell into three main categories: (a) definition of curricular leadership; (b) characteristics of faculty considered curricular leaders in the college and department; and (c) environmental conditions that support or inhibit curricular leadership. These three categories provided the framework around which response analysis occurred.

The interview protocol included 13 open-ended questions, which were pilot tested. The content of the protocol questions were grounded in the literature on curriculum leadership in higher education (Briggs, 2007; Stark et al., 2000; Stark & Lattuca, 1999). The questions focused on the concept of curriculum leadership and associated variables. For the pilot test, 15 academic leaders elected to participate in the focus group. The participants’ roles and group sizes were five academic deans, six department chairs, and four department directors. Appendix E & H provides the following: approved IRB documents, consent form, focus group invitation letter, and focus group protocol.

All focus group participants received the interview questions prior to the meeting and were informed that the focus group would be tape-recorded and transcribed. In addition, all focus group participants were assured that their comments were confidential.
and would not be identified by an individual or by a program. Following the focus group
session, participants had an opportunity to review and, if necessary, correct any errors.

**Exploratory Survey**

Based on the focus group results, questions were created for an exploratory
survey using an adapted version of the Bland et al. (2002) survey. With Bland’s research
partners’ permission (Carole Bland passed in 2008), the researcher used the survey
format and style to create a tool for faculty that examined the frequency of participation
in curricular leadership and the individual, institutional, and leadership variables
describing curricular leadership. Cooperation between the researcher for this study and
Bland’s colleagues resulted in the creation of a valid instrument.

For the purposes of the exploratory survey, a convenience sample of 2,100
tenured faculty from three large, public research-intensive universities in the Midwest,
south, and southwestern United States were invited to participate, resulting in 352
respondents or a 17% response rate. Public research institutions were identified because
research universities are criticized in the literature for lacking curricular reform, despite
reform attempts (Cuban, 1999). In addition, Bland et al.’s (2005) model focused on
faculty productivity within research institutions, so concentrating on another institution
type may have compromised the validity of the tool.

Surveys can be an effective means of gathering data, especially in the field of
education. In higher education, surveys are often used to gather information regarding
attitudes and behaviors of faculty, staff, and students. In this study, a cross-sectional
survey was administered to faculty electronically, using SurveyMonkey, so that data was
gathered at a single point in time (McMillan, 2000). The survey contained several types of questions: dichotomous questions that required an answer such as “yes” or “no”; multiple choice, asking the respondent to select the one that applies; ranked self-assessment items, measured on the six-point Likert system; and questions that allowed respondents to write-in comments. Using themes identified from the pilot focus group, the survey contained 39 questions organized under three main headings: (a) individual, institutional, and leadership factors; (b) strategies; and (c) work and demographical information. Prior to the release of the survey, the researcher validated the content and survey design with faculty members affiliated with Bland et al. (2005) and with faculty associated with the Curriculum and Instruction Program and Division of Research and Sponsored Programs at the major Midwestern university she attends (Newman & McNeil, 1998).

The first section of the survey related to the individual, institutional and leadership factors associated with faculty curricular leadership. This section included a six-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” that provided data about how faculty members spend their time, the type of mentoring available, and the internal drivers associated with their daily choices. The second section contained multiple-choice and open-ended questions providing insights into the factors that facilitate faculty curricular leadership productivity. Finally, the last section sought answers to “work and demographic” characteristics using categorical and open-ended questions to obtain a better understanding of each respondent. Appendix F provides a copy of the survey. The questionnaire was administered on-line via SurveyMonkey and
accessed through a URL that was sent to all faculty members at the three universities. Again, these individuals were targeted to better understand how their daily duties and expectations may or may not have supported or motivated a curricular leadership role. Survey respondents were anonymous and responses were automatically stored in a database. An informed consent question was posted at the beginning of the survey preventing faculty from proceeding without saying, “I agree to participate,” and expressing their willingness to complete the survey. The opening page provided contact information for the principal investigator in the event a faculty member had questions.

The survey instrument was pilot tested on nine tenure-track faculty volunteers who participated in a debriefing exercise following the completion of the survey. The pilot test helped to revise the questionnaire to address unclear items. In addition to clarifying items, the pilot allowed the researcher to analyze initial responses, fix any technical problems associated with the on-line study, and validate the instrument and test reliability prior to its release in late August 2013. The Research offices at all three institutions assisted in randomly selecting three pilot test participants. These participants were excluded from the larger study.

Upon release of the survey to the larger group, all faculty members received a reminder email with the link approximately five days after the initial invitational email. This was followed by a second reminder 10 days later.
Coding of Variables

The data analysis for Phase I began with repetitive readings of each interview transcription to gain a better understanding of the data. Methodologists describe this as being an essential step for the researcher as it allows for identification of patterns in the data (Creswell, 2003). The two focus groups in Phase I were studied separately by extracting key statements from the focus groups transcripts (Schram, 2006). The statements were clustered to create meaningful units and grouped into domains. Following the initial phase, a secondary analysis was conducted to reduce any redundancy and to streamline the domains. This synthesis and analysis confirmed the organization of characteristics as divided into environmental and personal domains. These domains were the beginning of a taxonomic analysis, which organized the characteristics into five distinct areas: process, mode, outcome, vision and personal development.

An associate faculty member from a non-affiliated institution acted as an independent rater during this process to establish inter-rater reliability. This faculty member was presented with 200 statements and utilized open coding to categorize the statements into five distinct domains. This process resulted in 85% agreement between the researcher and initial coder. The statements that were coded differently were discussed, which resulted in 100% agreement between the coders.

This synthesis and analysis confirmed the organization of characteristics as divided into environmental and personal domains. These domains extended the taxonomic analysis, and the researcher further organized the codes into themes during this second level of analysis. Each theme was bucketed into individual, institutional, and
leadership characteristics according to Bland et al.’s (2005) model pillars. Inter-rater reliability was again employed as the associate faculty member was asked to review the five themes to determine placement and associated open coding. This process resulted in 95% agreement between the researcher and associate. Any discrepancy in coding resulted in a discussion and subsequently, through conversation, evolved to 100% agreement. A table of themes and thematic descriptions outlining the results of this data analysis are described in Chapter IV (See Table 3, Chapter IV).

The data for this study was “mixed” at two distinct points. The mixing occurred when the data collected in Phase I informed the adaptions of the Bland et al. (2005) survey instrument that was used in Phase II. The results of this process are discussed in Chapter V.

**Procedures for Phase II**

The survey designed for Phase II measured faculty members’ perception of curricular leadership and the influence individual characteristics, supportive environments and institutional leadership have on curricular leadership productivity. The resulting taxonomy was influenced by Martha Nussbaum’s capability theory in which she suggests social and personal structures enable or limit the real exercises of capability (Lozano et al., 2012).

The goal of exploratory studies is to investigate a relatively unknown research area and gain additional and new insights into the phenomena, explicate the main concepts and constructs, develop hypotheses about an existing behavior as a result of the research, and determine considerations for future research (Marais, 1991). Likewise,
descriptive statistics can summarize demographic data. Therefore, a univariate analysis for Phase II was conducted to identify additional questions that would extrapolate emerging ideas and inform future work. Again, the same data-mixing procedure used in Phase I was conducted, followed by a descriptive examination of the data (Thorndike, 2005). Following the analysis, the researcher coded the results into the individual characteristics, supportive environment and institutional leadership buckets.

The two-phased theoretical coding process informed the grounded theory method. Together, the combined data sets allowed for exploration of administrator and faculty perceptions of the social relationships and behaviors imbedded in the academic culture which ultimately affect academic capabilities. Additionally, the data helped to unearth a preliminary definition of and characteristics of faculty who engage in curricular leadership. Thus, the emergent grounded theory provided plausible definitions of the environment necessary to cultivate curricular leadership, the factors of institutional leadership necessary to prompt curricular leadership, and personal characteristics important to propel faculty toward curricular leadership positions. The study explores the following questions:

1. According to a qualitative synthesis and analysis of empirical research, what are the characteristics of higher education environments in which faculty are engaged in curricular leadership?

2. According to a qualitative synthesis and analysis of empirical research, what factors of institutional leadership are necessary to prompt curricular leadership at the faculty level?
3. According to a qualitative synthesis and analysis of empirical research, what are the individual characteristics of faculty who are engaged in curricular leadership?

4. What definition emerges from the findings of a qualitative synthesis and analysis of the empirical research on institutional leadership, supportive environment and personal characteristics?

Summary

Chapter III described the methodology, data collection procedures, and a description of the variables considered in the study. Descriptive and univariate statistics were used to explore the extent to which they support the patterns that emerged within Phase I and the open ended questions in Phase II. Together, the “mixed data” provided a greater understanding of the individual, institutional, environmental and leadership domains expressed by individual faculty members and administrators regarding curricular leadership. Also described in the chapter was the pilot study conducted to test the methodological design, along with details of the main study, creation of the final data collection instrument, description of the setting and participants, and aims and hypotheses of the study. The data collection procedures were examined, including the processes of ensuring reliability of the coding procedure used to determine the occurrences that administrators and faculty referenced individual characteristics, supportive environment and institutional leadership buckets as being conceptually tied to curricular leadership. Chapter IV will provide an overview of the observations and potential interpretations that will shape future research.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

“Faculty are the most valuable resource any institution of higher education has” (Meacham & Ludwig, p. 169, 1997), yet little research exists regarding the perceptions of curricular leadership in the context of higher education. The goal of this exploratory study was to investigate the relatively unknown research area of curricular leadership in higher education and to gain additional insights into this notion conceptually, to elicit details into the phenomena through the lens of administrators and faculty, to gain a better understanding of the key individual, institutional and environmental domains, to develop a hypothesis surrounding curricular leadership as a result of the research, to define the term, and to determine questions to examine as part of future research (Marais, 1991). Therefore, Chapter IV examines the descriptive data collected from both electronic surveys and focused interviews conducted in Phases I and II, with the intent of addressing questions emergent from the research.

The demands placed on administration and faculty in higher education inspires examination of the processes that drive pedagogical leadership and learning outcomes (Anderson, 1965; Stark & Lattuca, 2005). Thus, an investigation using exploratory sequential design was utilized to capture the thoughts and opinions of both administrators and faculty in order to gain a robust understanding of the topical area. The rationale for using this methodology was to integrate both qualitative and quantitative data due to the complexity of the issue and the absence of a widely accepted definition of curricular
leadership in higher education (Creswell, 2002). Furthermore, Burgess (2004) emphasized the need to explore curriculum leadership through the lens of administrators and faculty by stating, “…there is a need for educators to understand the competing and at times contradictory forces in curriculum design, to enhance participation by the range of stakeholders involved” (p. 164).

Focused interviews with groups of administrators captured information used to construct a survey for faculty. Together, the “melding” of data from these exercises provided insight into both stakeholder groups’ views of curricular leadership, particularly in relation to key individual, institutional, and environmental domains.

Phase I of data collection occurred in April 2010, during which two focus groups were conducted with academic leaders from a large, public research university in the Midwestern region of the United States. Participants held diverse leadership positions in various academic units, with a cumulative average of 20 years of academic leadership experience. More specifically, 15 academic leaders elected to participate: five academic deans, six department chairs, and four department directors. Of the participants, 75% were male and 25% were female. The data collected from the focus groups informed the questions for the Phase II survey.

In Phase II, a convenience sample of 2,100 tenured faculty from three large, public, research-intensive universities in the Midwest, South, and Southwestern United States were invited to participate in an exploratory survey that was conducted in an online format in August 2013. Exploratory analysis on the data was conducted to assess both faculty members’ and administrators’ range of meaning regarding the characteristics
necessary to define curricular leadership in higher education since little research exists in this area.

Demographic data revealed that roughly half of the respondents were under the age of 50 (52%). Overall, the gender of faculty participants was split relatively evenly, featuring a slightly higher mix of women (59%) than men (41%). Most respondents were white, non-Hispanics (86%), with the remainder identifying their race and ethnicity as follows: Chicano, Latino, Hispanic (5%); Asian or Pacific Islander (3%); African—American (2%); American Indian/Alaskan Native (0.4%); and 3% identifying as “other.”

When asked to report all degrees obtained, faculty reported master’s degree (25%), PhD (81%), MD (4%) or post-PhD Fellowship (7%). The largest %age of faculty surveyed held the rank of Associate Professor (36%), followed by Assistant Professor (31%), and then Professor (22%). Faculty members identified varying degrees of teaching experience. More than half (53%) have been teaching for 15 or fewer years. In fact, 15% have 0 to 5 years of experience; 21% have 5 to 10 years of experience; and 17% identify with 10 to 15 years of experience. Roughly 47% have more than 15 years of teaching experience, with 19% reporting 25 to 30 years; 15%, 20 to 25 years; and 12%, 15 to 20 years.
Table 2

Profile of the Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicano, Latino, Hispanic</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Education</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNP</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Fellowship</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Fellowship (less than one year full time)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Fellowship (equal to or more than one year full time)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-PhD Fellowship</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Fellowship (less than one year full time)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Fellowship (equal to or more than one year full time)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Academic Rank</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position does NOT carry an academic title</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years Teaching</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The urgency of curricular reform and innovation often prompts faculty development (Angelo, 1994; Mosley, 1992), yet there is no widely accepted definition of curricular leader or curriculum leadership in higher education. Despite the lack of a definition, 60 respondents of the survey identified being a curricular leader. Of these, 21 identified themselves as leading a team to reform curriculum or as a program director. In addition, 12 identified themselves as members of curriculum committees or teams that revise, approve, or oversee curriculum changes. Forty-one subjects stated only that they had developed courses and did not include curriculum development in their response. In all but 13 cases, the researcher identified respondents as being driven by a personal desire to participate in either curriculum development or course creation.

When asked to describe aptitude and motivation to gain curricular leadership experiences, nearly half (44%) of the responses indicated the importance of a supportive environment in both motivating and providing training in curriculum development. A personal desire to gain leadership experiences was a trend that appeared to be fueled by a desire to help students succeed. Faculty respondents indicated personal satisfaction as a motivator, as well. In addition, 33% of respondents cited either a lack of support or a lack of desire (and in some instances, both) to gain curricular leadership experiences, while only one of the 112 respondents mentioned having an administrator who supported his or her attempts to gain curricular leadership experience. Varied reasons were discussed for those that self-identified as unmotivated, such as a preference to focus in other areas (i.e. research, their own courses, and other non-classroom based activities), disillusionment
with the process and/or their colleagues, or a perceived lack of proper support or incentives.

Essentially, the data indicated two main drivers of interest and participation in curricular leadership: motivation and opportunity. For the purposes of this study, motivation is the result of intrinsic and/or external factors on one’s desire to be involved. Opportunity, on the other hand, refers to the environmental and/or preparatory experiences that allow for action upon one’s desires. Data collected from this sample indicates that two-thirds of motivation for curricular leadership comes from intrinsic factors (45% personal satisfaction, 55% perceived value), with the remaining one-third from external factors (45% rewards and incentives, 55% student focus). In addition, administrative support and experience training are driving forces in opportunity. Within the opportunity construct, 40% of faculty discussed streamlined processes, such as limiting the layers of vetting and creating an automated workflow, while 60% indicated administrative support was needed. Finally, 75% stated that experience and training was necessary, while 25% felt that appropriate timing in one’s academic career was critical. This exploratory data reinforces the assumption that conditions must be right for both motivation and opportunity to allow for development of curricular leadership experiences.

**Principle Themes in Defining Curricular Leadership**

Despite the fact that many research studies have focused on specific organizational settings, “few are available to guide people who wish to develop and sustain—that is, lead—collaborative university-community partnerships such as those
created by curricular reform initiatives” (Bland et al., 2005, p. 230). This study identified themes that will help to minimize that gap.

Five key curricular leadership themes emerged from the data, regardless of the particular structure or content of the curriculum:

1. **Process**: Developing and revising coursework and programs; identifying opportunities for faculty involvement in curricular activities; and navigating higher education politics and bureaucratic systems.

2. **Modality**: A faculty member’s pedagogical approach to teaching and subsequently the perception of systematic reward and acknowledgement systems that reinforce teaching innovation.

3. **Outcome**: End result of courses or programs within an academic unit and all associated learning outcomes.

4. **Vision**: Strategy and big-picture thinking and the role of leadership as the driving force of curricular strategy.

5. **Personal Development and Satisfaction**: Personal and professional gain from curricular roles and experiences, including previous training and preparation.

Data coded into these themes subsequently were organized into Bland’s three main constructs: supportive environment, institutional leadership, and individual characteristics. The three main constructs help to extract characteristics that facilitate curricular leadership which may yield high levels of productivity over time (Bland et. al, 2005). Bland et. al (2005) defined these three main constructs as “pillars of productivity
that act together as an interdependent whole to support the overall structure of the enterprise” (p.2). Examining these three constructs is one way to better understand the key institutional characteristics that exist in a university and impact faculty curricular leadership. In addition, the buckets allowed the researcher to gain a better understanding of how all three constructs work together to facilitate higher levels of faculty engagement in curricular leadership activities that are eventually manifested in the form of curricular artifacts, including integrated learning across courses, greater attention to learning outcomes, and higher student and faculty satisfaction.

Table 3

Data Coding Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Data in Bland et al.’s 3 Main Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Leadership</th>
<th>Supportive Environment</th>
<th>Individual Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supportive Environment

The themes that emerged in the environmental domain were process, modality and outcome. Interestingly, topical literature discusses what to teach with much less attention on how to teach and to whom (Meacham & Ludwig, 1997), thus totally ignoring the “process” necessary to advance the conversation to the what, how, and whom.

Process

A key theme illustrating the concept of environment is process. In this study, process is defined as developing and revising coursework and programs; providing opportunities for faculty involvement in curricular activities; and navigating higher education politics and bureaucratic systems. Department chairs and individual faculty members are charged with meeting the needs of students and employers by developing and revising coursework and programs on a regular basis. In addition, faculty members must be knowledgeable and current in employment and education trends; must understand the committee process of curriculum approvals; and often must work with other departments and deans to make sure courses aren’t being duplicated (etc.). When asked to provide a brief account of a curricular leadership experience, one faculty member stated:

I have developed at least 5 new courses and moved two online. I have modified several others. I have been on university wide curriculum committees to create curriculum and those that consider new proposals. I lead my smaller program in curriculum changes constantly. We change on the program level each semester.
and try to make larger changes as often as needed to keep courses and the program as strong as possible.

Another faculty member depicted his or her role in the process as follows:

I developed two programs (which has been a disaster). I have been involved in repeated revisions of programs to improve standards and course offerings. Every year it seems that something needs to be changed, including several years’ worth of correcting past mistakes others have gone through and made “global” program changes that led to errors. These all require multiple forms, meetings, and layers of approval at times, just to correct typos—but which all have to be justified, described, with long narratives on positive and negative implications of making or not making these changes.

Based on responses, opportunities for faculty member involvement are a feeling of security, training, and collegial environment. Likelihood of participation is amplified if an individual is in the earlier stages of his or her career, has the time and resources that curriculum leadership demands, and is personally intrinsically motivated. One faculty member illustrated this point by stating:

I am highly motivated when it comes to developing an effective curriculum that takes into account the special needs and training for students. My preparation for this role includes training in up and coming fields. I am committed to the pursuit with a passion that prompts me to continue the work/training even without the support of my employer.
The third subcategory is a faculty member’s ability to navigate the system in his/her department and college. Obstacles such as tenure and promotion requirements, non-tenure track status, insufficient resources such as technology and staff support, and the lack of dedicated time to focus on issues of curriculum and instruction. Faculty often echoed comments such as this:

I would like to pursue curricular leadership and its relation to assessment. I serve on the University Advisory Council for Academic Assessment. I would like to share this with other educators in my discipline. Unfortunately, this is not likely the path to promotion to Full professor as these efforts are not rewarded in the current tenure and promotion criteria.

Forty-three percent of survey respondents focused on the curricular process. Among this sample, two-thirds of the items coded as process explored the development of new coursework or programs, while one-third examined the revision of existing courses. Of all the themes identified, process was perceived to be of the utmost importance when describing curricular leadership. More specifically, faculty discussed as inhibitors mechanics to make curricular changes, the political nature of curricular decision making, and the lack of curricular reform. The mechanics and political nature of the curricular change were conveyed repeatedly as faculty conveyed their perception of the curriculum development and revision process. On such example is as follows:

Curricular change is in fact, a highly political process that is fraught with power struggles and jealousies. Certain elements in this college allow only one perspective in terms of curriculum and have been successful at blocking all other
perspectives for over two decades. There is no balance and those with the strongest opinions and personal chutzpah are allowed to rule.

Another faculty echoed this sentiment by stating,

> It is such an onerous process to make changes that it is best to be avoided. I do it for the program and for the students, but it is highly punitive in its process. In addition, as a small program we often are outvoted and outmaneuvered by those with more faculty. This has resulted in several badly needed programmatic changes and updates being put on hold for several years—there seemed to be no justification except for programmatic jealousy.

In addition, faculty commented on how the cumbersome nature of the process prevented curricular innovation. One faculty member stated, “I find curricular changes to be largely cosmetic as currently practiced, and find it frustrating to see the same courses, especially on environmental issues, being offered now as I myself took as an undergrad a decade ago.” Another faculty member conveyed, “Many of my departmental colleagues rely on traditional curricular canons. To them, curriculum is a repertoire—tried and true. That becomes stopping points in conversations in the department.” Perhaps, these sentiments explain why 53% of survey respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed that they have weekly conversations about curriculum and education with people in their department. Not surprisingly, this statistic increased as faculty members reported their likelihood to have weekly conversations about curriculum within their discipline (57% disagreed) and college (62% disagreed). One may also argue that the process is often reactive, thus causing curriculum conversations to be rather limited, as conveyed by this
faculty member “Curricular change is reactionary and slow to happen unless there is a crisis. Decisions are made by gut and not by research or comparing other institutions generally. The budget tends to drive our curricular decisions.”

The qualitative responses gathered from administrator focus groups also indicate that process is a critical component of curricular leadership. In fact, 44% of respondents included process as essential in a definition of curricular leadership. One respondent indicated a need for faculty to, “Think and plan for the whole degree rather than a particular course” Other respondents echoed this theme. Additionally, many faculty members discussed curriculum in big-picture conceptual terms, yet often defined the concept of curriculum leadership rather narrowly in terms of revising courses or developing a new course. Overall, the open-ended comments would lead one to believe that faculty agree with big-picture thinking. Many faculty members made comments such as, “Teaching is what Universities were designed to do. The system has to be extensively overhauled if curriculum development and teaching excellence are a true priority anymore or still relevant.”

Thirty-three percent of administrator respondents indicated that faculty members understand that if they do not create new courses, they might be unable to teach in their field and therefore must be very attuned to the need to take a leadership role in curriculum development. In other words, the proclivity of universities to discontinue courses based on low enrollment may be a motivator for faculty to create new courses and new curricula.
In contrast, faculty indicated students were the main motivator to create new courses. As one faculty member put it, “My motivation is simple…I do it for the long-term benefit of the students, and I find it personally rewarding to be associated with a school and curriculum that best prepares them to succeed.”

Interestingly, 36% of administrators mentioned that the higher education model inhibits faculty from taking on curricular leadership roles. Merit awards, department size (i.e. larger departments have more cumbersome mechanisms); job security and tenure were mentioned as barriers that discourage faculty from taking the lead on curriculum projects. In fact, one respondent mentions the hiring process as laying out the requirements of the job (including curriculum development), but when a faculty member begins the procedures for rank and tenure, he or she is not credited for having participated in curriculum development as it is not valued for promotion.

Overwhelmingly, 45% of faculty members agreed that tenure, promotion, and resource allocation should be revisited if curricular leadership is going to become a priority. In addition, less than 1% of the faculty indicated that they elected to go non-tenure track, as tenure track would not support student success and program and curriculum development.

Finally, 49% of the administrators see their roles as facilitators, suggesting that communication, recognition, and empowerment to and of faculty are factors in an individual’s desire to contribute to curriculum design. Faculty, on the other hand, describe administration as to having little interest in curriculum leadership and therefore little interest in curricular change. One faculty member stated:
I am highly committed to education advancement. Unfortunately our present leaders are solely focused on increasing funding and my time in education has been reduced to minimal levels. It was my career plan to spend greater efforts in developing innovative approaches to education, however, my time has been eliminated by the leadership in lieu of chasing extramural research funding.

When asked about the identifying characteristics of faculty who adopt new technology, none of the administrators mentioned process, mode, or outcome. Interestingly, only a small percentage of faculty discussed curricular leadership in terms of leveraging technology, indicating that curriculum leadership is defined by faculty in more traditional terms.

**Modality**

Modality is another key theme in relation to curricular leadership. For the purposes of this study, modality is defined as a faculty member’s pedagogical approach to teaching and, subsequently, the perception of systematic reward and acknowledgement systems that reinforce teaching innovation. One can consider modality through Nussbaum’s (2011) capabilities approach which suggests that individuals can maximize a combination of their abilities only if real opportunity, facilitated by a legitimate system, exists for them to do so. Nussbaum’s theory, as it relates to mode, is supported by the data in this study as faculty respondents indicate they are more likely to apply skills—or capabilities—toward curricular leadership and pedagogical innovation if rewarding and real opportunities are available. In fact, mode is reflected in 13% of the survey
comments. Overwhelmingly, faculty conveyed the lack of protected time and reward as impediments to curricular leadership. Simply put, one respondent remarked:

I am well prepared for curriculum leadership based on the 25 plus years of teaching experience and a strong engagement since my early years on the faculty. I feel strongly that the most important work we do is to teach our students, and any work that improves this process is worthwhile. The biggest barrier to such developments is the absence of time to dedicate to such initiatives and the relative lack of recognition by the university of such work particularly above the department level, where merit pay seems to head to the most prominent researchers and rarely to individuals dedicated to teaching.

Furthermore, the open ended survey comments depicted an environment that discouraged curricular leadership due to the lack of incentives. For example, one faculty member stated, “I have found it very difficult to develop any curriculum beyond those I control myself. Many faculty are too busy determining what’s in it for them— no incentives to make it work.” Another faculty member stated, “Very interested but not incentivized to do so.”

Although faculty repeatedly referenced a lack of time and support, 42% reported that they had adequate time to develop curriculum, 45% reported they felt appreciated for their curricular work, and 54% conveyed they have excellent opportunities to pursue interests in curriculum development. In addition, faculty reported high levels of support and involvement that extends beyond individual support where 55% stating a large portion of his or her department’s faculty can be considered to contribute to the
development of curricula and courses. In fact, the survey indicated that more than three-quarters (78%) felt that their colleagues strive to provide a quality education. Nearly two-thirds (63%) stated that the skills, expertise and experience of the faculty in their department were appropriate to accomplish curricular goals, and 26% agreed that professional development was provided to them regarding developing and enhancing curriculum.

When asked for adjectives that best described respondents’ work environments, participants stated: collegial (68%), large (59%), supportive (57%), demanding (42%), diverse (42%) and challenging (40%). Despite the continued discussion regarding a supportive environment that is collegial, only 24% percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their department has fair mechanisms for non-monetarily recognizing and celebrating curricular achievements, and only 37% agreed that teaching is recognized but not as highly as research, which had a 50% agreement rate. While mode did not emerge as a dominant theme during the focus group interviews, administrators’ references of it converge with those of faculty. Lack of rewards and outdated technology were discussed as barriers. In other words, updated technology and an incentive structure are necessary to compel faculty to participate in curricular leadership roles.

Outcome

For purposes of this study, outcome has been defined as the learning-goal oriented product created by faculty. While focus group discussion did not reveal a plethora of outcome-related comments by administrators, the concept was addressed in terms of reward (or lack thereof) and student behavior. In other words, dealing with the behavioral
issues of students and a punitive work environment were two issues cited by administrators as potential roadblocks. On the other hand, the survey data showed that 15% of faculty indicated that outcome was viewed as being of primary importance. The majority of outcomes were defined by faculty respondents as course or program revisions, but a small percentage (less than 5%) of participants took the opportunity to discuss outcomes on a grander scale, including university mission and values. By in large, the faculty that discussed curriculum on a larger scale questioned the true academic mission. In addition, of the individuals answering this question fewer than 1 percent chose to say they weren’t motivated by the concept of curricular leadership, but felt a calling when course or program revision or creation is identified by colleagues if it is in the best interest of the students. Whereas in response to other questions, faculty reported motivation to be involved in curricular leadership yet fewer than three percent indicated any motivation at all.

**Institutional Leadership**

**Vision**

The emergent theme in this domain was vision. One example of vision from a focus group respondent is as follows:

I love working with other faculty on developing curriculum and working with part time faculty and colleagues on teaching and learning and providing professional development for them in this area. I actively think about assessment, evaluation, brain based research, best practices in teaching and do my best to share with my colleagues teaching strategies to help improve their teaching, advising and
communicating with students. All of these topics I find very interesting. I like to
learn and how people learn. I love thinking about scope and sequence and the (big
picture of curriculum.)

Based on the data, the researcher has likewise identified strategizing and big-picture
thinking as characteristics required of higher education leadership to drive curriculum
development. Out of 18 administrator responses to the question, “How do you define
curricular leadership?” five (28%) indicated that leadership characteristics such as
knowledge about curriculum development, experience, education in the field, being not
adverse to change, and big-picture thinking mattered. The respondents suggested that
allowing faculty to have ownership of work and evaluation or assessment of work, as
well as communicating leadership ideas, facilitated a definition of leadership.

When asked about the characteristics of an environment that fosters curricular
leadership activities among faculty, 62% of focus group respondents discussed topics
related to vision, such as policy (anti-bullying policy, in particular), student focus, and a
non-punitive environment. Interestingly, one group member reported, “[There is] no
reason to think about leadership when the focus is not coming from the faculty.” This
indicates that perhaps some academic deans and/or directors expect faculty to assume a
leadership role when it comes to curricular reform.

The majority of responses, however, suggest that administrators understand the
need to support faculty and remove obstacles so that faculty can assume leadership roles.
For example, overly complex procedures, unclear goal setting, and hiring that focuses on
cost containment rather than on bringing in the most qualified faculty are issues that
administrators feel impede faculty from assuming leadership roles. Likewise, administrators reported similar factors when talking about their roles in facilitating curricular leadership. Overwhelmingly, they view their roles as motivating for productivity and providing a healthy environment in which ownership is favored over micromanagement.

On the other hand, more than half (56%) of faculty members surveyed reported a high expectation in their department to develop and enhance curriculum. Despite that fact, only 27% stated that they received informal mentoring that provided valuable guidance in developing curriculum from within their department or another department. Lack of time was reported as an impediment to curricular design, as 42% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they have adequate time to dedicate to curricular matters. On average, about 30% of the college administrators were cited as being highly regarded for their roles in curricular innovation, compared to 50% of department administrators. This statistic supports Stark’s (2000) finding that department chairs are viewed as the nucleus of curricular matters.

**Individual Characteristics**

**Personal Development and Satisfaction**

The domain of individual characteristics is comprised of the personal development and satisfaction of faculty gained from curricular roles as well as professional development and previous experiences. Administrators repeatedly cited personal development as a key component in curricular leadership in all question categories, indicating that faculty are or should be in control of their professional
destinies. Of the 12 questions analyzed for this study, five were exceptions. Administrators did not rely on personal development as a key component for defining curricular leadership, nor did they indicate importance of environmental characteristics, leadership obstacles, student behavior or administrative role in this domain.

Personal characteristics such as focus, skill level, and connections outside the university were cited as important determinants of faculty who are teaching adopters. Faculty who were perceived to support interdisciplinary teaching were characterized by administrators as extroverted individuals with wide interests who are dedicated to their jobs and who keep updated in their field. Likewise, faculty who support experiential learning were described by administrators as being strong collaborators, connected in the community, dedicated and “big-picture” thinkers. Collectively, focus group respondents indicated that curricular leadership is personality dependent—that there is a “type” of individual that can best be described as a curricular leader.

Faculty who develop new courses were lauded as passionate and also were relatively new in their careers. One administrator noted, “[Faculty who develop new courses are] self-assured about themselves to move forward in teaching even with barriers to tenure.” Another administrator linked research excellence to teaching excellence, insinuating the expectation that faculty be leaders at both. However faculty respondents in the online survey indicated that demands of both tasks were too much to expect.

Seventy-six percent of the faculty respondents described themselves as being internally motivated to develop curriculum. With that said, 52% of the faculty stated that
they keep up-to-date in curriculum matters, and 55% reported that they would like more opportunities to contribute to curricular leadership in their department. Many faculty echoed comments such as, “I think our college requires a curricular overhaul, and I would like to be part of that process,” or “The more I teach, the more I realize that I need to learn more about teaching. I also see that our field is changing rapidly, and that we need to shift our teaching and curriculum to keep up with these changes.”

The final individual characteristic that emerged was the lack of preparation to conduct curricular leadership work. Roughly 70% of faculty members stated that they had little, if any, curriculum development experience. One faculty member reported, “I am very committed to this, both personally and as a function of my position. However, I often feel as though I am ‘winging it’ because I have no formal training in education/pedagogy.” Another faculty member wrote, “Preparation for curricular work was nil—simply thrown into the fire as many junior faculty in my department are.”

Not surprisingly, surveyed faculty members indicated that the top three strategies to facilitate teaching are: support (e.g. release time and funds) to acquire new skills (23%), value for all forms of teaching (17%), and salary increase offers for teaching achievements based on peer and student evaluations (17%). Additional support and training on new teaching strategies was ranked fourth (15%), thus further supporting the need for increased development in curriculum and instruction. Overwhelmingly, 40% of faculty members indicated that dedicated time, funds, and resources would help facilitate productivity in curriculum development. This indicates an interest in additional support in
curriculum development, thus challenging the role environment and leadership play in prompting faculty to take curricular action.

In conclusion, Chapter IV provided data descriptors and insight into both faculty and administrator interpretations and perceptions of the concept of curricular leadership in higher education. The datasets served to outline the exploratory investigation and how focus group and survey respondents interpreted and perceived the environment, institutional leadership, and personal characteristics that make up the concept of curricular leadership.

The results of this exploratory effort provided a greater understanding of the relationship between process, modality, outcomes, vision and personal development and satisfaction. This is the first attempt to examine the interplay between these concepts and to explore how these concepts could potentially work together to facilitate and support curricular leadership.

Chapter V will provide a definition of curricular leadership within higher education that emerged through grounded theory. In addition, the chapter will provide a hypothesis, summary and discussion of the results of the research, and reflection upon the factors necessary to compel faculty to become curricular leaders.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

The overarching goals of this study were to investigate the relatively unknown research area of curricular leadership in higher education and to gain additional insights into this notion conceptually, to elicit details into the phenomena through the lens of administrators and faculty, to gain a better understanding of the key individual, institutional, and environmental domains surrounding this conceptual realm, to develop one or more hypotheses surrounding curricular leadership as a result of the research, and ultimately, to define the term curricular leadership.

Historically, curriculum leadership is an interpretive term. Over 120 definitions of curriculum exist in scholarly work, and over 200 definitions of leadership occur in the realm of education (J. Henderson, personal communication, January 3, 2014). The myriad definitions vary greatly and have been subject to thought and debate over a length of time (McCaffery, 2004). For instance, curriculum often is defined in terms of learning experiences, course content, and objectives (Hyun, 2006). Leadership in higher education, on the other hand, tends to be defined in more ambiguous terms. For example, Paul Northhouse (2007) defines leadership as a process developed to influence a team of people to work together to achieve a common goal. Likewise, Shapiro (2005) states, “Leadership is an action, not a title, and the ability to lead can be found in every person” (p. 1). That is to say, despite all the literature on curriculum and leadership in higher education, the question still remains: What does it mean to be a curricular leader?
Rooted in the Latin word *currere*, meaning to run, the term *curriculum* is much more expansive than traditionally thought (Pinar, 2007). It goes beyond the practice of design and implementation of coursework or programs, referring instead to an educational journey through which a continuous growth of knowledge takes place. “The implication in this Latin phrase is that the educational course that the student will ‘run’ will be good for him or her. It will provoke, energize, and sustain growth” (Henderson et al., 2014). This perspective encourages faculty to challenge the status quo and move beyond traditional curricular boundaries and also implies that change will be expected within the faculty role, asking faculty members to embrace a more expansive skill set than what historically has been the case. Thus, in order to be curricular leaders, faculty members must be “...knowledgeable about curricular assessment and development processes and learning-centered or constructivist pedagogical theory” (Wolf & Hughes, 2007). Simply put, less emphasis should be placed on course content, and faculty energies instead should be directed toward their roles in facilitating student learning (Meacham & Ludwig, 1997).

The expansiveness of these concepts has implications for developing the future professoriate as well as the selection and reward process (Hughes, 2007). In other words, “Candidates with experience in curricular reform process or implementing innovative pedagogy may increasingly be preferred - or even required - in faculty selection decisions” (Hughes, 2007, p. 109). This theme was widely supported throughout the course of this study among administrators and faculty alike. Both groups indicated that a
candidate’s curricular knowledge and aspirations should be vetted prior to hire, with faculty stressing equitable reward mechanisms to sustain curricular leadership efforts.

Given the lack of a widely accepted definition, as well as the multitude of dimensions covered by this topical construct, it is especially impressive that study respondents identified with being a curricular leader. Those who communicated an affiliation described themselves as leading teams to reform curricula, such as program directors, or as members of curriculum committees or teams that revise, approve, or oversee curriculum changes. The researcher identified respondents as being driven by a personal desire to participate in either curriculum development or course creation, and that this desire stemmed from the presence of three key elements: a supportive higher education environment, clear and consistent institutional leadership, and individual faculty drive. These three realms intersect to provide the proper environment and support structure for curricular leadership to grow and thrive.

Supportive Environment

According to study respondents, a supportive environment allows one to act upon a desire for involvement. Faculty members view both administrative support and personal development as key contributors to creating the properly supportive environment for their involvement in curricular development and leadership. The organization or institution must have both administrative support and appropriate resources, and the faculty themselves must be equipped with the appropriate tools and consider themselves on an acceptable career trajectory with adequate development opportunities.
Both faculty members and administrators understand the importance of a supportive environment. Support is seen as critical, but in many cases in this study, a perception emerged among faculty members that administration, overall, did not endorse a structure that provided the means to allow for leadership development. Interestingly, however, while faculty repeatedly referenced a lack of time and resources to become curricular leaders, nearly half reported having adequate time to develop curriculum and communicated that they felt appreciated by their departments, colleagues, or organizations for their curricular work. Even more conveyed that they have excellent opportunities to pursue interests in curriculum development, yet failed to indicate that they acted on these opportunities.

The answer to the question begged by this juxtaposition suggests a misunderstanding between faculty and administration of the support and resources needed to encourage and conduct curricular leadership in addition to the publishing, researching, and teaching responsibilities in a faculty member’s job description. The leaders at institutions of higher education should consider open and frequent discussion about what is needed to compel faculty members to take leadership roles in curriculum development and provide adequate time, resources, and rewards to encourage work in this area. In exchange for administrators removing such barriers, faculty members should reciprocate through a high level of accountability, demonstrating a commitment and interest in taking the lead in activities outside the classroom.

Faculty development researchers Jack Meacham and Jeanette Ludwig (1997) discuss the importance of intentionally and continually developing faculty members in
the necessary facets of curriculum reform. They posit that “...changing how the faculty teaches is so important in the process of curriculum reform that faculty development should be conceived not as a one-time event but instead as a continual, visible, and expected component of academic life” (Meacham & Ludwig, 1997, p.178). Also they discuss the importance of linking such developmental activities to the reward systems of institutions by going beyond remuneration and time or load releases, and suggest that administration consider tying curricular reform efforts to professional advancement.

Corroborating the work of Meacham and Ludwig (1997), this study indicates there is little incentive for faculty to engage in curricular leadership activities as the work is rarely acknowledged in the promotion and tenure process. However, other faculty development literature indicates otherwise. According to the 2007-2008 Research Brief, faculty are beginning to incorporate new teaching strategies; however, they attribute this behavior to a new faculty member’s entrance into the academy rather than to a desire to adopt a curricular leadership role (McCrickerd, 2012). This suggests that timing matters in terms of faculty involvement in curricular development, as does the introduction and explanation of the tenure and promotion process to a faculty member who is younger in his/her career. The fact that faculty do, in fact, participate in curricular thinking early in their careers validates faculty members’ interest in the area, but suggests that a lack of reward for this behavior causes it to stagnate. To this point, one survey respondent said, “I would like to do more of this [curricular] work, but don’t feel it’s the best use of my tenure-track time.” Additionally, McCrickerd (2012) points out that senior faculty members are more likely to be tenured and, thus, may not be concerned about the
ramifications of investing in the improvement of teaching, while Edgerton (1992) insinuates that “stagnation is an occupational hazard of the professoriate” (p. 10). These views support the perspectives of respondents in this study who indicated that curricular leadership is more likely to happen post-tenure, but well before retirement.

Likewise, faculty respondents cited as a barrier an inequitable division of resources between curriculum development activities and research. Those surveyed conveyed that more resources should be directed toward curriculum development than toward research. Conversely, the majority of administrator responses suggest they understand the need to support faculty and remove obstacles so that faculty can assume leadership roles. For example, overly complex procedures, unclear goal setting, and a hiring process that focuses on cost containment rather than bringing in the most qualified faculty are issues that administrators feel impede faculty from assuming leadership roles. Despite that fact, the data from this survey indicate that faculty members’ perceptions are that little to nothing is being done to resolve this issue. The perceived lack of rewards prompted many faculty respondents to report that good teaching is not important or worth their efforts. This observation is supported by Parker Palmer, the co-author of *The Heart of Higher Education: A Call to Renewal* (2010) a book on community commitment in higher education. He paints a picture of disconnection, or an environment in which faculty are detached from students, their colleagues, from their own intellectual vocation and the passions that originally animated them. He vividly illustrates that some of that pain comes from economic factors from cutbacks and downsizing, from the anxiety of wondering whether there is a future to this enterprise (Palmer, Zajonc, & Scribner, 2010).
The disconnection between what faculty members perceived and what administrators reported in this study suggest that conversation at the top levels of colleges and universities should focus on simplifying procedures, clarifying goals, and determining a different business model that does not focus on hiring the least expensive faculty—but the most qualified faculty. Faculty must share in the discussion so that all stakeholders are on the same page.

Unsurprisingly, an additional facet of environmental concern emerging from this study relates to opportunities for collegial discussion and debate. Respondents to this survey stated that, while their environment is a collegial one, they often do not talk to colleagues within or outside of their home departments and institutions. This suggests that a key component for the ongoing development of faculty is an opportunity for networking and opening the door for professional and personal conversations both inside and outside the confines of the academy.

Meacham and Ludwig (1997) agree about the importance of encouraging faculty not just to get to know each other but also to foster a sense of respect for others’ opinions and discussion points, “...[an] overriding aim of a faculty development program…is to create and sustain among the faculty a sense of community around issues of teaching” (Meacham & Ludwig, 1997, p. 176). Only a small percentage of faculty in this survey agreed that valuable guidance was provided by the institution in developing and enhancing curriculum or that an informal mentor was assigned to provide curriculum development advice. By embedding mentoring opportunities and discussion and reflection time within faculty professional development programs, a university can
institutionalize the fostering of intra- and cross-divisional relationships, thus further emblematizing an environment that is supportive and helpful in nurturing the kinds of conversations that lead to enhancements in teaching production and curricular leadership.

**Institutional Leadership**

Institutional leadership in the context of this study refers to the ability of an organization to have in place visible and dependable procedures identifying both the need for new curricula and the need to revise existing curricula. With this in mind, an institution provides structure for five key thematic efforts: *process*, or the trajectory by which development and revision of coursework and programs occurs; *modality*, or a faculty member’s pedagogical approach to teaching, and systematic rewards and acknowledgements; *outcome*, or the end result of courses and programs within an academic unit; *vision*, or the strategy and big-picture thinking associated with innovation; and *personal satisfaction*, or the faculty’s gains from curricular roles and experiences.

Due to the current economic climate for colleges and universities, priorities are shifting within academic units. When money is tight, focus turns to grants and increasing classroom enrollment. With such a model, the impact on curricular leadership may be great, as was shown in this study. Participants repeatedly stressed the importance of process and the perceived affiliation with institutional leadership. The current literature essentially ignores the perceived barriers of process, yet it was cited widely as an obstacle to curriculum reform in this study by both administrators and faculty.

The question remains as to why the curricular revision process is so bureaucratic and political. The layers of policy analysis conducted in the literature review for this
study are interesting, particularly the idea that because few faculty are trained in curriculum and instruction, their capabilities of challenging the underlying assumptions in the curriculum design process may not be as developed as those with prior curriculum education and experience. Administrators, on the other hand, report their roles as process facilitators; however, administrative layers often deposit the curriculum development responsibilities at the institutional and state level. If, indeed, curricular leadership should reside at the faculty level, this study indicates that staff support is necessary to facilitate faculty roles. However, it only would support motivated faculty and not those who have an interest but cannot see past administrative hurdles. One survey respondent indicated this frustration, saying, “I no longer have any interest in trying to improve the academic environment…It has been easier to work outside of [the state] and away from [the university].” This mindset also indicates that leadership reform is necessary at a variety of levels. Institutional and state requirements that mandate action but allow for no input from faculty fail to motivate even the most dedicated employee.

Another concept revealed throughout the data analysis was the perception that curricular leadership only can be advanced if administrative obstacles (the overwhelming amount of approvals, multiple layers of paperwork, and inherent politics around this topical area) are overcome, yet neither the focus group nor the open-ended comments collected for this analysis alluded to any best practices. In fact, only one comment referred to the effectiveness of a curricular leader as, “The dean for curriculum is a powerhouse who knows her job inside and out”. Interestingly, the following response
suggests that barriers exist even when leaders are committed and poised to support curriculum reform.

The main issues with curriculum in our department are internal, relating mainly to the protection of narrow/parochial interests on the part of a few faculty who have no interest in changing their musty ways, and a doctoral chair who brooks no dissent and treats policy disagreements as personal attacks. Not surprisingly, many faculty have “disengaged” in face of such an environment.”

To address the administrative barriers described above, universities are tackling the reform process through the development of learning communities, cross-disciplinary courses, and clearly defined learning outcomes (Hubball & Burt, 2004). These researchers discuss the transformation from “teaching-centered to learning-centered approaches” (p. 52) to curriculum, with the underlying question of how to make those experiences more prevalent and pervasive throughout the entire higher education culture.

Being mindful of this theory, the thoughts collected in this survey clearly indicate the lack of best practices and readily available resources is perhaps the largest barrier to implementing long-term, meaningful curriculum reform.

It is essential that leaders of higher education support curricular leadership and encourage curricular innovation and that the structure of post-secondary organizations facilitate engagement of faculty members through motivation. Disappointingly, the data collected for this analysis clearly articulates that leadership is perceived as obstructionist. Perhaps this is due to the fact that leaders within institutions of higher education are challenged with balancing the need to fulfill the institution’s teaching and research
missions with continued pressure to raise the quality of delivery and cut costs (Henard & Roseveare, 2012). Too often, leaders respond to this pressure by implementing top-down curricular reform strategies that are perceived as non-collaborative and then wonder why the curricular reform effort failed. As stated be one survey respondent, “I believe that too much ‘leadership’ in curriculum development, meaning curricula design imposed upon faculty from an administrative level, could put faculty autonomy at risk. This would be counter to the mission of a research university.” Comments such as these show that top-down approaches make faculty question academic freedom and the mission of higher education, causing them to become disinterested and disillusioned in pursuit of curricular leadership opportunities.

Institutional leadership also is key to driving faculty curricular leadership since provosts, deans, and department chairs shape educational standards. Management should create an environment that encourages, but not forces, faculty to take on curricular leadership roles through the development of policies (i.e., recognition of curriculum initiatives in the tenure and promotion process) and reward mechanisms (i.e., incentives, release time) to support faculty efforts. Institutional leadership also must insist that curriculum reform and instruction is valued, encouraged, and celebrated. One way to execute this is by creating an atmosphere of trust. More specifically, McCrickerd (2012) states that people need to be in an environment where mistakes are accepted, where it can be assumed that people are listened to and treated with respect, and that is welcoming. Likewise, Bryk and Schneider (2003) identified “relational trust” as being an essential component to successful school reform. An example of a lack of trust is demonstrated
through one respondent’s comment that he/she, “...participate[d] in this survey with great skepticism. There have been too many studies, too many reports, too many surveys over the years that have resulted in virtually no change.” Another participant indicated the importance of the issues discussed in the survey by saying, “[they] are crucial to solve...way too much cynicism, disillusionment, and despair by faculty at [the university] to allow it [to] thrive or excel.” Yet an additional stakeholder tied these types of issues to the role of the administration, expressing appreciation for the survey and saying, “No one has ever asked these questions before. It shows that administration cares, and that is what really counts.” These responses demonstrate the essential nature of the relationship between faculty and administrators and how important trust is to faculty taking on curricular leadership roles.

Likewise, faculty respondents indicated that support, through reward mechanisms, would incentivize them to take on curricular leadership roles. According to McCrickerd (2012), either intrinsic or extrinsic motivation must be present to compel faculty members to engage in curricular development. While many institutions of higher education turn to external motivators to galvanize faculty involvement, such as monetary incentives, it is important to recognize that a majority of faculty in this study identify personal involvement or desired involvement, both of which reflect intrinsic motivational constructs, as motivators. McCrickerd’s (2012) study supports this idea. She theorized, “Despite the perception that good teaching is not rewarded, faculty members still report that good teaching is very important or essential to them personally” (p. 57).
Individual Faculty Drive

Toohey (1999) imparts that the power of teaching is embedded in the curriculum design process. This view is rather unique as neither administrators nor faculty conveyed their curricular leadership experience as being empowering—in fact, it’s quite the contrary. The survey elicited many self-identified curricular leaders who are driving the curricular process, trying to engage their peers, and who are motivated for a multitude of reasons, but mainly because curricular reform enhances student learning and, therefore, student success. The respondents’ perspectives challenged the common belief that faculty knowledge and commitment is the single largest barrier to reform (Ziegenfuss, 2007). Faculty knowledge about curriculum is easy to criticize, yet the magnitude of feedback in this study is so expansive it is hardly digestible. The factors that influence a faculty member’s individual drive are expansive and very personal—a subject worthy of future research to understand this phenomenon. Given the responses in this study, it can be suggested that the challenges facing curricular reform are largely contributed to by historically bureaucratic administrative structures, such as tenure and promotion.

Data analysis of faculty preparedness revealed yet another question: Can a faculty member be an expert in curriculum development, teaching and research, or is it necessary, in order to develop the needed level of skill and expertise, to select one area in which to specialize? Faculty in this study depicted teaching and research as conflicting. In other words, it was noted that institutional leadership often rewarded an educator with a research agenda more highly than one who focused on teaching. Despite these results, some scholars may argue that the roles complement each other. For instance, the
American Council of Learned Societies (2007) define a teacher-scholar “...as deeply committed to inquiry in his or her disciplinary field and passionately devoted to successful student learning through teaching and effective institutional practices” (p. 4). The authors suggest that teacher-scholars can be found at every institution of higher education, but a supportive environment is a distinguishing factor required to cultivate and support the faculty member’s calling.

Many determinants contribute to an individual self-selecting as a leader, but perhaps the most interesting detail emerging from this research is a personal calling for a higher purpose—be it in education or student learning. One faculty member states:

I don’t know that I am motivated for (curricular leadership experiences) per se, but when course or program need is identified by the faculty I am happy to do the work necessary to get the course or program in place so that we are able to better serve our students.

Many aspects of institutional support such as institutional mission, student success, and inspirational colleagues, impact faculty members’ experiences and either motivate or demotivate them to actively pursue leadership opportunities. One faculty member explains, “Preparation for leadership comes with ample experience in the field. Good ideas or motivation to lead are often rewarded with more opportunities. Most often, leadership arises out of others’ lack of willingness to assume leadership roles.” In essence, these data indicate that a faculty member’s decision to seek out curricular leadership opportunities is predominantly personal, yet institutional leaders must find
ways to appeal to faculty members using individualized motivators and seek ways to cultivate leaders who may not possess a “personal calling.”

Additionally, this survey illustrates that faculty value curriculum development, even with lacking compensation, enough to prioritize it above commitments that have a greater organizational appeal or above tasks on which they receive assistance from other staff members or administration. This suggests that institutional leadership might encourage faculty to prioritize taking a lead in curriculum development by demonstrating how changes in curricular practices impact learning and student success. One model may be to develop a curriculum development teaching track as part of the tenure and promotion process, rewarding those who wish to follow a curricular leadership path by protecting their time and offering advancement based on their contributions to this area.

A minor, yet interesting, theme that emerged from this study is lack of motivation. Some faculty members self-identified as being unmotivated to participate in curricular leadership. Respondents cited various reasons for their lack of interest, including preferential focus in other areas, institutional emphasis on conducting research or other non-classroom based activities, disillusionment with the process and/or colleagues, lack of proper support, imminent retirement, and an absence of incentives or external motivators. These reasons cited by respondents suggest that administrators should understand the motivators, skills and knowledge faculty need to participate in the curriculum leadership process, a concept supported by McCrickerd’s (2012) research indicating that faculty members often lack motivation to change even though they ranked teaching as personally very important or essential. McCrickerd (2012) also suggests that
many faculty have *experienced* the educational process and have been successful, thus they have neither reason to challenge its effectiveness nor an impetus to change the system. If, indeed, faculty members operate under dysfunctional systems that inhibit a desire or ability to be active curricular leaders, it would behoove administrators to change the paradigm by providing time and support for faculty development designed to introduce the scholarship of curriculum and instruction and provide the most effective curriculum development methods available. Interestingly, many faculty members referenced participating in curriculum mapping and assessment as curricular leadership activity, but future research should examine if they truly understand the expansive nature of the scholarship in this area and the vast amount of resources available to them. Clearly, faculty development and institutional support will enhance the skills for existing faculty, but particular attention should be paid to future faculty so they begin their careers in a functional environment.

While extant research demonstrates that new faculty are open to learning and practicing novel pedagogy (McCickerd, 2012), it is unclear if all doctoral students should be required to participate in a sequence of courses around curriculum instruction. Understanding that requiring additional coursework is far from an ideal situation, perhaps institutions should consider providing existing graduate-level faculty the resources and instructional support needed to embed principles of curriculum and instruction into the discipline-specific course design. This approach would encourage professional development of graduate-level faculty while also placing them in a curricular leadership role that potentially could alter the way curriculum and instruction is viewed. The survey
data indicates that faculty would support this type of approach as it appeals to faculty’s
desire to improve student learning and, ultimately, success in a fashion that promotes
curriculum leadership in a collegial, safe, and empowering environment. Hackney and
Henderson (2013) echoed this sentiment by stating, “Beyond the standard focus of
positional authority, aspiring leaders need to develop curriculum wisdom with and
through others” (p. 118), further supporting participants’ comments regarding a desire to
be mentored by seasoned and tenured professors and have conversations about
curriculum development with colleagues.

Another example of professional development is the creation of faculty learning
communities around Henderson’s (2014) seven-part, lead-learning agenda. This avenue
invites faculty to engage in the scholarship of curriculum in a collegial environment
grounded in the conversations that surface in applied practice. Additionally, developing a
summer institute that would invite interdisciplinary teams of faculty to apply the
scholarship of curriculum to traditional curricular practices would expand the
conversation. Each of these examples embraces interdisciplinary work as an avenue to
promote curricular reform.

In a conversation about the role of ethics in faculty members at all levels, Nagel
(2014) suggests that a blurring of the organizationally constructed divisions between
educator rankings can only facilitate a more common understanding of curriculum
leadership and therefore a higher level of commitment. In fact, if the man-made chasm
between levels of faculty was narrowed, power and responsibility could be distributed
more evenly breaking down resistance to collegiality. He posits that faculty only will
develop sincere interest in becoming curricular leaders when the academic regime can be comfortable with the discomfort that discussion about the academic process provokes. In the end, it is only through participation in these types of conversations that faculty will be empower to co-create curriculum that addresses public need and public trust and engagement will be regained (Nagel, 2014).

**Defining Curricular Leadership**

A definition of curricular leadership emerged as a result of analyzing the findings of this study and leveraging the questions posed by the few scholars of curricular leadership in higher education. Curricular leadership in higher education, therefore, can be defined as: *individuals who are dedicated to a higher level of understanding of curriculum, its purpose and organization, and who therefore have the ability to translate pedagogical vision into reality, empower others to act, and transform subject matter knowledge and best practices of their colleagues to embody the underlying principles of higher education*. This definition speaks to the higher level of faculty engagement in curricular leadership activities that are manifested in the form of curricular innovations, including integrated learning across courses, greater attention to learning outcomes, and higher student and faculty satisfaction.

Institutions and curriculum committees alike should engage faculty members who will take responsibility for curriculum design and implementation, particularly as learning in the 21st century becomes more complex. Therefore, a description of a faculty curricular leader can assist administrators as they create working teams. A curricular leader is an individual who is motivated to think about curricular issues and seeks to
understand the scholarship of curriculum to better inform his or her practice. This person values education, its important mission, and is willing to tackle curricular issues due to the understanding of responsibility he/she has to students, parents, and lastly, colleagues. In addition, faculty curricular leaders are good listeners who, through the art of listening, have the ability to influence and motivate colleagues to take curricular action. In essence, this is a person who is a visionary and has earned a reputation worth following. Parker Palmer states, “good teaching can never be reduced to a technique. It always flows from the identity and integrity of the teacher” (Palmer, 1997, p. 15).

Faculty curricular leadership in higher education matters as it is the key to facilitating change in a period of unprecedented changes. This sea change in higher education demands a new solution to the same, age-old questions. How is higher education going to meet the ever-changing work force needs in addition to individual student learning needs? Members of the academy should be part of the solution and be given the support and vote of confidence to take the risks necessary to redefine current curricular boundaries. To truly bridge this gap, faculty also must be empowered to streamline the administrative bureaucracy in the spirit of student success.

The definition put forth in this discussion will continue to evolve over time as more research becomes available. Its expansiveness reflects the current state of higher education in general. As the academic community’s receptivity to this line of inquiry expands, the definition will follow suit in becoming more simplistic and less open to interpretation. Some of the past evolution, and the reluctance of faculty to identify themselves as curricular leaders, may be attributed to old, traditional understandings of
curriculum in which the concept of curriculum development is separated from the
concept of instruction. Furthermore, a general misunderstanding of what curricular
leadership means leaves faculty members often at odds with administrators. Having a
common definition on hand can alleviate this conflict.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study explored many concepts around curricular leadership and, while it
provides a baseline foundation for starting to define leadership in the realm of
curriculum, it merely scratches the surface of possible research opportunities. Research
potential exists in a multitude of areas, including those important questions and issues
raised by the research findings such as (a) how does the existence and requirements of the
tenure system encourage or discourage curricular leadership? (b) what are the
administrative processes that must be streamlined, and how can they be streamlined to
promote initiative in curricular leadership? and (c) how can the definitions of commonly
used terminology be improved to avoid ambiguity? The narrow scope of this research
amplified additional areas that deserve exploration. These include (a) why mode didn’t
surface as a dominant theme with administrators? (b) whether faculty descriptions of
themselves in curricular leadership roles align with and meet the criteria administrators
assume are required and (c) the importance of understanding of course fit into the
curriculum of a program for faculty involvement in curriculum development.

From the perspective of motivators for involvement, topical areas for exploration
include: (a) what specific obstacles must be removed for faculty to be compelled to lead
curriculum development activities? (b) the idea of aiding administrators responsible for
hiring faculty in understanding what intrinsically motivates an individual to be a curricular leader. These proposed future research topics, as well as a multitude of additional topics, will allow the foundational work provided throughout this study to begin immersing into the culture of higher education curricular leadership.

**Conclusion**

Chapter V illuminated the questions that emerged from the quantitative and qualitative data gathered from faculty members and administrators. In doing so, a definition of curricular leadership has been proposed, as well as an analysis of understanding and engagement in the process. A faculty member’s role in curricular leadership continues to remain unclear, and several opportunities exist for follow-up research regarding roles in curriculum development and revision, as demonstrated above. Faculty is the fabric of higher education, yet it is unclear what a faculty member’s role is as education evolves in the 21st century. Julie Hughes (2007) states,

> We, in the professoriate, may have lost sight of what it means to be a scholar.

Perhaps as a result of the dichotomy between research and teaching, heavy workloads, or simply lack of critical awareness, many faculty appear to routinely make decisions in their teaching and service activities that are not evidence based.

(p. 109)

The question is simple - how do we redefine what it means to be a scholar that embraces and supports curriculum leadership? The answer is more difficult. The findings of this exploratory study resolve how the presence of three key elements, supportive higher education environment, clear and consistent institutional leadership, and individual
faculty drive, can coincide to provide the proper environment and support structure for curricular leadership to grow and thrive.
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Curriculum Leadership Roles of Chairpersons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitator</strong></td>
<td>Most frequently, chairs reported that they see their roles as facilitator of the curricular process meaning that they work to convene the appropriate people to discuss and work to develop processes that will empower faculty to work to move ideas forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiator</strong></td>
<td>The initiator schedules faculty meetings with a slightly different intention—to present a curricular proposal for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agenda Setter</strong></td>
<td>The agenda setter’s role is somewhat between the facilitators concern with process and the initiator’s development of proposals for faculty to review. The agenda setter’s preference is to bring faculty to the table to discuss a problem and then act as a mediator helping faculty members cultivate ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinator</strong></td>
<td>The role of the coordinator is to work with existing curriculum committees to move the process along. The coordinator will assume necessary responsibility to move a curricular proposal to completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensor</strong></td>
<td>A sensor works to identify problems or opportunities within a department’s curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocate</strong></td>
<td>The advocate role works to further the mission of the department by marketing curricular changes, seeking external funding opportunities, and working to develop administrative partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Setter</strong></td>
<td>The standard setter role is one of either a role model or monitor. Chairs that see themselves as standard setters make sure departmental curriculum is in compliance with state and national accreditation standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B

LEADERSHIP ROLES OR STYLES
## Appendix B
### Leadership Roles or Styles

| **Style A** | The Chairperson emphasizes the responsibility of faculty for curriculum planning. S/he encourages faculty members to develop curriculum planning skills and supports them in these efforts. S/he fosters extensive faculty discussion and teamwork in developing curriculum and gathers information to support the planning process. S/he may or may not agree with specific curriculum proposals, but tries to attain faculty consensus when decisions are made and then communicates and supports the decision. |
| **Style B** | The chairperson emphasizes his/her responsibility to coordinate the process of curriculum planning. S/he establishes clear planning guidelines, assigns faculty members leadership roles, and sets timelines for the curriculum planning process. S/he assesses whether the alternatives the faculty are considering are feasible with existing resources, fosters faculty discussion of the proposed alternatives, and evaluates the results of decisions. |
| **Style C** | The chairperson strongly encourages faculty members to take curriculum leadership, but s/he also takes an active role. S/he frequently clarifies the department mission and suggests future visions and priorities for the department. High productivity in all academic endeavors is a key priority. S/he often attends conferences and meetings to obtain and share new information in curriculum development, teaching and learning, and student assessment and encourages faculty to do the same. S/he finds ways to reward faculty who lead and contribute to the curriculum development efforts. |
| **Style D** | The chairperson supports and encourages regular curriculum change and adaption. S/he keeps abreast of trends in the field and external conditions affecting the department and proposes specific scenarios for future curriculum change. On campus s/he emphasizes the importance of maintaining credibility for the department. S/he establishes connections within the college or university and seeks collaboration with other departments in order to negotiate approvals of new and innovative programs as well as the needed resources to sustain them. |
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Bland, et al. (2005) Model

List 1

Description of individual, institutional, and Leadership Characteristics that Facilitate Research Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recruitment and selection: Great effort is expected to recruit and retain new faculty who have the training, skills, experience, and dedication that are necessary to market and develop.</td>
<td>1. Scholarly: Highly regarded as a scholar, serves as a mentor, and peer model for other group members.</td>
<td>1. Scholarly: Highly regarded as a scholar, serves as a mentor, and peer model for other group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Socialization: Understands the values, beliefs, expectations, and standards of the academic community.</td>
<td>2. Research oriented: Possesses a “research orientation” that internalizes the group’s research-centered mission.</td>
<td>2. Research oriented: Possesses a “research orientation” that internalizes the group’s research-centered mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Motivation: refers to the desire to undertake, understand, and follow one’s own ideas, and to advance and contribute to society through scholarly work, inquiry, and creative work.</td>
<td>3. Capably fulfills all critical leadership roles.</td>
<td>3. Capably fulfills all critical leadership roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Content knowledge: Familiar with one’s research area with all major published works, papers being conducted, and areas of inquiry.</td>
<td>4. Participative leader: Uses an interactive, participative style of leadership.</td>
<td>4. Participative leader: Uses an interactive, participative style of leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Basic and advanced research skills: Behaves according to established ethical norms, and adheres to established ethical codes.</td>
<td>5. Communication within professional network: Members have a shared network of colleagues with whom they have frequent and substantive contact.</td>
<td>5. Communication within professional network: Members have a shared network of colleagues with whom they have frequent and substantive contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Simultaneous projects: Engages in multiple concurrent projects, and attends meetings and activities that are not directly related to the institution.</td>
<td>6. Resources: Members have access to sufficient resources such as funding, facilities, and expertise (e.g., local peers for support, research assistants, technical consultants).</td>
<td>6. Resources: Members have access to sufficient resources such as funding, facilities, and expertise (e.g., local peers for support, research assistants, technical consultants).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Orientation: Committed to both internal activities (e.g., regional and national meetings) and activities that are not directly related to the institution.</td>
<td>7. Sufficient work time: Members have sufficient time to devote to scholarly activities.</td>
<td>7. Sufficient work time: Members have sufficient time to devote to scholarly activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work habits: Has established productive scholarly habits early on in one’s career.</td>
<td>8. Communication: Clear and multiple forms of communication such that all members feel informed.</td>
<td>8. Communication: Clear and multiple forms of communication such that all members feel informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stakes experiences/reputation: Members offer different perspectives by virtue of their degree levels, approaches to problems, and varying disciplinary backgrounds.</td>
<td>9. Rewards: Research is regarded equitably and in accordance with defined benchmarks of achievements; potential rewards include money, promotion, recognition, and new responsibilities.</td>
<td>9. Rewards: Research is regarded equitably and in accordance with defined benchmarks of achievements; potential rewards include money, promotion, recognition, and new responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Broader opportunities: Professional development opportunities are readily and proactively offered to members to assure their continued growth and skill development.</td>
<td>10. Diverse opportunities for continued growth and skill development are offered.</td>
<td>10. Diverse opportunities for continued growth and skill development are offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Advocacy for participative governance: Clear and common goals, active and participative leadership, where active participation of members is expected, and active feedback system is utilized.</td>
<td>11. Advocacy for participative governance: Clear and common goals, active and participative leadership, where active participation of members is expected, and active feedback system is utilized.</td>
<td>11. Advocacy for participative governance: Clear and common goals, active and participative leadership, where active participation of members is expected, and active feedback system is utilized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IRB Approval Documents

Kent State University

Survey Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A CURRICULAR LEADERSHIP STUDY

Study Title: Curricular Leadership Study
Principal Investigator: Terri L. Christensen

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision.

Purpose of the Research Study:
The purpose of this study is twofold: 1) to describe the individual, institutional, environmental and leadership variables expressed by individual faculty regarding curricular leadership and 2) to gain a better understanding of the prompts that faculty curricular leaders use inherently without understanding curriculum theory.

Procedures
If you agree to participate you will be asked to complete an on-line survey. The survey responses will be confidential and automatically stored in a database that can then be easily converted to Excel or SPSS formats. The survey seeks to examine variables thought to be instrumental in the identification of faculty curricular leaders.

Benefits of Participating in this Research Study:
Although there may be no benefits to you personally, the knowledge gained may assist universities in developing faculty development programs to promote curricular leadership in faculty.

Risks of Participating in this Research Study:
The risks are minimal and constitute no greater danger to the client than would ordinarily be expected in any on-line survey.

Privacy and Confidentiality
Any information that you provide will be confidential. The information collected will be used for research purposes, and will not be disclosed or released to anyone but the researcher conducting the study.

Voluntary Participation
Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you
are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation.

**Contact Information**

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this curricular leadership study you may contact Terri Christensen, Doctoral Student by phone at (330) 554-9420 or by email at christ4@ccf.org or Robert Frank, President, The University of New Mexico by phone at (505) 277-2626 or by email at rdfrank@unm.edu. This project has been approved by the Kent State University and University of New Mexico Institutional Review Board.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330-672-2704.

**Consent Statement and Signature**

I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference.

**Participant Name (Print):**

**Participant Signature:**

**Date:**
I agree to participate in an audio-taped interview about views on curriculum development. I agree that Terri L. Christensen may audio-tape this interview. The audio-tape will be transcribed, stored under a pseudonym, and then erased. Voice recordings will not be played at any presentations which may result from this study. The date, time and place of the interview will be mutually agreed upon.

_____________________________  ____________________________
Signature                                Date

I have been told that I have the right to listen to the recording of the interview before it is used. I have decided that I:

____ want to listen to the recording   _____ do not want to listen to the recording

Sign now below if you do not want to listen to the recording. If you want to listen to the recording, you will be asked to sign after listening to them.

Terri L. Christensen may/may not (circle one) use the audio-tapes made of me. The original tapes or copies may be used for:

____ this research project   ______ publication   _____ presentation at professional meetings

_____________________________  ____________________________
Signature                                Date
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IRB Informed Consent

Informed Consent To Participate In A Curricular Leadership Study

**Study Title:** Curricular Leadership Study  
**Principal Investigator:** Terri L. Christensen

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision.

**Purpose of the Research Study:**
The purpose of this study is twofold: 1) to describe the individual, institutional, environmental and leadership variables expressed by individual faculty regarding curricular leadership and 2) to gain a better understanding of the prompts that faculty curricular leaders use inherently without understanding curriculum theory.

**Procedures**
If you agree to participate you will be asked to complete an on-line survey. The survey responses will be confidential and automatically stored in a database that can then be easily converted to Excel or SPSS formats. The survey seeks to examine variables thought to be instrumental in the identification of faculty curricular leaders.

**Benefits of Participating in this Research Study:**
Although there may be no benefits to you personally, the knowledge gained may assist universities in developing faculty development programs to promote curricular leadership in faculty.

**Risks of Participating in this Research Study:**
The risks are minimal and constitute no greater danger to the client than would ordinarily be expected in any on-line survey.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**
Any information that you provide will be confidential. The information collected will be used for research purposes, and will not be disclosed or released to anyone but the researcher conducting the study.
Voluntary Participation
Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns regarding this curricular leadership study you may contact Terri Christensen, Doctoral Student at (330) 672-8613, or Dr. Sonia Alemagno and Dr. James Henderson, faculty advisors, at Kent State University, Kent Ohio (330) 672-6501 (Dr. Alemagno) or (330) 672-0631 (Dr. Henderson). This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330-672-2704.

Consent Statement and Signature
I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study by advancing to the next page of the survey.
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Focus Group Discussion Guide

**Number and Size:** Deans, Chairs and Directors

**Length:** One hour

**Welcome and Purpose**
Hello and thank you for coming today. My name is Terri Christensen and I’m a Ph.D. Candidate within the Curriculum and Instruction program in the College and Graduate School of Education, Health, and Human Services. I am conducting research to develop a new measure of curricular leadership in higher education.

We are here today to discuss your definition of curricular leadership and how you see that definition practiced in the units you lead. Your feedback will be very helpful in developing an instrument for measuring “curricular leadership”.

**Grounds Rules and Reminders**
So before we get started, I want go over a few ground rules for our discussion.

- There are no right or wrong answers in this discussion. I want to hear your honest opinions – both positive and negative.
- Feel free to speak up whenever you have a comment to share. I hope to hear from all of you. You don’t need to wait for me to call on you. Please try to speak one at a time and not to interrupt others.
- My research assistant will be taking notes so that I can review discussion themes before I write up my report – in case I miss anything the first time. My notes won’t be used for any other purposes. Your answers are confidential and your names will not be used.

**Introductions**
Let’s get started with introductions.

- Please tell me your name, title, and the College/Department you are affiliated. I’ll start.

**Overview**
Today’s conversation is focused on the concept of curriculum. The term *curriculum*, broadly defined by Clifton Conrad (2007), includes goals for student learning (skills, knowledge and attitudes); content (the subject matter in which learning experiences are embedded); sequence (the order in which concepts are presented); learners; instructional methods and activities; instructional resources (materials and settings); evaluation...
(methods used to assess student learning as a result of these experiences); and adjustments to teaching and learning processes, based on experience and evaluation.

Curricular Leadership (10 Minutes)

- How do you define curricular leadership?

Characteristics of faculty (20 Minutes)

- What other characteristics do you think exemplify faculty who take a leadership role in teaching?

Now that we have a running list of characteristics, I would like to go back and group these characteristics in some conceptual way. (10 Minutes)

- What are your suggestions for conceptual groupings?

Environment (15 Minutes)

- What are the characteristics of an environment that promotes curricular leadership?
- What obstacles do faculty face who want to be leaders?
- What rewards can be provided to faculty who are curricular leaders?
- What issues related to students impact a faculty’s ability to be curricular leaders?

Unit Leadership’s Role

- What is your role as a Dean or Department Chair in facilitating curricular leadership?
- What is the role of the University in facilitating curricular leadership?

Wrap-Up (5 Minutes)
We’re almost out of time for today. Any final thoughts?
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#### Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Curricular Leadership Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Overview</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator: Terri L. Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are being invited to participate in a research study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Research Study:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of this study is twofold: 1) to describe the individual, institutional, environmental and leadership variables expressed by individual faculty regarding curricular leadership and 2) to gain a better understanding of the prompts that faculty curricular leaders use inherently without understanding curriculum theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The on-line survey responses will be confidential and automatically stored in a database that can then be easily converted to Excel or SPSS formats. The survey seeks to examine variables thought to be instrumental in the identification of faculty curricular leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Participating in this Research Study:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will have the opportunity to reflect on your understandings of curriculum leadership as a participant in a dissertation research project, and you will be providing knowledge that could assist universities in designing faculty development programs that focus on curriculum leadership capacity-building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks of Participating in this Research Study:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The risks are minimal and constitute no greater danger to the client than would ordinarily be expected in any on-line survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy and Confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any information that you provide will be confidential. The information collected will be used for research purposes, and will not be disclosed or released to anyone but the researcher conducting the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you have any questions or concerns regarding this curricular leadership study you may contact Terri Christensen, Doctoral Candidate at (330) 672-8613, or Dr. Sonia Alemagno and Dr. James Henderson, faculty advisors, at Kent State University, Kent Ohio (330) 672-8501 (Dr. Alemagno) or (330) 672-0631 (Dr. Henderson). This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330-672-2704.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Curricular Leadership Survey

*1. I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I also understand that portions of this survey instrument were previously published by Bland et al. (2002).

☐ Yes
☐ No
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**Individual, Institutional, and Leadership Factors**

Please check one response for each question or subpart that best describes you or your work environment.

### 2. I have adequate time to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Research Projects</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Enhance Curriculum</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfills Administrative Roles</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfills Service Roles (i.e., participate in committees)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Advising Load</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. I have been (or was when I was a junior faculty member) formally assigned an advisor or mentor within my academic department:

☐ Yes

☐ No
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### 4. Valuable guidance was provided in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing/Enhancing Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. I have (or had when I was a junior faculty member) an "informal" mentor(s) either in this department or in other departments/schools/organizations who provide me with valuable guidance in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing/Enhancing Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. I keep "up-to-date" in my field:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Interest area(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching area(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Literature area(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. I am highly committed to contributing to the success of my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. **I would describe myself as being internally driven to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Enhance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **I would like more opportunities to contribute to the leadership of my:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit’s curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **I have an academic unit that allows me to protect periods of uninterrupted time to address:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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11. For the following items, indicate if you believe you are currently up-to-date in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research skills for your area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grant (e.g., identifying your funding sources, contacting funding agency personnel, preparing grants, using research reviews)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education (curriculum design, various teaching formats - large lecture, small group, etc., student evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer skills (e.g., word processing, data management and analysis, presentation software, online searching, e-mail, Electronic Grants Management System - EGMS, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing skills (e.g., identifying appropriate outlet/audience, preparing materials according to specified format, constructing convincing/persuasive text, preparing charts/tables/figures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative skills (e.g., university procedures, personnel policies, strategies for facilitating productivity and high morale, strategic planning, conducting meetings, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I feel appreciated and valued by my local colleagues (depts/college/univ) for my work in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**13. I have excellent opportunities here to pursue my interests in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Institutional and Leadership Factors

**14. There is a high expectation in my department for faculty to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be productive in research (e.g., produce peer reviewed articles, develop innovations that can be patented or copyrighted)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct research that is externally funded</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide quality education (e.g., rated highly by students, achieves excellent objective student outcomes)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop/enhance/assess curriculum</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generate as much revenues as possible via non-teaching or research activities (e.g., patient care)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**15. A large portion of my academic department's faculty can be considered to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be productive in research (e.g., produce peer reviewed articles, develop innovations that can be patented or copyrighted)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be a significant external grant &quot;getter&quot;</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide quality education</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to the ongoing development of curricula and courses</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**16. I have a well developed network of colleagues with whom I discuss curriculum and education:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>within my academic department</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside my department/within Univ</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside the university</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**17. How do you best describe the environment in which you work (Check all that apply)?**

- [ ] Supportive
- [ ] Collegial
- [ ] Diverse
- [ ] Provides opportunities for scholarship
- [ ] Provides opportunities for advancement
- [ ] Provides incentives (monetary)
- [ ] Challenging
- [ ] Fractious
- [ ] Demanding
- [ ] Flexible
- [ ] Empathetic
- [ ] Compassionate
- [ ] Socially responsible
- [ ] Environmentally responsible
- [ ] Competitive
- [ ] Creative
- [ ] Cohesive
- [ ] Stable
- [ ] Small (fewer than 10 faculty members in the department)
- [ ] Large (greater than 10 faculty members in the department)
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18. At least weekly, I have substantive uninterrupted conversations with important colleagues about curriculum and education in my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. My unit administrator/department head is very supportive of my efforts in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>NA - I fill this role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. My unit administrator/department head is highly regarded for his or her:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>NA - I fill this role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. My college leader is highly regarded for her/his:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>NA - I fill this role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curricular leadership efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**22. I have access to adequate resources such as secretarial support, research/teaching assistants, computers, library materials, data analyses, technical support, clerical staff support etc., to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct my research projects</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide education (e.g., curriculum design)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfill administrative roles</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**23. My academic unit provides me with, or I have from external or other sources, adequate support to travel to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-based conferences</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education-based conferences</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**24. The number of faculty in my academic unit is large enough to accomplish our goals in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development/Enhancement</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**25. The skills, expertise, and experience of the faculty in my academic unit are appropriate to accomplish our goals in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development/Enhancement</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Curricular Leadership Survey

#### 26. My opinions are routinely solicited for important decisions in my academic unit.
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither Agree/Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Not Applicable - My role is to formally serve as the administrator of the academic unit

#### 27. My opinions are seriously considered by leadership in my academic unit when making important decisions.
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither Agree/Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Not Applicable - My role is to formally serve as the administrator of the academic unit

#### 28. It is expected that faculty will meaningfully and actively contribute to important decisions in my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 29. I get constructive feedback, guidance, and suggestions that help my efforts to perform my best from my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unit head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleagues outside my unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associate dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Curricular Leadership Survey

#### 30. My department leadership (e.g., department head, senior faculty) actively nominates the following individuals for awards, honors, and growth opportunities such as fellowships or new positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-career faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 31. My department has systematic and fair mechanisms for non-monetary recognizing and celebrating achievements (e.g. putting in department newsletter, "toasting" at faculty meetings) in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 32. When money is available, my department has systematic and fair mechanisms for monetarily recognizing and rewarding achievements in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty Curricular Leadership Survey

### Strategies

**33. Please check the two strategies that would most facilitate your teaching.**

- [ ] Require that tenure be granted only to individuals who demonstrate excellence in teaching.
- [ ] Provide honorary awards for teaching achievements (based on evaluations, e.g., by students or peers, or student performance on standardized tests).
- [ ] Provide salary increases for teaching achievements (based on evaluations, e.g., by students or peers, or student performance on standardized tests).
- [ ] Support you (e.g., release time) while you acquire new teaching skills.
- [ ] Provide training on new teaching strategies, including electronic teaching tools (e.g., Power Point, animation software, web-based instruction).
- [ ] Create a financial benefit to your department for the teaching you do (e.g., tuition recovery).
- [ ] Value equally all forms of teaching (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, clinical).

**34. Please check the two strategies that would, in general, most facilitate your productivity in curriculum development.**

- [ ] Provide a formal mentoring program for junior faculty.
- [ ] Provide more opportunities for senior faculty to contribute and to continue to grow.
- [ ] Provide coaches for faculty interested in curriculum development.
- [ ] Dedicate time, funds, and resources to curriculum exploration.
- [ ] Designate a faculty development person to coordinate strategies to help faculty succeed in curriculum development efforts.

**35. Please add any other strategies you think would be helpful to you as you think about your own curricular leadership efforts**

---
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Work Information

36. On average, in 2013, how many hours each week were you involved in: (Numerical answers only)

- teaching
- research
- curriculum
- development/enhancement efforts
- administration
- university service (committee participation, etc.)
- outreach
- other faculty work (specify)

37. What age range are you in?

- 18 to 29
- 30 to 39
- 40 to 49
- 50 to 59
- 60 or older

38. What is your gender:

- Male
- Female

39. What is your ethnic origin? (check one)

- Chicano, Latino, Hispanic
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- African American
- White or Caucasian

Other (please specify):
### Faculty Curricular Leadership Survey

#### 40. What is your formal education (please check all that apply)?

- [ ] MD
- [ ] CNP
- [ ] MPH
- [ ] MA/MS
- [ ] PhD
- [ ] Clinical Fellowship
- [ ] Research Fellowship (less than one year full time)
- [ ] Research Fellowship (equal to or more than one year full time)
- [ ] Post-PhD Fellowship
- [ ] Education Fellowship (less than one year full time)
- [ ] Education Fellowship (equal to or more than one year full time)

Other (please specify)

#### 41. What is your current academic rank? (check one)

- [ ] Instructor
- [ ] Assistant Professor
- [ ] Associate Professor
- [ ] Professor
- [ ] Position does NOT carry an academic title

Other (please specify)
### Faculty Curricular Leadership Survey

42. Please check the college that you hold your primary appointment

- [ ] College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability & Technology
- [ ] College of Architecture and Environmental Design
- [ ] College of the Arts
- [ ] College of Arts and Sciences
- [ ] College of Business Administration
- [ ] College of Communication and Information
- [ ] College of Education, Health, and Human Services
- [ ] University Libraries
- [ ] College of Nursing
- [ ] College of Podiatric Medicine
- [ ] College of Public Health

43. Number of years I have been teaching

- [ ] 0-5
- [ ] 5-10
- [ ] 10-15
- [ ] 15-20
- [ ] 20-25
- [ ] 25-30
- [x] 30+

44. How do you best describe your personal and social circumstances (check all that apply)?

- [ ] I feel fulfilled
- [ ] I am satisfied with my health
- [ ] I have been able to achieve my professional goals
- [ ] I have been able to get as much education as I have wanted
- [ ] I have the means to enjoy life
- [ ] I have enough leisure time to relax and recharge
- [ ] I engage in spiritual practices if I choose
- [ ] I can put myself in another's shoes
- [ ] I practice recycling
- [ ] I have been able to reach my personal goals with few barriers
- [ ] I am motivated by my work and working with my colleagues in an intellectually stimulating way
- [ ] I am detached from my work
- [ ] I have too much anxiety in my work life
- [ ] I have too much anxiety in my personal life
- [ ] I am committed to the vision of my university
- [ ] I feel respected in my workplace

45. Please give a brief account of your curricular leadership experience and mention any courses and/or programs in which you were instrumental in developing.
Faculty Curricular Leadership Survey

46. In relation to your academic interests and personal perspectives, please describe your aptitude and motivation to gain curricular leadership experiences, including your preparation for this role, and your commitment to development in this area.

47. What additional comments do you have about the issues presented in this survey?
Thank you for taking time out to participate in my survey. I truly value the information you have provided.
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