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Executive summary

The Australian higher education sector needs a new generation of effective and capable leaders if it is to ensure a prosperous future. It is no longer good enough to wait for new leaders to surface. They must be nurtured and developed if universities are to avoid facing a leadership succession crisis.

“While there are strong societal pressures that maintain leadership as a mysterious brotherhood into which only the cognoscenti are admitted, an international leadership crisis in education and other fields demands that we nurture and develop leaders and not wait, hoping that tradition and primogeniture will suffice to fill the next generation of leadership roles” (Reeves, 2008).

The PROPEL project is a practical response to this anticipated leadership crisis in universities. Through the development, trialling and dissemination of a new leadership program targeting pre-leadership academics, the project aims to provide institutions across the sector with a proven and cost-effective framework from which to customise their own academic leadership development programs.

The PROPEL Program (Program for Preparing Early Leaders) is the major deliverable of this project, and is provided online for use by Australian higher education institutions in the form of the PROPEL Resource at <research.uow.edu.au/propel>.

The project took a two-stage approach to creating the PROPEL Program:

- **Stage one** consisted of undertaking broad qualitative and quantitative research into academic leadership. The aim of this research was to identify the skills and personal characteristics found in excellent university leaders, and particularly to highlight those which may be specific to the academic leadership environment. The research also aimed to identify which of those skills and characteristics can realistically be taught, thus driving the focus of the PROPEL Program.

- **Stage two** saw the creation and trialling of the 12-month PROPEL Program with a group of 15 carefully selected pre-leadership academics from University of Wollongong, University of Ballarat, University of South Australia and Queensland University of Technology. The pilot Program was based at the University of Wollongong.

Findings of the project’s leadership research brought out two distinct sets of attributes which are considered important in an effective academic leader — those that can be taught and those that can’t (or would be very difficult). The profile of those ‘important but unteachable’ characteristics has been incorporated into the PROPEL Program participant selection guidelines. The teachable characteristics have been summarised into a set of leadership attribute domains upon which the components of the PROPEL Program were built.
By selecting participants for leadership development who already demonstrate the ‘unteachable’ qualities of a good leader, and focusing development activity on those areas where a training program has some chance of long-term impact, the PROPEL Program provides a strong opportunity for universities to positively influence the quality of their future leaders.

The 12-month PROPEL Program pilot was a revealing journey for both the participants and the project team. All 15 participants successfully completed the Program, and it was through their enthusiasm, insights and experiences that the Program grew richer and more practical.

The final structure of the PROPEL Program model is a single, homogeneous program which brings together multiple facets of leadership development. It consists of six interrelated components — Mentoring, Networking, Big Picture, Leadership Skills, Active and Reflective — each focusing on the development and practice of broad leadership skills and the growth of confidence as a leader.

A unique feature of PROPEL is that it targets more than just one type of leadership, giving participants the opportunity to reflect on the kind of leadership they are interested in and suited to at a formative point in their academic careers. The PROPEL Program is designed to target academic staff who are at a ‘pre-leadership’ stage, but have shown leadership ability and potential. Traditionally, leadership training is only available to those already in leadership positions and is usually focused on performing a particular role, such as Dean or Head of School. The PROPEL Program takes an unashamedly proactive approach by giving potential future academic leaders a taste of the day-to-day complexities of university leadership well before they commence their first leadership roles, thereby laying the foundations for their entire leadership careers.

The PROPEL project will be of benefit to institutions across the higher education sector, whether or not they currently have an academic leadership development strategy. The PROPEL Program is compartmentalised and easily adaptable, and can be used in its entirety or by taking up selected components to supplement existing programs. Institutions which implement PROPEL will be taking proactive steps to develop a pool of candidates for future leadership roles, and will be supporting and nurturing their most promising academics who, as skilful leaders, will inspire the people around them and take their institutions forward, even before they reach a formal leadership position.

Summary of major recommendations

1. Leadership development should be provided to suitable ‘pre-leadership’ academics in order to support the succession planning process.
2. A multi-component development program such as the PROPEL Program should be adopted to expose ‘pre-leadership’ academics to the wide range of issues, both self-focused and organisational-focused, which they face as potential leaders.
3. The PROPEL Resource should be utilised by institutions to build a multi-component leadership development program for ‘pre-leadership’ academics which can be customised to fit with existing academic development strategies.
Overview of the PROPEL project

1 Context and need for the project

The anticipated leadership crisis in the Australian higher education sector demands that universities take active steps to nurture and develop new leaders to ensure they will have the skills and attributes to carry the sector forward. To do this successfully, the PROPEL project leaders believe a new approach to leadership development is needed.

It is acknowledged that “effective and capable” (Scott, Coates and Anderson, 2008, p. vii) academic leaders are essential in higher education. However, concern about replenishment suggests we are facing a “succession crisis” (Scott et al., 2008, p. xv). “While there are strong societal pressures that maintain leadership as a mysterious brotherhood into which only the cognoscenti are admitted, an international leadership crisis in education and other fields demands that we nurture and develop leaders and not wait, hoping that tradition and primogeniture will suffice to fill the next generation of leadership roles” (Reeves, 2008, p. 1).

Leadership is “… a practical and everyday process of supporting, managing, developing and inspiring academic colleagues” (Ramsden, 1998, p. 4).

While this sounds simple at first, the increasing complexity of the academic environment makes leadership quite challenging, in our view requiring future academic leaders who react quickly to internal and external challenges, think beyond disciplinary boundaries, live collaboration, inspire people, and genuinely care about the development of their staff. Such leaders are rare and often the result of fortuitous circumstances rather than pro-active development.

We argue, then, that Australia needs a new generation of effective and capable leaders to ensure a prosperous future for its tertiary education sector and that pro-active development of such leaders needs to start at the early career stage of academics, rather than waiting until they undertake leadership roles. The PROPEL project proposes a one year intensive leadership program for early career academics (Program for Preparing Early Leaders — PROPEL) which will immediately start to train future academic leaders, locally and nationally, as well as resulting in a model that is transferable to other institutions.

In the past there has been a “deeply entrenched association of leadership with hierarchy and authority” (Parker, 2008, p. 3). The majority of leadership programs are therefore targeted at academics who are already on the leadership ladder (e.g. courses and seminars offered by the LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management). New appointees to leadership roles can become overwhelmed, so early planning and development is crucial.
2 Focus of the project

The PROPEL project’s focus is squarely on developing a practical response to the anticipated leadership crisis in universities through the development, trialling and dissemination of the PROPEL Leadership Development Program. Our aim is to provide institutions across the sector with a framework, from which to customise their own development programs, which meets the needs of ‘pre-leadership’ academics.

Through this project we hope to contribute to raising the awareness of a potential leadership crisis in the sector by:

1. Provision of a model as a potential solution for the academic leadership crisis.
2. Provision of a pool of candidates for future leadership positions who are equipped with leadership skills for the future.
3. Fostering of collaboration between faculties and Australian universities.

3 Methodology — Developing and trialling a new leadership program for the sector

3.1 Leadership research

The PROPEL project needed to establish a clear understanding of what good academic leadership looks like before it could start the work of building a development program aimed at producing good academic leaders.

The project undertook a three-phase research study aimed at producing a catalogue of leadership attributes that were considered essential to good academic leadership, and which were believed to be teachable.

The three phases of this research study were:

1. Literature review of existing work on academic leadership attributes.
2. Qualitative study consisting of interviews with a sample of academic staff in non-leadership roles.
3. Qualitative study consisting of an online survey of all academic staff at one Australian university.

The research study is described in detail in Part 1 of this report.

3.2 Pilot leadership development program

With the knowledge gained from the research study into academic leadership, the project designed, trialled and evaluated the 12-month ‘Program for Preparing Early Leaders (PROPEL)’. 
Development phase

The aims of the development phase were to:

1. Establish relationships with project stakeholders within and outside of UOW.
2. Promote interest in, understanding of and support for the PROPEL project among key executive staff at UOW.
3. Develop all six components of the PROPEL Program.
4. Synthesise outcomes of the leadership research study into the PROPEL Program framework.
5. Develop processes required to support the PROPEL Program, such as participant selection guidelines, self-assessment and 360 degree feedback instruments.

At the outset of the development phase, the project conducted stakeholder identification and expectation assessment exercises. The Project Team and Advisory Board were established and consultation commenced. This consultation was ongoing for the life of the project, with the Project Team being an especially valuable source of critical feedback and new ideas. In addition, a number of Australian universities were approached and invited to put forward applicants to be involved as participants in the pilot PROPEL Program.

A promotion strategy was developed to ensure key executive staff at UOW were fully aware of the aims of the PROPEL project and were publicly supportive of the project’s activities. This strategy consisted of individual meetings and group presentations, followed up by regular project bulletins.

The six PROPEL Program Components which had been envisaged at the commencement of the project — Mentoring, Active, Big Picture, Reflective, Interdisciplinary and Leadership Skills — were fully developed, including documentation of guidelines and development of training and supporting materials. A number of components, such as the Active and Big Picture Components, required the cooperation of key university staff including Deans and Chairs of university-level committees. Liaison and negotiation with these key staff was undertaken and their support established.

The outcomes of the leadership research study were considered in the context of the six Program Components. A skills matrix was developed to ensure all leadership attributes identified by the research study were incorporated in the Program. The list of identified attributes heavily influenced the content and structure of the three-day Leadership Skills Workshop.

Processes surrounding the implementation of the pilot PROPEL Program were developed. These included the negotiation and articulation of the participant selection process, and the development of two new leadership assessment tools: The PROPEL Leadership Self-Assessment instrument and the PROPEL 360 Degree Feedback Leadership Assessment instrument.
**Trial phase**

The trial phase commenced in June 2010 with the Information Session for prospective applicants. Overall, the trial phase lasted for 15 months, including the 12-month PROPEL Program itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 June 2010</td>
<td>Information Session for prospective applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 July 2010</td>
<td>Participant applications close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 August 2010</td>
<td>Participant Selection Committee meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 August 2010</td>
<td>Program Launch for participants and mentors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 2010</td>
<td>Participants complete the PROPEL leadership self-assessment questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 September 2010</td>
<td>Supervisors, colleagues and reports of participants complete the PROPEL 360 degree leadership feedback questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2010</td>
<td>Participants submit Active Leadership Project proposals for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 28 and 29 September 2010</td>
<td>Three-day Leadership Skills Workshop attended by participants and project leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>Mentoring meetings commence (held monthly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>PROPEL participant network meetings commence (held monthly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>First committee attendance by participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 February 2011</td>
<td>Program Mid-Point Workshop (including Interdisciplinary Forum).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>Second committee attendance by participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August 2011</td>
<td>Active Project outcomes presentation event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>Participants repeat the PROPEL leadership self-assessment questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>Supervisors, colleagues and reports of participants repeat the PROPEL 360 degree leadership feedback questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 September 2011</td>
<td>Reflective Event and participant graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifteen participants were selected to take part in the trial PROPEL Program. Twelve participants were selected from UOW applicants, spread across 10 faculties. Three participants external to UOW were also selected, one each from University of South Australia, Queensland University of Technology, and University of Ballarat.

**Evaluation phase**

At the completion of the trial Program, the structure and content of the Program were evaluated. Evaluation included indicators of changes in leadership ability as measured through the PROPEL Leadership Assessment instruments (both self-assessment and 360 degree), through feedback from participants gained throughout the Program, and through feedback from other key players in the Program such as the leadership mentors.

*The pilot PROPEL Program is described in detail in Part 2 of this report.*
4 Outcomes of the project and *The PROPEL Resource*

The 12-month PROPEL Program pilot was delivered as planned, with all 15 participants successfully completing the Program. Much was learned from the experiences of the participants, who provided clear and honest feedback on all aspects of the Program, as well as on their thoughts and plans about following a leadership career in academia.

The original design of the PROPEL Program was adjusted and enhanced based on the outcomes of the pilot Program. The final structure of the PROPEL model is a single, homogeneous program which brings together multiple facets of leadership development. It consists of six interrelated components — Mentoring, Networking, Big Picture, Leadership Skills, Active and Reflective — each focusing on the development and practice of broad leadership skills and the growth of confidence as a leader.

The major deliverable of this project is *The PROPEL Resource* — a comprehensive user guide and materials kit available for use by universities and other institutions as a starting point for building in-house leadership development programs for pre-leadership academics.

*The PROPEL Resource is available online at* <research.uow.edu.au/propel>. *Copies of a selection of elements from the PROPEL Resource are included in Part 3 of this report.*
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PART 1: Understanding Academic Leadership
PART 1: Understanding Academic Leadership

1 Background

Australian universities will need a new generation of “effective and capable” (Scott, Coates and Anderson, 2008, p. vii) leaders to ensure a prosperous future for the tertiary education sector.

“While there are strong societal pressures that maintain leadership as a mysterious brotherhood into which only the cognoscenti are admitted, an international leadership crisis in education and other fields demands that we nurture and develop leaders and not wait, hoping that tradition and primogeniture will suffice to fill the next generation of leadership roles” (Reeves, 2008, p. 1).

The PROPEL project is based on the argument that efforts to develop good leaders need to start in the early stages of their academic career, well before they commence their first leadership roles. By approaching leadership development in this way, universities can be pro-active in counteracting the anticipated leadership succession crisis.

2 Defining good academic leadership

Leadership is “... a practical and everyday process of supporting, managing, developing and inspiring academic colleagues” (Ramsden, 1998).

While this sounds simple at first, the increasing complexity of the academic environment makes academic leadership quite challenging. The PROPEL project needed a clear understanding of what good academic leadership looked like before it could start the work of building a development program aimed at producing good academic leaders.

Empirical research on effective leadership in the higher education sector, though, has been somewhat limited (Pounder, 2001; Scott, Coates and Anderson, 2008), a situation which the ALTC Leadership grants have sought to address. Consequently, our initial literature searches drew on the broader leadership research, particularly that which explored transformational leadership (see, for example, Bass and Avolio, 1988; Johnston and Caldwell, 2001). Transformational leaders can be defined as “those who stimulate and inspire followers to both achieve extraordinary outcomes and, in the process, develop their own leadership capacity” (Bass and Riggio, 2006, p. 3). They are characterised by their passion, energy, enthusiasm, and vision. Ramsden (1998) drew on this theoretical framework in drawing attention to the aspects of leadership that are both shared and different for leaders in the higher education sector compared to leaders of other organisations.
In sharpening our search for higher education leadership, we found that the focus was on the skill set required of university leaders in a context of dramatic change in the sector. A small-scale study of 18 university leaders conducted by Drew, Ehrich, and Hansford (2008), for example, determined that effective leaders in the university context possessed the following skill set: people skills; supported growth and provided opportunities for others; possessed credibility and trustworthiness; role models; demonstrated ethical, inclusive and collaborative behaviours; strategic thinking; clear communication of the goals and vision for the university; understanding of organisational priorities; and, access to required resources and connections.

We then reviewed a variety of sources of information on leadership skills and characteristics. Primarily, the project focused on the comprehensive study by Scott, Coates and Anderson (2008) which developed a set of characteristics based on input from over 500 university leaders (Table 1).

Table 1: Top Twelve Ranking Leadership Capabilities
(the rank of each item is given in brackets, 1 – highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal capabilities</th>
<th>Cognitive capabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being true to one’s personal values and ethics (2)</td>
<td>Identifying from a mass of information the core issue or opportunity in any situation (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining calm under pressure or when things take an unexpected turn (3)</td>
<td>Making sense of and learning from experience (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding my personal strengths and limitations (5)</td>
<td>Thinking creatively and laterally (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and passion for L&amp;T (7)</td>
<td>Diagnosing the underlying causes of a problem and taking appropriate action to address it (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitting to and learning from my errors (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal capabilities</th>
<th>Skills and knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being transparent and honest in dealings with others (1)</td>
<td>Being able to organise my work and manage time effectively (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathising and working productively with staff and other key players from a wide range of backgrounds (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Scott et al., 2008, p. 74)

Another source of information on the characteristics of good academic leaders came from the study by Marshall, Adams, and Cameron (2001) which asked the question ‘What does “academic leadership” mean to you?’ to groups of academics at different levels within the leadership spectrum.
To complement the information gained from the projects led by Scott and Marshall respectively, the PROPEL project also reviewed operational documents from within the University of Wollongong which aim to define academic leadership characteristics, the main one among these being the UOW Deans’ Capabilities Matrix. This matrix concurred with Scott and Marshall on many points, but also contributed some new characteristics and skills. The PROPEL project team also contributed their ideas on leadership attributes.

Finally, the project examined the development focus of the major provider of academic leadership training to Australian universities at the present time — the LH Martin Institute. The key learning outcomes from a number of LH Martin programs were considered, and again this contributed further to the total collection of leadership skills, characteristics and attributes considered necessary for good academic leadership.

The project’s understanding of how good academic leadership had been defined in the past was now quite clear. However, there was a part of the puzzle still missing. Traditionally, studies such as Scott et al have sought opinions on academic leadership as expressed by academics in leadership positions (generally at the level of Head of School and above). To balance this view, the project leaders were interested to examine the opinions of staff in non-leadership positions. What did they feel made a good academic leader?

Stage one of the PROPEL project consisted of undertaking broad qualitative and quantitative research into academic leadership. The aim of this research was to identify the skills and personal characteristics found in excellent university leaders, and particularly to highlight those which may be specific to the academic leadership environment. The research also aimed to identify which of those skills and characteristics can realistically be taught, thus driving the focus of the PROPEL Program.

Findings of the project’s leadership research brought out two distinct sets of attributes which are considered important in an effective academic leader — those that can be taught and those that can’t (or would be very difficult). The profile of those ‘important but unteachable’ characteristics has been used to develop the participant selection guidelines for the PROPEL Program. The teachable characteristics have been built into the content of the PROPEL Program. By selecting participants for leadership development who already demonstrate the ‘unteachable’ qualities of a good leader, and focusing development activity on those areas where a training program has some chance of long-term impact, the PROPEL program provides a strong opportunity for universities to positively influence the quality of their future leaders.
2.1 Qualitative Study: Academic leadership from the perspective of academic staff in non-leadership positions

The study by Marshall, Adams and Cameron (2001) indicated that non-leadership staff understood the focus of leadership to be on people, whereas those in leadership roles viewed the focus of leadership in terms of task.

The purpose of the PROPEL qualitative study was to test if non-leadership academic staff at UOW viewed leadership in a similar way to that suggested by Marshall et al. The study also wished to examine if non-leadership staff felt skills required for good academic leadership differed to leadership skills required outside the university environment, and which skills and characteristics of a good leader could or could not be taught.

Methodology

Email invitations to take part in an interview were sent to 245 UOW academic staff at levels A (Associate Lecturer) to C (Senior Lecturer). This represented 38% of the total population of 647 staff at these levels. Invitations were targeted to ensure an even representation of levels and faculties, as well as of teaching and research staff. Any staff who held a leadership role were excluded from the invitation list. (For the purpose of this study a ‘leadership role’ was defined as chair of a faculty-level committee or a formalised leadership position.) Where a faculty had less than three teaching staff or research staff at a particular level, interview invitations were not sent as confidentiality of responses could not be ensured.

A minimum of 20 interviews was anticipated. In total, 23 interviews were conducted. The spread of interview respondents was as follows:

Table 2: Breakdown of Interview Respondents by Faculty and Level
(n/a indicates no invitations were sent to this group due to low staff numbers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Level A</th>
<th>Level B</th>
<th>Level C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach</td>
<td>Rsch</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informatics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolyungah</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewees were asked to respond to the following questions:

1. What are the most outstanding POSITIVE skills and characteristics of leaders you have experienced?
2. What are the most difficult NEGATIVE characteristics or lack of leadership skills you have experienced?
3. Do you believe there are leadership skills or characteristics which are specific to the university environment?
4. Of the leadership skills and characteristics you have mentioned, which do you feel are the most important? Please give each a ranking (with 1 being most important).
5. Are there any skills or characteristics on your list which you believe cannot be taught?

Results

Questions 1, 2 and 4

Responses to the questions on generic leadership skills and characteristics are summarised below. The majority of statements concern how the leader interacts with members of staff, with the strongest focus being on:

- communication
- service to and interest in staff
- empowerment
- equity

Statements are shown in order of frequency (number of statements shown in brackets).

From the perspective of non-leadership academic staff, a good leader demonstrates . . .

- Good communication — listening, consultation, feedback, consistent responses, sharing information (31)
- Service to staff — concerned with supporting and helping staff achieve, not driven by self-interest, ego, power (22)
- Genuine interest in people — a ‘people person’, connecting with staff on a personal level (22)
- Opportunity giver, empowering staff (19)
- Equity towards staff — fairness, consistency of treatment (19)
- Direction, vision, strategic thinking (12)
- Professionalism in dealing with people, respect, appropriate behaviour (11)
- Transparency, honesty, integrity (10)
- Confident decision maker (9)
- Valuing staff — achievements, diversity (9)
- Support for collaboration (7)
- Well organised, including appropriate delegation (7)
- Maturity — self-understanding, resilience (6)
- Responsible/sensitive initiation and management of change (6)
• Guiding, not driving staff — not autocratic (4)
• Fosters team cohesion and collegiality (4)
• Role model who is passionate about their discipline (4)
• Inclusiveness (3)
• Personality is suited to a leadership role (3)
• Mentoring (3)
• Dealing appropriately with people who are under pressure (3)
• Self-motivated and motivates others (3)
• Diplomacy and negotiation skills (2)
• Avoids micro-managing (2)
• Supports faculty staff within the organisation — ‘goes into bat’ for them (2)
• Understands rules and applies them appropriately (2)
• Manages staff workload (2)

**Question 4**

Question 4 asked respondents to rank their statements in order of priority. Not all respondents were able do this. The following list shows the skills/characteristics which were ranked as number one by those respondents who undertook a ranking. (Number of times ranked #1 shown in brackets.)

- Communication (5)
- Vision, direction (4)
- Service to staff (3)
- Transparency, honesty (3)
- Equity (2)
- Respect, professionalism (2)
- Interest in staff as people (2)
- Inclusiveness (1)
- Opportunity giver (1)
- Valuing staff (1)
- Motivating (1)
- Decision making (1)
- Resilience (1)
- Organised (1)

**Question 3**

Responses to the question about specific skills required by an academic leader varied widely. Only 4 respondents felt there were no special skills required to be a good leader in the academic environment. Others felt there were a number of special challenges faced by academic leaders.
Responses are grouped into five broad categories:

1. Combining academic and administrative roles
2. Leading academic staff
3. Organisational structure and constraints
4. Academic integrity
5. Suitability to lead

### Combining academic and administrative roles

- Keeping in sight that universities’ main aim is the production of knowledge. Not letting this become overwhelmed by day to day issues. Keep it front of mind in meetings, seminars.
- Academic intellectual leadership must complement administrative leadership: uphold values of teaching, students as core business, interest in students’ concerns. Explosion in middle management. Leaders must uphold values of good academic life as a balance with management demands.
- Dealing with the underlying conflict between academic and administrative priorities and the problems of academics being at loggerheads with general staff even though they rely on them.
- Leader has too much tension between managing own research requirements and organisational management requirements. Successful researcher and successful leader are probably two different personality types being expected to be found in one role/person. People in this situation of tension are not inspirational to others.
- Too many academics are spending their time sitting on committees when their strengths are not in the administration area. Would be better to employ administrators or managers with these skills and leave academics to do what they do best.
- Flexibility, elasticity of mind so you can be good at teaching, research, governance, budgets all at the same time.
- Be responsible to the students, respect their time.
- Balancing all the demands of an academic career (and other demands, especially for women).

### Leading academic staff

- In a company everyone is working towards the same ‘product’ — in universities academics are like separate entities.
- Academic environment has wider brief than is found in organisations with a common company purpose. People pointing in different directions need to be brought together.
- Develop sense of working together in people who pride themselves on the value of their own individual work.
Leadership of academics is hard because they are individualistic, entrepreneurial, self-determining. Leader needs to have a tolerance for these characteristics and work out how to allow academics to express them while still meeting objectives of the organisation.

Academics are less inclined to follow the corporate model. Leader needs to help people pursue their own goals while keeping them aligned.

Able to deal with idiosyncratic or difficult people. Micro-manage people whose individual goals are not necessarily consistent with the institutional goals. Passive aggressive non-team players.

Allow different people to develop, bring strength to the organisation as whole to develop institutional outputs and branding.

Dealing with diversity of staff who are all highly intelligent and articulate when it comes to arguing their point.

Dealing with people of different ages and styles.

Unis full of communicators. Leaders get into trouble if they don’t communicate effectively with these staff. Creates resentment and forms cliques.

Academics can be harder to manager because they are not just money orientated. Need to find other ways of motivating and encouraging them rather than traditional measures which apply in private sector. People can get dissatisfied if they don’t seem to proceed in their careers in a way which is meeting their own expectations. Some don’t even want to get on the progression band wagon, so a different model of motivation and reward is needed for them.

Flexibility of work hours is unique in academia — leaders need to be aware of and reasonable in their expectations of time given to the job by their academic staff, and general staff as well in a different way.

Leader must understand and balance disparate requirements of different disciplines e.g. publication rates.

Gender equity — male academics tend to have an advantage. Leader needs to even this out.

Good leaders can make the most of the potential of staff who are the ‘rain makers’ but understand the necessity of encouraging and supporting the people who provide the ‘bread and butter’ services.

Good leaders cultivate people with differential expectations and directs competitiveness into positive directions rather than it becoming divisive.

Research — new academics need close guidance through the whole research process, especially importance of and support for grant applications. Leader needs to act as a research mentor with their new academic staff.

Student issues — leader needs to provide guidance on how to relate to students, manage student issues. Especially important for new academics to make the personal transition from being a student themselves to being an academic.

Provide support for writing journal articles, and which journals to target.

Leaders need to support staff to work on journal articles without interruption some times.

Understanding the other pressures on staff who are not publishing enough.
Organisational structure and constraints

- Leadership in an organisation which is single focussed is more straightforward than one which is multifaceted. Tension between teaching and research. How does organisation create a nexus at an organisational level, when these are often pointing in opposite directions? Leaders need to understand their own prejudices on this point first, and then understand others who may have a different position.
- Different levels of thought processes are needed for different types of leadership roles: sense of vision for uni’s direction, political savvy (e.g. marketing manager), planning and organisation skills (e.g. committee chairs), compassion and empathy for students (e.g. program leader).
- Ability to develop interfaculty communication and collaboration.
- University systems often don’t support collegiality e.g. promotion based on personal achievement.
- Need to break down barriers between faculties. No need to reinvent the wheel, information should be shared. Any competitiveness between faculties should be turned into a positive for the uni to be strong in the international arena, not a matter of competition for funding.
- Ever-changing research funding environment (govt/political).
- Pressure to fund own research costs. Leader needs to recognise this.
- Universities are less autonomous than industry.
- Sources of funding for unis (govt, grants etc) puts leaders in position of making good use of money within budget, with an eye to getting grant money in without becoming too dependent on it (and therefore vulnerable).
- Difference in leadership for small or large faculties.
- Military style chain of command is getting worse. This is hampering decision making. Too many levels of bureaucracy.
- Reading, and assisting others to read, the broader context, especially in a hierarchical institution like a university.
- Knowledge of rules and regulations.
- At executive level — has to be part of the business community, interact with the wider community.
- Strategy, and engagement in strategy, is lacking at universities.
- Often people are brought into universities because of their skill set gained in the outside world, but then are made to conform to uni culture.
- Research Fellows and Post Doc’s mostly on short contracts. They worry about job security. This makes it very hard for them to focus on longer term career development. UOW needs a plan for long term career building which includes these staff.
Academic integrity

- Teaching and research integrity — fostering collaboration, supporting professional development in staff.
- Connection between teaching and research very important. Must be brought together and acknowledged. Leaders coming from industry lack this.
- Softening boundaries between disciplines while keeping excellence in own discipline. Leaders must encourage this environment and make time in staff jobs for this.
- Leaders must lead in all areas of teaching, research and community engagement.
- Innovative, genuine and successful teachers — not just researchers.
- Must have working knowledge of the discipline.
- Leadership needs to give focus to dynamic, rapid changes happening in the discipline and their social implications. Not get stuck in conservative, traditional models.
- Must be highly respected scholar within field and institution. Respected academic can open up pathways for their staff. Leaders who are not respected academics try to keep their units isolated and dependent on them. They lack the links and relationships and are embarrassed by this.
- Not just about leadership from the top and outputs by the top professors, but encouraging intellectual life to flourish.

Suitability to lead

- Academic success requires self-focus, leading people is opposite to this. Many people are in leadership roles who are just focussed on themselves and where they want to go.
- People are often put in leadership roles without the right skills e.g. senior researcher not necessarily going to make a good leader. Leader doesn’t necessarily need to be the highest expert in the field. May be more appropriate for more junior staff to be leaders.
- Academics develop in an environment of competition, need to prove themselves, political manoeuvring, to protect and promote their own ideas. They have very aggressive PR backgrounds. Academic leaders continue this behaviour when it is no longer appropriate. They often don’t recognise why they are doing it. To correct this, need a technique to move issues forward based on areas of agreement rather than areas of conflict.
- Leadership skills learned in industry would benefit academic leaders, e.g. management skills.
- If leader has only been in academia, they need the skills as a business leader as well e.g. academic would not be a good choice in leadership role involving marketing program.
• People put into leadership roles cold, with no previous experience. Often the corporate memory of their predecessor has been lost and there is a lack of mentoring for the new leader.
• Having been an academic is important for a leader so they can impart their own experience to those coming up the ranks.
• Coming up through the ranks is important — is seen as more authentic than bringing in a ‘generic’ manager from outside.
• Academic leaders can have a tendency to be snobbish.
• Unis have had few career development programs for leaders (compared to industry or govt bodies). This lack of development shows through.
• When a person in the ‘box seat’ for succession to the HoD role it is the ideal time to do a leadership up skilling period.

Question 5

Responses to the question on whether any of the skills and characteristics mentioned by the respondent could be taught were divided. Some respondents felt confident that anything could be taught given the right circumstances and had suggestions for how this could best be achieved. Others identified areas which would prove difficult (but not impossible) to teach but would require a more long-term approach to learning. Others felt there were some characteristics that were innate and would be impossible to teach to people of certain personality types.

The three types of responses are summarised below.

No leadership skills/characteristics are impossible to teach

• With good will from participants, all should be ok to teach.
• All can be taught, but will get to a point with some people where their own personality will determine how much they listen to and take in, how much they will honour.
• Better to try to train leaders than to let people bumble through.
• Real training in leadership should not just encompass an academic’s own discipline. It should be like an apprenticeship.
• Exposure to different types of leadership can improve techniques.
• Must teach change management, communication, dealing with conflict. Start course with “What do we/UOW mean by leadership?”
• All ok to be taught if done the right way. Learning needs to be interactive, experiential, each participant getting a turn of being a leader in a situation (possibly filmed) and then gets feedback from the group.
• Need process to identify people to train who will make good leaders.
• 360 degree feedback useful.
• Find out how diplomacy is taught — possibly history and politics staff?
• Use provocative hypothetical problems to demonstrate issues. Will have a more lasting impact.
• Include information on law and ethics.
• Re selection of participants — motivation to become a leader needs to be assessed. Good motivation involves sense of being of service. Poor motivation includes narcissistic, superiority tendencies.
• Not many people know about UOW development support and other support available through faculties.
• Theoretical models exist for servant leadership.

A person’s temperament will govern what they will do well in. Need to find a match between temperament and type of leadership role (strategic, operational).

**Difficult (but not impossible) to teach — may need to be learned over time with guidance**

• Service to staff — can teach this philosophy, but leader must believe in it for it to work, and this comes down to experience and maturity.
• Maturity — can’t teach this, but having guidance to process your experiences can help, otherwise you may not learn from them.
• A leader who is taught what to do and begins to practise it is just putting on a performance of leadership until their maturity catches up. Support and reinforcement is needed to guide them while they are getting to that point.
• Learning leadership skills needs to be embedded over time — consider yearly followup, refresher with the participants.
• Valuing diversity would require a lot of self reflections.
• Many leadership problems are carried in by people when they are appointed. They then tend to be reinforced by top-end leaders. Difficult to stop this happening — may require Deans etc to engage in career development around these issues to ensure the system is supporting what new leaders are being taught.
• Allow people to develop as leaders — expose them to variety of people and roles with smaller leadership demands before being dropped into Head of School role.
• Different leadership personalities may be needed for different leadership roles — e.g. call centre leader compared to academic leader.
• Some leaders have naturally authoritative personalities, they are not approachable people. People going into leadership positions need to learn early on not to become like this. It is hard to change this type of leader once they are established in their ways.
• Can learn about leadership by watching others modelling good leadership (e.g. through mentoring). Can ‘get’ skills that can’t be directly taught in other ways.
• Not everyone is interested in learning about management.
• Networking/collaboration — some people not naturally inclined to do this, need to be pushed.
Impossible to teach — characteristics need to be innate

- ‘People person’ is a personality type — you either are one or you’re not. Non-people person types can still be good leaders, they have to work harder on it.
- Inclusion — hard for some who is over competitive.
- Valuing people — you can teach people about it but some people just don’t see it, it doesn’t come from within, because they are too busy focussing on their own agendas.
- Interpersonal skills need to be innate.
- To be a good teacher has to come from within.
- Can’t teach someone to be motivated themselves.
- Person must want to be in a leadership role. Not everyone has leadership potential.
- Generosity, daring, controlling own ego — can’t be taught.
- Supporting young researchers — senior researchers need to believe this is worth doing and be generous in their approach.
- Some negative traits in people will make teaching leadership problematic — abrasiveness, abruptness, stubbornness, resistance to new ideas.
- Look carefully at who we are grooming for what — can leadership be generalised?
- To be a leader you need a basic liking and respect for human beings, and to feel they can be trusted. Without this it is very hard to teach any of the other leadership skills.
- Some leaders are naturally charismatic and their personalities allow them to fall into leadership roles. They are extroverted and have the ability to engage and inspire people. Can’t really teach this.
- Come down to nature vs nurture — much of a person’s leadership style will have been determined by their home environment.

Conclusions

This study confirmed the findings of Marshall et al that non-leadership staff place greater value on the people-focused skills required by good leaders rather than the task-focused skills. Moreover, the study added a range of new leadership attributes to the list accumulated by the project from pre-existing sources, and introduced a balance of perspective.

The study found that non-leadership staff see good leaders as having well developed skills to communicate and interact with their staff and characteristics that make them supportive, personable and caring. While the vast majority of responses focussed on these areas, there was also strong acknowledgement that leaders needed vision and direction to be successful.

A range of specific challenges were identified which leaders in the university environment face, both in terms of the type of organisation itself and the people within it. There was some concern that success as an academic may actually build up a skill set which is opposite to that required for success as a leader.

There was general scepticism as to whether all the skills needed to be a good leader could be taught to all types of people. Some personality characteristics were seen as contradictory to good leadership. However, there was support for taking on the challenge of training academic leaders, especially if a wide variety of methods was explored.
3 Determining which attributes to target in the PROPEL Program

The results of the qualitative study described above, combined with attributes identified from the literature and operational sources, allowed the project to compile a list of 197 individual characteristics of good academic leadership. The original list of 197 attributes was analysed to eliminate statements which were essentially describing the same concept, reducing the list to 91 independent statements. Using Scott et al.’s leadership capability framework (2008, p. 18) the list was further categorised into ‘interpersonal’, ‘cognitive’, ‘skills and knowledge’ and ‘personal’ characteristics, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Source/s of Leadership Attributes Identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership statement</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPEL interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for consultation with their staff.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine interest in people — a ‘people person’, can connect with staff on a personal level.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give timely feedback to staff (both positive and negative).</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information openly with staff.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take time to listen to and understand needs of staff.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent responses to questions or requests from staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good listener</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is accessible, visible and approachable.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has strategies to successfully lead academic staff (who as a group are individualistic, entrepreneurial, self-determining, diverse in age and background, and have a wide range of motivators).</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional in dealings with people; demonstrate respect and appropriate behaviour.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote, support and reward collaboration and consultation outside own unit/faculty/institution.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive management of change.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look positively at ways to move forward and initiates change responsibly.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convey a sense of progress to staff and also to those outside the unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership statement</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure tangible outcomes from planning events, forums or meetings.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunity for reflection and planning.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create informal and formal forums for discussion.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal effectively with adversarial or difficult people to resolve conflict.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster team cohesion and collegiality.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop high performing teams.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an engaging environment which fosters innovation and creativity.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not driven by self-interest, ego, and power.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to be of service to staff and is concerned with supporting and helping staff achieve.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables and transform both their staff and their unit.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity giver; empower staff and build their confidence and abilities.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively assist staff to work better in ways which are visible to them.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster and champion the ideas and visions of others.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive of staff in decision making.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and consistency treatment of staff.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not privileging one aspect of academic work over another.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent, honest, showing integrity towards staff and developing trust.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work productively with staff and other key players from a wide range of backgrounds.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t become isolated from colleagues, is open to input.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build culture or achievement and continuous improvement.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build the culture of their unit/faculty, including develop attitudes of responsibility and mentoring for each other.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor others.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal appropriately with people who are under pressure.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomacy and negotiation skills.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide, not drive, staff — not autocratic.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership statement</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate others by acknowledging and celebrating successes.</td>
<td>PROPEL interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good influencer.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring people to task if necessary.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence with respect to self and staff.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident decision maker — keep their unit moving forward.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong advocate for their unit whilst at the same time having a strong commitment to the faculty and university.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident problem solver — diagnose the underlying causes of a problem and take appropriate action to address it.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong advocate for their unit/faculty within the organisation — ‘go into bat’ for their area.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a ‘can do’ attitude — commit to action, take responsibility and deliver results.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable working in complex situations of ambiguity and incomplete information.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes external networks.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance pressures from above with needs of staff below.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and work within an organisation which is multifaceted rather than single-focused.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political awareness, know how the system works.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a big-picture view.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify core issue or opportunity in any situation from a mass of information.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction, vision, originality.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t leave things to chance.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up-to-date with developments and anticipate opportunities.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage risk.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive initiatives, gain alignment and commitment.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek advice about problems before they get out of hand.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think and act strategically, creatively and laterally by ensuring access to information, being aware of the environment, and maintaining a capacity to seize and exploit opportunities.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link vision to strategy and strategy to operational plans.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate academic integrity and leadership in all areas of teaching, research and community engagement.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Leadership statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership statement</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successfully combine academic intellectual leadership with administrative leadership responsibilities.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sense of and learn from experience.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand personal strengths and limitations.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit to and learn from mistakes.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Skills and knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills and knowledge</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep control over resources.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make strategic use of budgets.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand rules of the institution and apply them appropriately.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the wider higher education context and environment.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the breadth of academic work.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well organised and manages own time effectively.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid micro-managing.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage staff workload fairly.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates appropriately.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remain calm under pressure or when things take an unexpected turn.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate resilience.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience, cooperativeness, consideration.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate a quality of excellence.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model who is passionate about their discipline.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show passion for both teaching and research.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit to ongoing personal and professional development.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to move from a self-focused academic role to a people-focussed leadership role.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity, self-understanding, self-motivation</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has conviction and a positive attitude.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive, energy, enthusiasm.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has charisma.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true to own personal values.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine regard for diversity and seeing difference as positive.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Having collated this extensive list of attributes, the project needed to ascertain which attributes should form the foundation of the PROPEL Program. It was clearly not realistic or achievable to attempt to cover all identified aspects of leadership within the scope of the Program.

The project determined to refine the list by applying two criteria:

1. Is this attribute ranked highly amongst all attributes on the list?
2. Is it considered possible to teach this attribute?

3.1 Quantitative Study: Which attributes of academic leadership are both essential and teachable?

The project undertook a quantitative study to identify the leadership attributes which met both criteria of importance and ‘teachability’.

Methodology

An online survey was produced from the list of leadership attributes developed in the qualitative phase (see Table 3 above). A copy of the PROPEL Leadership Survey questionnaire can be found at Appendix A. The survey was distributed to all academic staff at one Australian university (The University of Wollongong). In total, 877 email invitations were sent out asking academics to respond to the following questions relating to each of the leadership attributes:

1. whether they thought the attribute was ‘essential’, valuable’ or ‘not so important’ to have as a leader in academia;
2. whether they thought the attribute was more, less or equally important for academic leaders than for leaders in industry; and,
3. whether or not they thought the attribute could be taught (as opposed to being intrinsic to the person).

Results

In total 148 surveys were completed (17% of the total population). The sample contained 45 percent male and 55 percent female respondents (a slight shift from the overall population mix of 60% male and 40% female). The average age was 48 years (ranging from 29 to 66) and the average length of time working in academia was 15 years. The breakdown of respondents according to level, background and leadership status is shown in Tables 4, 5 and 6 respectively. Interestingly, the majority of respondents (71%) were currently in, or had previous experience in, an academic leadership role.
Table 4: Survey Respondents by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Survey Respondents by Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural background</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raised in Australia</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised overseas — English-speaking background</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised overseas — Non-English-speaking background</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Survey Respondents by Leadership Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership status</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently in a HIGH LEVEL leadership role at UOW — e.g. Associate Dean or above; Head of School; Director of University Research Strength or Strategic Research Initiative.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in a MIDDLE LEVEL leadership role at UOW — e.g. Chief Investigator on grant; Subject Coordinator; Committee Chair; Director of Faculty Research Centre.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently in a leadership role at UOW, but have previous academic leadership experience.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not held an academic leadership role.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to this survey produced a hierarchy of attributes in order of most important to least important. Table 7 below includes all attributes and shows the percentage of respondents who stated that they felt each attribute was essential to academic leadership. Despite all attributes on the list having been identified by academic staff, or from literature and operational sources, as being important to good academic leadership, a clear divergence between attributes was seen once the question of ‘how important’ was posed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership attribute statement</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates academic integrity.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates clearly, openly and honestly.</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates integrity and develops trust by being consistent and transparent.</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands organisational rules and applies them fairly and consistently.</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has direction and vision.</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows respect for staff by being professional, patient and cooperative in dealings with them.</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes time to listen and to understand.</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the higher education context and environment.</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits to and learns from their mistakes.</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a genuine interest in their staff as people.</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives positive feedback to staff.</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is prepared to hear and act on feedback about themselves.</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages change sensitively.</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters team collegiality.</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is accessible, visible and approachable.</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is well organised, (e.g. good time management, delegates effectively).</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks strategically, creatively and laterally.</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives staff opportunities which empower them and build their confidence.</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks positively at ways to move forward.</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a ‘can do’ attitude (e.g. commits to action, takes responsibility and delivers results).</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balances demands from above and below.</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has maturity to make sense of and learning from experience.</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify the core issue or opportunity in any situation from a mass of information.</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deals effectively with adversarial staff.</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands how the system works in a multi-faceted organisation.</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes the transition from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role.</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks, identifies and seizes on strategic opportunities.</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converts vision into strategy then into operational plans.</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has strategies in place to find out about staff needs.</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates change responsibly.</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes strategic use of available resources.</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands own personal strengths, limitations and motivators.</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds high performing teams with a culture of shared responsibility and success.</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true to own personal values.</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a big-picture view of the organisation.</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has resilience.</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates the breadth of academic work and avoids privileging one aspect over another.</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses and manages risk.</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes staff in decision making processes.</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t allow their Unit or themselves to become isolated.</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys a sense of progress by ensuring tangible outcomes from meetings and forums.</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspires innovation and creativity in staff by demonstrating drive, energy and enthusiasm.</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors others.</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balances academic leadership role with administrative leadership demands.</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commits to ongoing personal and professional development.</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes external networks to share views and ideas and to consult for advice.</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sees diversity as positive.</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates passion for their discipline in teaching and research.</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives negative feedback to staff when required.</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and solves problems early.</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a strong negotiator.</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models a quality of excellence.</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works to be of service to staff (e.g. offers guidance to help them achieve).</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t leave things to chance.</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts genuine structures in place to promote and reward collaboration.</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates staff by celebrating successes.</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides both formal and informal structures for consultation and reflection.</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads academic staff in ways which suit their unique communication and work styles.</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions the ideas and visions of others.</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drives initiatives by gaining alignment and commitment.</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is always a strong advocate for their own Unit.</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has political awareness.</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a strong influencer.</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions quickly and with confidence.</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates leadership in teaching, research and community engagement equally.</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents to the survey were also asked to state whether they thought the attribute could or could not be taught. Table 8 below includes all attributes and shows the percentage of respondents who stated that they believed each attribute can be taught.

**Table 8: Percentage of Respondents Rating Each Attribute as ‘Teachable’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership attribute statement</th>
<th>Can be taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands the higher education context and environment.</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands organisational rules and applies them fairly and consistently.</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses and manages risk.</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives positive feedback to staff.</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands how the system works in a multi-faceted organisation.</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has strategies in place to find out about staff needs.</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides both formal and informal structures for consultation and reflection.</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes staff in decision making processes.</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts genuine structures in place to promote and reward collaboration.</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors others.</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is well organised, (e.g. good time management, delegates effectively).</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives negative feedback to staff when required.</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys a sense of progress by ensuring tangible outcomes from meetings and forums.</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes strategic use of available resources.</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives staff opportunities which empower them and build their confidence.</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commits to ongoing personal and professional development.</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a strong negotiator.</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds high performing teams with a culture of shared responsibility and success.</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deals effectively with adversarial staff.</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates staff by celebrating successes.</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates change responsibly.</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converts vision into strategy then into operational plans.</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a big-picture view of the organisation.</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes external networks to share views and ideas and to consult for advice.</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates clearly, openly and honestly.</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads academic staff in ways which suit their unique communication and work styles.</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balances academic leadership role with administrative leadership demands.</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drives initiatives by gaining alignment and commitment.</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages change sensitively.</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balances demands from above and below.</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters team collegiality.</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and solves problems early.</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works to be of service to staff (e.g. offers guidance to help them achieve).</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows respect for staff by being professional, patient and cooperative in dealings with them.</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes the transition from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role.</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sees diversity as positive.</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is prepared to hear and act on feedback about themselves.</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates the breadth of academic work and avoids privileging one aspect over another.</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is always a strong advocate for their own Unit.</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify the core issue or opportunity in any situation from a mass of information.</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions the ideas and visions of others.</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks, identifies and seizes on strategic opportunities.</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t allow their Unit or themselves to become isolated.</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models a quality of excellence.</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates academic integrity.</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t leave things to chance.</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands own personal strengths, limitations and motivators.</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has political awareness.</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates leadership in teaching, research and community engagement equally.</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes time to listen and to understand.</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is accessible, visible and approachable.</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks positively at ways to move forward.</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a ‘can do’ attitude (e.g. commits to action, takes responsibility and delivers results).</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates integrity and develops trust by being consistent and transparent.</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks strategically, creatively and laterally.</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions quickly and with confidence.</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has direction and vision.</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits to and learns from their mistakes.</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a strong influencer.</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has maturity to make sense of and learning from experience.</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has resilience.</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspires innovation and creativity in staff by demonstrating drive, energy and enthusiasm.</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a genuine interest in their staff as people.</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true to own personal values.</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates passion for their discipline in teaching and research.</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conclusions**

The results of the survey presented the project with a clear picture of which attributes of leadership are considered most important by academic staff. Those attributes which rank highly on the list must form the basis of the PROPEL leadership development program.

However, there was little correlation between the importance of an attribute and its ‘teachability’. A subset of attributes was identified which were rated as high importance but low teachability (see Table 9). These attributes are seen as essential by a substantial proportion (70% or more) of the respondents, but only considered teachable by 35% or less of respondents.

**Table 9: High Importance — Low Teachability Attributes**
*Rated as essential by 70% or more of respondents, but as teachable by 35% or less of respondents.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Can be taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has direction and vision.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits to and learns from their mistakes.</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a genuine interest in their staff as people.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has maturity to make sense of and learning from experience.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true to own personal values.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has resilience.</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspires innovation and creativity in staff by demonstrating drive, energy and enthusiasm.</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates passion for their discipline in teaching and research.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Implications for development of the PROPEL Program

From its investigations into the nature of academic leadership, the PROPEL project now had a much clearer understanding of what were the important attributes of a good academic leader. A framework was developed to capture these important attributes and group them into six broad domains:

**POSITION:** Think and work strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within UOW and the wider context

**REFLECT:** Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes

**OPEN:** Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal level

**PROVIDE:** Provide a supportive environment in which your staff will thrive

**ENABLE:** Enable your unit to always move forward

**LINK:** Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline

The full list of attributes in each domain is shown in Table 10.
### Table 10: PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>Think and work strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within UOW and the wider context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Understand the higher education context and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Know your direction and your vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Seek, identify and seize on strategic opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Convert vision into strategy then into operational plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Drive initiatives, gain alignment and commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Assess and manage risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Make strategic use of available resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Take a big-picture view of the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Develop political awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Understand how the system works in a multi-faceted organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Balance demands from above and below, but always be a strong advocate for your Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Champion the ideas and visions of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFLECT</th>
<th>Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Move from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Understand your personal strengths, limitations and motivators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Develop maturity by making sense of and learning from experience, including admitting to mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Commit to ongoing personal and professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Develop strategic, creative and lateral thinking abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Be true to your personal values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Develop your skills as a negotiator and influencer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Develop resilience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN</th>
<th>Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Be accessible, visible and approachable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Take time to listen and to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Communicate clearly, openly and honestly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Demonstrate integrity and develop trust by being consistent and transparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Give staff both positive and negative feedback and be prepared to hear and act on feedback about yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Take a genuine interest in your staff as people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>See diversity as positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDE</td>
<td>Provide a supportive environment in which your staff will thrive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Be of service to staff, offer your guidance to help them achieve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Give staff opportunities which empower them and build their confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Have strategies in place to find out about staff needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lead academic staff in ways which suit their unique communication/work needs and styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Appreciate the breadth of academic work and avoid privileging one aspect over another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Balance your academic leadership role with administrative leadership demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Understand organisational rules and apply them fairly and consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Respect staff and be professional, patient and cooperative in dealings with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Foster team collegiality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Demonstrate academic integrity and leadership in teaching, research and community engagement equally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENABLE</th>
<th>Enable your unit to always move forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Make decisions quickly and with confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Provide both formal and informal structures for consultation and reflection which include staff in decision making processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Don’t leave things to chance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Identify and solve problems early and deal effectively with adversarial staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Look positively at ways to move forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Initiate change responsibly and manage it sensitively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Be well organised, have good time management and delegation skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Engage staff and inspire innovation and creativity with your drive, energy and enthusiasm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Motivate staff and convey a sense of progress by celebrating successes and ensuring tangible outcomes from meetings and forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Take a ‘can do’ attitude — commit to action, take responsibility and deliver results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Build high performing teams with a culture of shared responsibility and success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Demonstrate passion for your discipline in teaching and research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Establish external networks to share views and ideas and to consult for advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Don’t become isolated either as an individual or Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Put genuine structures in place to promote and reward collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mentor others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the quantitative and qualitative research undertaken by the project showed, there is a subset of important leadership attributes which most academics believe cannot be taught. These are the qualities which must be intrinsic to the person and which they need to bring with them to the leadership role and develop in themselves as they grow in maturity as a leader.
To ensure the PROPEL Program was training those academics with the greatest likelihood of becoming good leaders, these ‘unteachable’ characteristics of leadership formed the basis of the selection criteria for the PROPEL Program.

- Direction, vision, originality;
- Role model who demonstrates a quality of excellence and is passionate about their discipline (in either teaching, research or both);
- Genuine interest in people and the ability to connect with staff on a personal level;
- Genuine regard for diversity and seeing difference as positive.
- Personal traits including drive, energy, enthusiasm, positive attitude, conviction, cooperativeness, patience, consideration;
- Maturity, self-understanding, self-motivation, being true to own personal values;
- Comfortable working in complex situations of ambiguity and incomplete information.

The full Participant Selection Guidelines are available at Appendix B.

With this framework in place, the PROPEL project was now able to begin the process of constructing the PROPEL Program in detail.
The PROPEL Project

PART 2:
The 2010–2011 Pilot PROPEL Program
PART 2: The 2010–2011 Pilot PROPEL Program

1 Program participants

The PROPEL Program was designed to fill a development need not currently being met by existing leadership development opportunities within the higher education sector. The Program was specifically targeted to ‘pre-leadership’ academics in order to develop not only their skills and abilities ahead of taking up a leadership position, but to influence their understanding of the broader context of university leadership and open their minds to the range of choices available, both in terms of their individual leadership careers and in terms of how they will operate and behave once they reach a leadership position.

1.1 Targeting

The target group for the PROPEL Program was determined as ‘pre-leadership’ academics. This term was defined early in the Program development phase as:

“For the purposes of PROPEL a pre-leadership academic is defined as a member of academic staff who has not held an institutional leadership role.”
(PROPEL Participant Selection Guidelines, 2010)

‘Institutional leadership role’ then needed further clarification. For the purposes of the PROPEL participant selection process, leadership roles were divided up into two groups:

Institutional leadership roles (NOT eligible for the PROPEL Program):

- Head of School or Discipline
- Associate Dean or above
- Director of University Research Strength or Strategic Research Initiative

Other leadership roles (Eligible to apply):

- Chief Investigator on grant
- Subject Coordinator
- Committee Chair
- Director of Faculty Research Centre
- Period of acting in an ‘Institutional Leadership Role’

When defining a ‘pre-leadership’ academic, the project was careful not to disqualify staff who had some low to medium range leadership experience. The variety of leadership experience these definitions allowed was quite broad. It was expected that participants would be selected who ranged from no leadership experience at all to acting Heads of School and extensive project leadership experience.

From the leadership research study it was clear that a number of attributes of good leadership considered essential by most academics are also thought to be ‘unteachable’.
‘Unteachable’ characteristics of good academic leadership:

- Direction, vision, originality;
- Role model who demonstrates a quality of excellence and is passionate about their discipline (in either teaching, research or both);
- Genuine interest in people and the ability to connect with staff on a personal level;
- Genuine regard for diversity and seeing difference as positive.
- Personal traits including drive, energy, enthusiasm, positive attitude, conviction, cooperativeness, patience, consideration;
- Maturity, self-understanding, self-motivation, being true to own personal values;
- Comfortable working in complex situations of ambiguity and incomplete information.

To have the best chance of developing outstanding future leaders, the PROPEL Program needed to target those academics who were already seen to possess many of these essential but unteachable attributes.

A set of selection criteria for the Program was developed:

**PROPEL Participant Selection Criteria**

Applicants for PROPEL will be assessed in four areas:

1. Energy and enthusiasm for new ideas and ways of working;
2. Interest in collaborative and interdisciplinary work;
3. Strong research and teaching performance (relative to opportunity, but not necessarily in equal measure)
4. Characteristics of leadership including, but not limited to:
   - Direction, vision, originality;
   - Role model who demonstrates a quality of excellence and is passionate about their discipline (in either teaching, research or both);
   - Genuine interest in people and the ability to connect with staff on a personal level;
   - Genuine regard for diversity and seeing difference as positive.
   - Personal traits including drive, energy, enthusiasm, positive attitude, conviction, cooperativeness, patience, consideration;
   - Maturity, self-understanding, self-motivation, being true to own personal values;
   - Comfortable working in complex situations of ambiguity and incomplete information.
In addition, applicants were expected to describe how participation in PROPEL would be of benefit to:

- themselves at this current point in their career; AND
- their Faculty and UOW as a whole.

The focus of the selection process was to identify those academics who were already thinking and behaving like leaders, were not self-absorbed but were able to see the effects their strong leadership skills could have across their faculty and university, and were flexible and creative in their working style.

1.2 Selection

The participant selection process commenced more than three months prior to the first Program event. The project team felt selection was a vital stage in the pilot Program, and all care should be taken to ensure the most suitable participants were chosen.

Materials developed to support the selection process included:

- Selection Guidelines (see Appendix B)
- Applicant Brochure (see Appendix C)
- Application Form (see Appendix D)
- Information Sheet for Deans of Participating Faculties (see Appendix E)

The project faced a hurdle in developing its participant selection process caused by a divergence of views between the project team and UOW Deans. The project team’s original intention was to open the application process up to all academic staff, and to select participants based on both the Dean’s recommendations and the PROPEL selection criteria. This was to ensure the process was open and equitable, and any staff with an interest in developing as a leader could make their interest known. Deans strongly opposed this process, as they felt they were in the best position to recognise those staff who had leadership potential and did not want to cause dissatisfaction or raise unfulfilled expectations or perceptions among their staff.

Managing the interests of the Deans was vital to the success of the project, as Program participants needed their Deans’ full support to be able to achieve the objectives of the Program. The project team therefore decided to amend the original selection process and allow each Dean to nominate a group of staff they felt were either on a leadership trajectory or were showing strong potential.

The project team were able to bring balance to the selection process by approaching members of the UOW Executive (DV-C Operations, DV-C Research and DV-C Academic) for a further list of names of those academics who had come to their notice as being potential strong contributors to the University.
All nominees on the list were approached, advised of their nomination, and invited to apply for a place on the Program. A PROPEL Program Applicant Information Session was held to give nominees full details of the Program, especially time commitments and levels of expectation. Nominees were then free to choose whether or not to complete the application process and be considered for selection onto the Program.

In total 48 academic staff were nominated by either their Dean or the DV-Cs. From this number 21 applications were received.

A selection committee was then formed to assess the applications again the PROPEL Program selection criteria. The committee consisted of the three PROPEL project leaders and the UOW Senior DV-C Operations.

The project team originally intended to select one participant from each of the 12 UOW faculties/graduate schools. When the applications were considered, one faculty was not represented by an applicant, and the single applicant from a second faculty was considered not strong enough to be accepted onto the Program. As a result of the unallocated places, two faculties were given the opportunity to have two participants each on the Program.

The process for identifying participants for this pilot Program was influenced by the opinions of the existing Deans. However, a process for selection was considered which should be used for subsequent programs:

Pilot Program (2010)

1. Request Deans’ nominations with rankings.
2. Request further suggestions from DV-Cs.
3. Advise Deans of DV-C’s suggestions and determine which of these nominees they are willing to support. Request a ranking of all nominations from that faculty.
4. Selection Committee considers rankings PLUS best-fit of candidates to Program.

Subsequent Programs . . .

1. Information on PROPEL made available to all academics.
2. Interested staff discuss Program with their Head of School/Dean at their Career Development Review (CDR) interview and have it noted in their career development plan.
3. Deans requested to nominate candidates. Advised to also consider those staff who have documented their interest in the Program through the CDR process.
4. Deans decide on candidates to nominate (with rankings) for the upcoming Program.
5. DV-Cs invited to add to nomination list.
6. Selection committee considers rankings PLUS best-fit of candidates to Program.
2 Integrated program structure

The intention of the PROPEL project was to create a program which brought together the most valuable and effective elements of existing approaches to leadership. With the knowledge gained from the research study into academic leadership, the 12-month ‘Program for Preparing Early Leaders’ (PROPEL) Program was developed as an integrated set of activities and learning processes which, it was hoped, would give the participants broad exposure to the realities of academic leadership and develop many of the skills identified as essential to good leaders.

The original design of the PROPEL Program consisted of six components:

- Mentoring Component
- Active Component
- Leadership Skills Component
- Big Picture Component
- Interdisciplinary Component
- Reflective Component

Early in the development phase of the project, it became clear to the project team that a further element was needed to hold the Program together — the PROPEL Network. In addition to the six Program Components, it was decided that participants would be encouraged to form a community of practice for peer support, discussion and expansion of their existing networks.

The six Program Components were considered in the context of the outcomes of the leadership research study. The study had identified a range of leadership attributes which were considered essential to good academic leadership and were also considered ‘teachable’. The list of attributes was categorised into a set of leadership ability domains:

**POSITION**: Think and work strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within UOW and the wider context

**REFLECT**: Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes

**OPEN**: Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal level

**PROVIDE**: Provide a supportive environment in which your staff will thrive

**ENABLE**: Enable your unit to always move forward

**INK**: Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline
A skills matrix was developed to ensure all leadership attributes identified in these domains were adequately incorporated in the Program (Table 11).

**Table 11: Leadership Skills Training Matrix across PROPEL Program Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domain</th>
<th>Leadership Skills Sessions</th>
<th>Mentoring</th>
<th>Big Picture</th>
<th>Active Project</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary</th>
<th>Reflective</th>
<th>PROPEL Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Academic stream                   | Research focused          | Teaching focused       | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
|                                   | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓                   | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓                 |
|                                   | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓                   | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓                 |

✓ covered
✓✓ extensively covered

Most domains were extensively covered by many components of the Program. The domains ‘Open’, ‘Provide’ and ‘Enable’ were not as broadly covered as other domains. These domains are more easily developed and practised by participants who are leading and/or managing a team. As the target participant group for the PROPEL Program is pre-leadership academics, the opportunity to learn and practise team-specific skills beyond the theoretical and workshop situation is limited. Most development in these domains would be expected to come from observation of other leaders, mentoring discussions and interaction with other participants through the Network.

A timetable of activities for each component was developed. Face-to-face group activities were included in most components.
### Timetable of PROPEL Pilot Program 2010–2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 June 2010</td>
<td>Information Session for prospective applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 July 2010</td>
<td>Participant applications close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 August 2010</td>
<td>Participant Selection Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 August 2010</td>
<td>Program Launch for participants and mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 2010</td>
<td>Participants complete the PROPEL leadership self-assessment questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 September 2010</td>
<td>Supervisors, colleagues and reports of participants complete the PROPEL 360 degree leadership feedback questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2010</td>
<td>Participants submit Active Leadership Project proposals for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 28 and 29 September 2010</td>
<td>Three-day Leadership Skills Workshop attended by participants and project leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>Mentoring meetings commence (held monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>PROPEL participant network meetings commence (held monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>Committee meeting attendances commence (minimum two attendances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 February 2011</td>
<td>Program Mid-Point Workshop (including Interdisciplinary Forum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August 2011</td>
<td>Active Project outcomes presentation event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>Participants repeat the PROPEL leadership self-assessment questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>Supervisors, colleagues and reports of participants repeat the PROPEL 360 degree leadership feedback questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 September 2011</td>
<td>Reflective Event and participant graduation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3 The PROPEL Program Components

### 3.1 Mentoring Component

Mentoring has a long tradition in education and training contexts but it is especially important in a leadership program at universities. Studies of university leaders have shown that learning from others was among the top three most significant influences on their learning how to lead and their leadership effectiveness (Drew, Ehrich and Hansford, 2008; Scott, Coates and Anderson, 2008). Being in a mentoring partnership with a successful academic leader offers pre-leadership academics an invaluable opportunity to learn from the leader’s knowledge, experience and insight.

Mentoring is both an opportunity for self-development and a leadership skill which itself must be learned and practised. At universities, as in other organisations, leaders are mentors of other staff (Drew et al., 2008). Pre-leadership academics who experience a successful mentoring partnership will develop a mentoring ‘mindset’ which they carry forward into future leadership roles.
Each PROPEL participant was assigned a leadership mentor for the full 12 months of the Program. Mentors were selected from university staff who had strong leadership experience. The mentor’s role was to be available to the participant throughout the program, especially to discuss the leadership project and to prepare for and debrief after the committee meetings attended by the participant.

Through the Mentoring Component, PROPEL participants were expected to develop leadership skills but also to develop an awareness of the value of mentoring others.

The Mentoring Component supported participants as they worked through the various Program Components. Participants were able to gain both direct and indirect support.

Direct support to:

- develop specific leadership skills identified through the Leadership Skills Component;
- plan and carry out the leadership project during the Active Component;
- reflect on learnings from meetings attended during the Big Picture Component;
- be self-reflective throughout the Program, and especially in preparation for elements of the Reflective Component;
- benefit from knowledge and skills of an experienced academic leader;
- experience firsthand and learn effective mentoring techniques.

Indirect support to:

- extend collaborative networks;
- take a focused approach to planning;
- increase confidence in their leadership abilities;
- increase motivation to pursue academic leadership pathways;
- build a personal leadership development plan with both long and short term goals;
- establish contacts and networks to support their development;
- better balance demands of academic life;
- reduce any sense of isolation.

**Identifying and selecting mentors**

Potential mentors were identified from academic leaders within the participant’s university. Criteria for selection as a PROPEL mentor included:

- leadership experience in teaching and/or research;
- membership of a university-level committee;
- demonstrated competencies of a good mentor:
  - a willingness and capacity to commit time to a mentoring partnership
  - recognised leadership capabilities and strengths
  - a demonstrated interest in sharing knowledge and experience with colleagues
  - strong communication and interpersonal skills.
Support for mentors and PROPEL participants

Mentoring is a time-consuming task. Senior leaders are often called on to take part in organisational development programs such as PROPEL, and each request they accept takes time away from their primary responsibilities. Universities which are committed to developing their academic staff and recognising the contributions of their experienced leaders need to explore ways to compensate both mentors and participants for time dedicated to professional development.

One model of providing this compensation is through negotiating buy-out of a small amount of face-to-face teaching for both the Program participants and mentors. The PROPEL Program Coordinators negotiated one hour per teaching week buy-out for both mentors and participants with the faculties involved.

Mentoring training and follow-up

Mentors and participants received some mentoring training as part of the PROPEL Program Launch, prior to the commencement of the partnerships. The training focused on preparing to be mentored, being an effective mentor, and maintaining a worthwhile mentoring partnership.

Supporting materials were provided to participants, including structured tools for planning, goal setting and monitoring outcomes achieved. The PROPEL Coordinators were available to provide follow-up support at regular intervals to assist partners maintain momentum and revisit goals.

Matching participants with mentors

Program participants were matched with experienced academic leaders outside their own Faculty. Cross-faculty partnerships have the advantage of:

- broadening the participant’s experience beyond the limits of their own discipline;
- ensuring the mentoring partnership is not conflicted by any professional or personal issues with the faculty.

Mentoring partnerships were determined based on:

- participant’s stated professional development needs in relation to leadership (this information was collected as part of the PROPEL application process);
- alignment of participant’s needs with the professional/personal abilities and circumstances of the mentor;
- gender (where a preference has been identified by the participant or mentor);
- any specific requests by participants.

Both participants and mentors were advised that they had the option of declining their selected partner and being rematched prior to the commencement of the Program. No changes to the selected partnerships were requested at the outset of the Program; however two changes took place about mid-way through the Program. In one case the original mentor passed away and a replacement was sought. In the other case the participant was not satisfied with their mentor and requested a new mentor whom they identified from within their own faculty at around the half-way mark in the Program.
Focus of PROPEL mentoring partnerships

Mentoring partners were encouraged to complete a Mentoring Agreement at their initial meeting to clarify the logistics and expectations of the partnership. Mentoring partners were expected to schedule and hold regular face-to-face meetings. The length and frequency of meetings was to be determined by the participant and mentor, but was expected to be at least one hour a month. It was suggested that meetings be scheduled to align with other elements of the PROPEL Program, such as attendance at committee meetings and milestones in the Active Project.

During their mentoring discussions, the partners were encouraged to focus on:

- working through the results of self-assessment and 360 degree feedback instruments completed by the participant at the commencement of the Program;
- preparing an individual development plan for the coming 12-months;
- developing the leadership skills the participant has decided to focus on;
- supporting the participant as they plan and carry out their leadership action project;
- preparing for and debriefing following participant attendance at committee meetings;
- self-reflection and reflection on the PROPEL Program;
- setting longer-term leadership goals (beyond the PROPEL Program) and developing action plans to achieve them.

3.2 Active Component

The teaching profession has long recognised that learners need to actively participate in an activity in order to fully appreciate its implications (Engeström, 1996; Leontiev, 1978). This has not always been reflected in non-Education fields, but is increasingly being applied to academic leadership.

A study of 513 university leaders strongly endorsed “role-specific, practice-based, peer-supported and self-managed learning” as the most effective means for learning about leadership (Scott, Coates and Anderson, 2008, p. xvii). Similarly, Drew, Ehrich and Hansford (2008) identified learning through action as important for university leaders, while Bailey, Cimini and Coffey (2008) described projects and cross-functional teams as a highly effective tool for the development of leaders.

In the Active Component, each PROPEL participant was asked to choose one project which they would lead during the 12-month Program. The project was identified and agreed upon through consultation between the participant, their Dean and the PROPEL Coordinators. All selected projects were expected to meet a set of criteria (see Table 12). Participants were given information on selecting suitable projects at the PROPEL Program Launch, and were expected to submit a project brief to the PROPEL Coordinators prior to the Leadership Skills Workshop. All project briefs were assessed by the Coordinators and some participants were advised to change or limit their projects to ensure they were achievable during the Program.
The PROPEL Program is designed to provide lasting benefit to both the participant, in terms of their career development, as well as their university in terms of succession planning. For this reason it was critical that projects undertaken by PROPEL participants were genuinely valuable to their university and provided substantial learning opportunities for participants.

Table 12: Criteria for Identifying Suitable Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects need to be . . .</th>
<th>Value to participants</th>
<th>Value to faculties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligned with the needs of the faculty.</td>
<td>Projects of strategic or operational importance to the faculty will generate greater interest and support, increasing participants’ likelihood of successful completion.</td>
<td>Faculties will gain tangible outcomes from taking part in the PROPEL Program which contribute to their strategic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable to the participant’s career development.</td>
<td>Low-priority or ‘make-work’ projects will not extend participants’ capabilities and will lessen their motivation to complete the project.</td>
<td>Participation in PROPEL should be seen as one aspect of developing staff into valuable future leaders. Projects should reflect this in their priority to the faculty and the level of expertise they demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused in an area which will expand the participant’s knowledge and connections beyond their current role.</td>
<td>Projects are a practical way to develop new connections and understanding at a faculty-wide or university-wide level.</td>
<td>Participants who become confident operating beyond their own discipline boundaries are a valuable resource for their faculty and university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistically achievable within the 12-month timeframe.</td>
<td>Participants will have a limited amount of time to dedicate to project activities. Projects which can be completed within the time available will motivate participants and reward their efforts.</td>
<td>Unrealistic expectations will result in incomplete or inadequately developed projects, which are of little benefit to the participant or the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable beyond the 12-month PROPEL program.</td>
<td>Participants’ connection with a project which provides long-term benefits to the faculty will increase their leadership credibility.</td>
<td>Projects which have long-term relevance and can be integrated into faculty business offer a better return on investment for faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable, to a certain degree, within and outside the University.</td>
<td>Exploring transferability in projects will give participants the opportunity to look outside their own faculty’s university’s way of operating, and will encourage active collaboration and broaden participants’ connections.</td>
<td>Dissemination of project outcomes across faculties will provide university-wide benefits. Dissemination to other institutions will provide opportunities to collaborate and form connections, and contribute to the development of the tertiary sector as a whole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants commenced planning for their project at the PROPEL Leadership Skills Workshop at the beginning of the Program. They then led the project to completion by the end of their training year.

At the end of the Program, participants prepared a poster and presentation on their project, as well as a final report in which the leadership project was explained and the participant’s reflections on what went well, what could have been done differently, and what was learned about leadership from undertaking the project were recorded.

**Benefits to PROPEL participants from the Active Component**

By undertaking a self-directed project, PROPEL participants were able to put into practice many of the leadership skills they were developing through other components of the Program. The project provided a practical avenue for participants to apply what they had learned, try out new approaches, and reflect on their performance to identify strengths and areas needing further development. Participants and mentors were able to use the project as a practical focal-point for mentoring discussions.

The project was expected to have the added benefits of:

- Elevating participants’ profiles within their faculty and university.
- Raising participants’ awareness of what is happening around them and how other areas of their university operate.
- Giving participants an insight into the strategically important issues in their faculty/university.
- Providing a vehicle for collaboration with other PROPEL participants.
- Expanding participants’ connections within and outside their faculty/university.
- Acting as a stepping stone to other leadership roles/responsibilities in the future.

**Training and resources for participants**

Participants received training in a wide range of leadership skills at the PROPEL Leadership Skills Workshop at the commencement of the Program. This included areas critical to project leadership such as communications, planning and change management. Participants received a number of templates to assist in managing their projects. Brief training on project evaluation was provided at the Program Mid-Point Workshop.

The Leadership Skills Workshop also gave participants the opportunity to begin planning their project and receive critical feedback from the Coordinators, facilitators and other participants.
**Timeline for project activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills Workshop</td>
<td>Initial project planning and feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within next 1-2 months</td>
<td>Finalise project plans and commence work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program mid-point</td>
<td>Provide feedback on progress to Deans. Discuss projects at Mid-Point Workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Presentation Event</td>
<td>Present outcomes of projects and reflections on leadership learnings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Reflective Event</td>
<td>Prepare final project report and submit to PROPEL Coordinator and Deans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Active Project Presentation Event and final project report**

The project presentation and final report served to:

- Set fixed deadlines for participants to work towards in their project timelines.
- Ensure participants remained committed to developing their project throughout the year.
- Give participants the opportunity to showcase their achievements to the PROPEL Coordinators, other participants and their Deans.
- Give participants a structure in which to consider and present their reflections on the leadership skills they have learned and practised by undertaking the project.

At the Presentation Event, each participant prepared a brief presentation which explained their project, showcased the outcomes achieved, indicated where difficulties arose and how they were overcome, and pointed to the leadership lessons learned along the way. A poster session was also run to allow participants the chance to provide more detailed information about the content of their project.

3.3 Leadership Skills Component

The Leadership Skills Component of the PROPEL Program is the closest to the traditional, workshop-based method of leadership development of all the six components. The content and structure of the Component is heavily influenced by the PROPEL Leadership Attributes Domains list (see Table 10 in Part 1 of this report).

The Leadership Skills Component exposes participants to a combination of guest speakers and facilitated sessions designed to cover all aspects of leadership identified by the PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains. It consists of two face-to-face workshops:

- Leadership Skills Workshop
- Mid-Point Workshop
3.3.1 Leadership Skills Workshop

The Leadership Skills Workshop marked the start of the Pilot PROPEL Program. The Workshop was run over three days (27–29 September 2010) at the Kangaroo Valley Golf and Country Resort, around two hours drive from Sydney. All fifteen participants attended the workshop.

While the main objective of the Workshop was to develop in the participants an identified set of leadership skills, the event was also the beginning of a 12-month association between the participants and the project leaders and as such needed to achieve many other outcomes as well. The objectives of the Workshop are shown at Table 13.

| Table 13: Outcomes for PROPEL Participants from the Leadership Skills Workshop |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Form a cohort                     |                                |
| 1. Break the ice and get to know each other. |
| 2. Establish ‘rules’ of openness, tolerance, willingness to contribute, confidentiality. |
| 3. Build rapport, trust — between participants and coordinators, among participants. |
| 4. Develop a sense of belonging to something exciting/special which is going to make a difference. |
| 5. Form PROPEL network; determine how participants want it to work. |
| Understand PROPEL                    |                                |
| 6. Briefly revisit purpose of PROPEL Program and importance of early leadership development to the sector. |
| 7. Receive clear information on structure and requirements of PROPEL and roles and responsibilities of participants and coordinators, including how to get support if needed. |
| 8. Become familiar with communication channels set up for the PROPEL participant group. |
| Consider ‘what is leadership?’      |                                |
| 10. Focus on leadership skills rather than management skills (recognise the difference). |
| 12. Examine the effect leaders have had on them and their careers so far. |
| 13. Give their input on the leadership skills THEY value. |
| 14. Understand how they can be a leader without having a formal leadership role. |
| 15. Recognise where they are at in terms of their current leadership behaviours, skills, styles. |
| 16. Understand the existing culture and history of leadership in higher education. |
| Develop leadership skills                                                                 | 17. Increase awareness and skills in each of the leadership-attribute domains: Position, Reflect, Engage, Provide, Enable, Link. |
|                                                                                            | 18. Gain awareness of what’s important in research leadership. |
|                                                                                            | 19. Gain awareness of what’s important in teaching leadership. |
|                                                                                            | 20. Increase skills in research- and teaching-specific leadership. |
|                                                                                            | 21. Practice generic and specific leadership skills through case studies / role plays etc. |
|                                                                                            | 22. Recognise importance of seeing the big picture, looking beyond the immediate issue. |
| Be inspired                                                                               | 23. Develop their vision for themselves as leaders (not just seeing leadership as the next rung on the career ladder). “What kind of leader can I be, what can I contribute, how can I make a difference?” |
|                                                                                            | 24. Be inspired by high profile leaders from universities or tertiary sector bodies. |
|                                                                                            | 25. Be inspired by high achievers who are not in institutional leadership roles. |
|                                                                                            | 26. Look to the future of the tertiary education sector. |
| Begin Active Project Component                                                              | 27. Be able to discuss their project with the other participants, coordinators, presenters. |
|                                                                                            | 28. Relate workshop learnings to reality of running their projects. |
|                                                                                            | 29. Formulate ideas, plans and strategies for their projects. |
|                                                                                            | 30. Understand the practicalities of managing their projects. |
|                                                                                            | 31. Understand how to lead a change management initiative. |
|                                                                                            | 32. Develop some skills to use when they face challenges or obstacles, with this project / beyond. |
|                                                                                            | 33. Develop a first draft project plan. |
|                                                                                            | 34. Give brief presentation of project plans and receive feedback. |
| Begin Reflective Component                                                                  | 35. Learn about reflective practice. |
|                                                                                            | 36. Reflect on where they currently are at on each of the leadership-attribute domains. |
|                                                                                            | 37. Receive and debrief their pre-program leadership assessment reports. |
| Prepare for Big Picture Component                                                           | 38. Understand how to make the most of committee attendance opportunities. |
|                                                                                            | 39. Select committees to attend. |
| Plan and prepare for their own leadership development                                        | 40. Identify the leadership areas they want to focus on developing during the Program. |
|                                                                                            | 41. Set goals for their mentoring relationship. |
|                                                                                            | 42. Develop self-leadership abilities (resilience, emotional intelligence, balance/well-being). |

The key feature of the Workshop was the line-up of outstanding tertiary sector leaders who accepted the project leaders’ invitation to be guest speakers. Interspersed among the speakers were workshop sessions led by a professional leadership development facilitator and coach.
# Leadership Skills Workshop Program

## Day 1 — Monday 27 September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30am</td>
<td>Arrivals and refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Introductory Session and Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPEL project leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Opening Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ms Jillian Broadbent, AO — Chancellor, University of Wollongong</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Leadership Keynote Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Emeritus Prof. Ken McKinnon, AO — Vice-Chancellor (retired), University of Wollongong</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Positioning’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm</td>
<td>Guest Speaker — Leadership in Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Prof. Gerry Turcotte, Executive Dean, College of Arts &amp; Sciences, University of Notre Dame Australia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45pm</td>
<td>Leadership Assessment Debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00pm</td>
<td>Drinks, Dinner, Guest Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Prof. John Patterson, Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor, University of Wollongong</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Day 2 — Tuesday 28 September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>Day 1 review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00am</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Reflection’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Open’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>Preparation for Big Picture Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45pm</td>
<td>Guest Speakers — ‘Link’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Associate Prof. Stephen Blanksby and Dr Todd Mitchell, University of Wollongong</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Provide and Enable’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45pm</td>
<td>Preparation for Active Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00pm</td>
<td>Drinks, Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30pm</td>
<td>Project planning work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Day 3 — Wednesday 29 September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>Day 2 review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9.00am | Guest Speaker — Leadership in Research<br>
**Prof. Margaret Sheil, Chief Executive Officer Australian Research Council** |
| 10.00am| Morning Tea                                                               |
| 10.15am| Project work presentations                                                |
| 11.30am| PROPEL Network                                                            |
| 12.00pm| Lunch                                                                     |
| 1.00pm | Connecting the Dots                                                        |
| 3.00pm | Afternoon Tea and Departures                                              |

**3.3.2 Mid-Point Workshop**

The one-day Mid-Point workshop was not part of the original plan for the PROPEL Program. After planning out the Leadership Skills Workshop, it was clear there was more to cover than could realistically be done in three days. The Mid-Point Workshop was added to the Program to allow some further exploration of leadership skills as well as to provide a formal face-to-face contact opportunity for participants and coordinators between the two main events at the beginning and end of the Program.

The Mid-Point Workshop was held on 14 February 2011 at the University of Wollongong. All but two of the participants were able to attend. The Workshop incorporated the Interdisciplinary Forum in the afternoon.
### Mid-Point Workshop Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30am</td>
<td>Registration and coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45am</td>
<td>Welcome and opening activity — Project leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Leadership skills session: ‘Having difficult discussions without damaging collegiality’&lt;br&gt;Deb Tetley, Professional and Organisational Development Services, UOW with Professor Will Price — Dean, Faculty of Science, UOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30am</td>
<td>Big picture session: “A day in the life of a Head of School / Research Leader: roles, responsibilities, challenges, rewards.”&lt;br&gt;Professor Lesley Head — Director, Australian Centre for Cultural Environmental Research and former Head, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch with the UOW Vice-Chancellor, senior executive and PROPEL leadership mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Professor Gerard Sutton, Vice-Chancellor, UOW ‘The big challenges facing future leaders in the higher education environment’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15pm</td>
<td>Active project session: Evaluation of your Active Component leadership project&lt;br&gt;Carolyn Webb, evaluation consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15pm</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Forum on the theme ‘Popular Culture’&lt;br&gt;• Professor Sandra Jones, Centre for Health Initiatives, UOW&lt;br&gt;• Dr Lisa Kervin, Faculty of Education, UOW&lt;br&gt;• Dr Debra Dudek, School of English Literatures, Philosophy and Languages, UOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30pm</td>
<td>What’s ahead in the PROPEL Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Big Picture Component

Academic leaders need to have a big picture vision and know how to get there by understanding the structures and systems that will enable the enactment of that vision. These include “policy formation, managing relationships, working with challenging staff, involvement in various aspects of planning, and attending meetings” (Scott, Coates and Anderson, 2008).

Potential future leaders need to gain understanding about how their university and the university sector work in order to see the big picture and develop inspired leadership visions. At the same time they need to become aware of the — often conflicting — pressures confronting universities and staff in universities.

The Big Picture Component allowed PROPEL participants insight into how universities work on a day-to-day basis through attendance at university-level committee meetings.
Arrangements were made for each participant to attend at least two committee meetings, ideally one in the teaching and learning area and one in the research area. For each committee meeting attended, the participant was expected to arrange an appointment with the committee Chair to discuss observations and gain further insights. The participant then wrote a short general reflective report which was given to the committee Chair.

**Identifying appropriate committees**

Committees identified to be included in the Big Picture Component:

- Were at university governance level.
- Had a regular schedule of meetings.
- Dealt with topics which gave an insight into issues of significance to the university as a whole.
- Were active in developing options and solutions (committees which were mainly concerned with approvals were not preferred).

Chairs of selected committees were contacted by the PROPEL Coordinators to seek approval for PROPEL participants to attend a set number of committee meetings during the 12 months of the Program. Committees selected at UOW were:

- Academic Senate Standing Committee
- University Education Committee (UEC)
- Student Support for Learning UEC Sub-Committee
- Education Policy Review UEC Sub-Committee
- eLearning and Teaching UEC Sub-Committee
- Excellence, Diversity and Innovation UEC Sub-Committee
- Internationalisation in Learning and Teaching UEC Sub-Committee
- University Research Committee (URC)
- University Research Standing Committee
- University Ethics Policy URC Sub-Committee
- Animal Ethics URC Sub-Committee
- Gene Technology Review URC Sub-Committee
- Health and Medical Research Ethics URC Sub-Committee
- Social Sciences, Humanities and Behavioural URC Sub-Committee
- Thesis Examination URC Sub-Committee
- University Internationalisation Committee (UIC)
- International Student Experience UIC Sub-Committee
- International Alliances UIC Sub-Committee
- Community Engagement Committee
- Faculty Education Committee Chairs Committee
Support for participants

Supporting materials were provided to participants, including structured tools for recording and reviewing their observations during committee meetings. These tools were designed to help participants focus on:

- Leadership skills and style demonstrated by the Chair.
- Other committee members who adopt a leadership role.
- Dynamics in the room and how they are managed effectively.
- Types of topics on the agenda.
- How issues are dealt with and resolved.
- How the committee deals with situations where they can’t reach agreement.
- External forces affecting the university or the faculty.
- How academic and administrative issues overlap.
- Connections between vision, strategy and operational planning.

Confidentiality

All PROPEL participants were required to provide the committee Chair with a signed confidentiality agreement which stated that they would not disclose any confidential or sensitive information they received as a result of their participation in that committee.

Participants were advised that they should step out of a committee meeting at any time that the committee was discussing sensitive matters regarding the participant’s own faculty.

3.5 Interdisciplinary Component

The Interdisciplinary Component was the smallest part of the Program. It was originally planned to consist of two Interdisciplinary Fora held throughout the 12 months. The first forum was held as part of the Mid-Point Workshop and involved a number of guest speakers presenting on their research and their personal experiences of working on interdisciplinary projects. After the first forum, feedback from participants suggested that this component was not a good fit with the rest of the PROPEL Program and that they were not gaining much benefit from the time spent. The project leaders also felt the Interdisciplinary Component was not adding to the development of leadership ability. The second forum was not held.
3.6 Reflective Component

The intention of the Reflective Component was to put processes in place which would give participants the opportunity to stop and reflect on themselves both as academics and as potential academic leaders.

The Reflective Component consisted of two distinct elements:

- PROPEL Leadership Assessment Instruments
- PROPEL Reflective Event

Reflective activity was also built in to each of the other PROPEL Program Components in various forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Reflective elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>• Discussing ‘where am I now’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifying ‘where I want to be’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Considering development needed to get there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>• Evaluating the project in terms of where things could have been done better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Considering and reporting on leadership lessons learned through undertaking the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>• Group reflective time provided after each guest speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership Assessment Reports debriefed as a group and individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses considered ahead of completing the Individual Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Picture</td>
<td>• Reflection on personal/professional characteristics of committee Chair and comparison with participant’s own style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>• Consideration of boundaries of current research interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>• Sharing reflections on leadership generally and specific experiences during the PROPEL Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6.1 Leadership assessment instruments

A set of leadership assessment instruments was developed. The purpose of these instruments was to:

- Allow Program participants to gauge their current leadership abilities.
- See how abilities developed over the course of the Program.
- Gain insight into how they are viewed by their colleagues.
- Identify areas for improvement which can be focussed on during the Program.
The instruments were not intended to act as a screening tool for selection of staff with leadership ability/potential. Their intended use was as a professional development tool only.

The instruments also had a secondary role of providing the project leaders with feedback on the effectiveness of the Program through tracking changes in participants’ abilities and providing a vehicle for participants to give comments on the Program.

The project drew on the work of Dr Tom Kennie of Ranmore Consulting Group, UK in the development of the leadership assessment instruments. Dr Kennie permitted PROPEL to trial his ‘Dimensions and dysfunctions of academic leadership’ scale within the context of the pilot Program. Although this scale was developed for use with academics currently in leadership positions, it was the only pre-existing instrument which could be found which was considered suitable for inclusion. Many commercially available scales were considered, but the cost of licences to run these were prohibitive, given that the aim of the project was to develop a stand-alone and cost-effective resource for use by other higher education institutions. Additionally, these instruments were all generic in focus and did not match PROPEL’s specific focus on academic leadership and potential, rather than current, leaders.

The leadership assessment framework consisted of a self-assessment instrument (administered at the pre-program, mid-program and end-of-program points) and a 360 degree feedback instrument (administered at the pre-program and end-of-program points). The framework is summarised at Figure 1.
Figure 1: PROPEL Leadership Development Assessment Framework
**Self-Assessment**

The Pre-Program Self-Assessment Questionnaire (see Appendix F) consisted of the following parts:

1. Questions on current level of leadership experiences and opportunities.
2. Questions on current level of interest in leading and readiness to lead.
3. Academic leadership ratings scale — ‘Dimensions of Academic Leadership’.
4. Academic leadership ratings scale — ‘PROPEL Leadership Domains’.
5. Questions on the teaching-research nexus.
6. Questions on interdisciplinary collaboration.

The questionnaire was quite long (approximately 25 minutes to complete) and consisted of a combination of multiple choice and free answer fields. It was administered online via the Qualtrics survey interface.

Program participants were asked to complete the questionnaire in the weeks prior to attending the first event of the Program. All participants completed the questionnaire.

Around half way through the Program, participants were asked to complete the Program Mid-Point Self Assessment Questionnaire (see Appendix G) which focused on setting individual development goals and reflecting on their progress in the Program to date.

At the conclusion of the Program, participants completed the End-of-Program Self-Assessment Questionnaire (see Appendix H). This questionnaire was very similar to the pre-program questionnaire and allowed direct comparison of ratings.

**360 Degree Feedback**

A Pre-Program 360 Degree Feedback Questionnaire (see Appendix I) was developed which mirrored parts of the self-assessment questionnaire. It consisted of the following parts:

1. Questions on working relationship with the participant.
2. Questions on participant’s current level of interest in leading and readiness to lead.
3. Academic leadership ratings scale — ‘Dimensions of Academic Leadership’.
5. Questions on the participant’s activities relating to the teaching-research nexus.
6. Questions on the participant’s activities relating to interdisciplinary collaboration.

The 360 Degree Feedback Questionnaire was also quite long (approximately 25 minutes to complete) and consisted of a combination of multiple choice and free answer fields. It was administered online via the Qualtrics survey interface.
An End-of-Program 360 Degree Feedback Questionnaire was also administered (see Appendix J). Based on feedback received by respondents to the pre-program questionnaire, this later version was substantially shortened.

Program participants were asked to nominate between two and five colleagues in each of the following categories to be invited to complete a questionnaire:

- Supervisors — those who have a leadership or management or supervisory role in the participant’s work.
- Peers — those who are a colleague/peer of the participant.
- Reports — those who are led, managed or supervised by the participant.

In total, 108 responses were received to the 360 degree instrument, an average of just over seven per participant.

**Leadership Assessment Reports**

A Pre-Program Leadership Assessment Report (see example at Appendix K) was developed for each participant based on data collected in the self-assessment questionnaire and the 360 degree feedback questionnaire. A report was provided to each participant during the Leadership Skills Workshop at the start of the Program. During a debriefing session, participants were encouraged to read through their reports carefully and begin to digest the implications for their development of the ratings and comments. Discussion of participants’ responses to the reports was encouraged, within the bounds of confidentiality.

During the Program, the individual Leadership Assessment Reports were updated at the Program mid-point (6 months) and at the end of the Program (12 months). Each update added information to the report from the additional self-assessment and 360 degree feedback questionnaires completed during the Program. An example of the End-of-Program Leadership Assessment Report is at Appendix L. The End-of-Program Report allowed participants to see the changes they had noticed in themselves over the course of the Program, as well as any differences in how others perceived them. Discussion and debrief of the End-of-Program Reports formed a part of the final event of the Program, the Reflective Event.

3.6.2 PROPEL Reflective Event

The final event of the 12 month Program was the Reflective Event. This full-day event allowed participants to get together one final time to ‘put together the pieces’ they had experienced during the Program and start to consider their future directions and future leadership development needs.
Program for the Reflective Event:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30am</td>
<td>Registration and coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45am</td>
<td>Welcome and Reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>GUEST SPEAKER — Leading Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Geoff Scott, University of Western Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>PARTICIPANT REFLECTIVE SESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Assessment Reports debrief (techniques for constructive self-reflection; planning for the next phase of leadership development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deb Tetley, Professional and Organisational Development Services, UOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>GUEST SPEAKER — Reflections on a leadership career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Kathy Eagar, Australian Health Services Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30pm</td>
<td>GUEST SPEAKER — Developing effective multidisciplinary research teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Gordon Wallace, Intelligent Polymer Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15pm</td>
<td>PARTICIPANT REFLECTIVE SESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing what everyone has learned about leadership (insights, experiences, ongoing challenges, questions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15pm</td>
<td>PROGRAM EVALUATION SESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion and feedback on the PROPEL Program as a leadership development vehicle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Reflective Event concluded with a PROPEL ‘Graduation’ and celebratory drinks, attended by participants, Coordinators, UOW Executive, Deans and leadership mentors. The UOW Chancellor presented each participant with a plaque and a brief description of their achievements during the Program was read.

3.7 PROPEL Network

The PROPEL Network was not originally anticipated to be part of the Program structure, but early in the planning stages it became clear that a vehicle was needed to join the parts of the Program together, and also to keep the PROPEL participants feeling connected to the Program and to each other.

Through the Network, the participants were expected to:

- Provide each other with advice and feedback on their project plans and strategies.
- Discuss committee attendances and share experiences.
- Provide each other with a range of perspectives on leadership through discussion of their experiences at the faculty level.
- Develop a sense of trust and connection among the group where they felt safe to discuss issues of concern and frustration.
- Contribute to Program content by providing the Coordinators with feedback on topics they wanted to hear more about, or parts of the Program which they were not finding especially useful.
On the final day of the Leadership Skills Workshop, the participants were asked to decide how they would like the Network to function. All participants were very keen to establish the Network, and the group decided they would like to:

- Meet once a month for informal get-togethers.
- Occasionally invite guest speakers to the Network get-togethers to expand on topics covered during the Leadership Skills Workshop.
- Set up an email list to allow contact among the group.

Along with an email distribution list, a participant blog was established to allow participants to share experiences and ideas.

The PROPEL Network held eight monthly meetings during the Program. The topics of these events were driven by the participants in the early stages. Get-togethers in the later part of the Program tended to be free discussion sessions as the participants wanted time just to debrief experiences and continue to get to know each other better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Network get-together topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>University finances guest speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2010</td>
<td>PROPEL blog site (guest speaker). Academic leadership pathways — video presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>ERA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td>No Network held due to Mid-Point Workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Active Project Component — discussion of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>Free discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Free discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>No Network held due to low availability of attendees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2011</td>
<td>Free discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>No Network held due to Reflective Event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Evaluation of the Pilot Program

At the completion of the trial Program, the structure and content of the Program were evaluated. Evaluation methods included indicators of changes in leadership ability as measured through the PROPEL Leadership Assessment instruments (both self-assessment and 360 degree), feedback from participants gained throughout the Program, and feedback from other key players in the Program such as the leadership mentors.

4.1 Overall Evaluation Summary

**PROPEL Program’s impact on leadership development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership ability</th>
<th>On average, participants self-reported a 71% increase in leadership ability as measured by the ‘PROPEL scale’. Responses ranged from a 354% increase to a 16% percent decrease (only one decrease was recorded). The PROPEL Program specifically targeted the attributes identified in this scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding academic leadership pathways</td>
<td>80% of participants reported PROPEL helped them ‘very much’ to understand and evaluate the various academic leadership pathways open to them. 87% decided on their preferred leadership pathway goal during the 12 months of the Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career progression</td>
<td>84% of participants took on new roles with greater leadership responsibilities than their roles at the start of the Program. 83% of these reported PROPEL had a ‘very strong’ influence on them taking up these roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived value of Program Components**

- Mentoring Component 78% of participants rated this component as either ‘very valuable’ or ‘valuable’.
- Active Project Component 69% of participants rated this component as either ‘very valuable’ or ‘valuable’.
- Leadership Skills Component Participants gave the two workshops in this component an average satisfaction rating of 3.6 (out of a possible 4).
- Big Picture Component 92% of participants rated this component as either ‘very valuable’ or ‘valuable’.
- Interdisciplinary Component Participants gave the forum in this component an average satisfaction rating of 3.0 (out of a possible 4).
- Reflective Component Participants gave the workshop in this component an average satisfaction rating of 3.3 (out of a possible 4).
Feedback recorded on the PROPEL Program as a whole during the final Reflective Event is shown in full in Table 14.

**Table 14: PROPEL Reflective Event — Summary of group feedback session**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has been learned . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Debating issues, using humour to counter resistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embracing the messiness, logic is not enough. Suck it up, but also push back when necessary and hold own leadership accountable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complexities of issues, mentoring including from speakers, leadership demystified. It is messy, works out as you go along. Practical advice about managing people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Think about situation, make a decision then be confident in that decision. Role playing what this would feel like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategies for committees, e.g. talk to individuals before meetings. Solve issues before the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Situate project locally. It still relies on local institutional support even if it has a national or international focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build alliances, have conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having role model, especially a mentor. See that some problems are external to you, not necessarily in you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taking ego out of leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relationship of leader with the team and different ways they can be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supporting of change is generally done badly. You need to bring people along with you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Still need to learn . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Managing up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managing stress, multiple demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility — following any whim or sticking to your guns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-skilling, e.g. need to be a good business manager to run a research centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need faculty big picture as well. This should not be assumed knowledge for all. Three-way meeting with Dean, Mentor, Participant needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Day to day people management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Letting go of the need to be perfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managing beyond yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time management. Time management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Map different work flows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How not to micromanage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use your own package of strengths — you don’t have to be ‘tough’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facing conflict or comfortably walking away from it if necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Managing politics.
• OK to be a research leader.
• What is it ok to say no to? E.g. deputy head of school job offer.
• How much institutional leadership do you have to do to ‘get by’?
• Worklife balance, especially around teaching.
• Time to do the big picture stuff — planning, reflecting, thinking long term.
• How to delegate, letting go of crushing perfectionism.
• Saying ‘no’ or saying ‘yes’ with parameters.

Best parts of program . . .

• Active Project.
• Big Picture, seeing other ways of operating from a different university’s perspective.
• Mentoring.
• Three-Day retreat — so much learned there.
• Getting to know senior people.
• Meetings of network.
• Reflection time (good that it is ‘forced’ on you).
• Opportunities e.g. followup with chair after committee meetings.
• Getting to know each other — getting to know the group of people you’ll be with as a leader in the future.
• Reflective event.
• Meeting people in other faculties.
• 360 Degree feedback.

4.2 Evaluation — Mentoring Component

The Mentoring Component saw each participant matched with a senior leader outside their own faculty for a mentoring partnership which would run the full 12 months of the Program. All participants commenced mentoring meetings following the three-day workshop, but some partnerships met more regularly than others. Only one participant requested to be matched with a different mentor, about half way through the Program.

Feedback, both formal and anecdotal (from discussions at network meetings), indicates participants valued the support of their mentors and gained in various ways from their experience. The main hindrance to partnerships seems to have been finding time to meet regularly.
Detailed Feedback

Following is a summary of participant feedback on this component (feedback received from 14 of the 15 participants).

- The majority (71%) of participants met with their mentor less than once per month (which was the recommended interval).
- Most participants (85%) met their mentor for 45-60 minute meetings, although 21% reported meeting for 90 minutes on average.
- 78% of participants saw the Mentoring Component as ‘very valuable’ or ‘valuable’ to their leadership development. Their comments on the Component included:
  - I didn’t manage to see my mentor once a month. He was very helpful, but tended to talk rather than listening, and wanted to find simple solutions that didn’t always address the complexity of what I was trying to communicate (possibly my fault!). That being said, on other occasions that simplicity of vision reflected his capacity to look past and get me to look past the ‘small stuff’ and prioritise.
  - Very good element of program.
  - Even though I didn’t meet often I did find the meetings I had valuable.
  - I am lucky to have a great mentor.
  - Met less than intended, ad hoc around every 2 months. Talked about project a lot; managing staff; being a spokesperson; personal wellbeing; career mentoring.
  - My mentor was really good at listening to what was going on for me and then providing me with suggestions of ways forward. Great advice and great perspective, which is often what was most required.
  - They were really good but still developing relationship and working through specific issues — would like to continue.
  - Good to have an experienced person outside your faculty — allowed more liberal conversations.
  - One of the best components. The casual conversation and shared tips really helped.
  - I really like the Mentoring Component in the PROPEL program. It connected me with a senior person outside my discipline who can give me a distinct and sincere perspective.
  - I am glad I got the mentor I did. She provided me with some key contacts, had the “big picture” in mind and explained how things work at the University.
• Comments from the three participants who found the Mentoring Component ‘of some value’ or ‘of little value’ included:

  – I had two mentors: ‘Mentor A’ for the first two-thirds of the year of the project, and then ‘Mentor B’. I met with Mentor A perhaps three times in total, and with Mentor B perhaps twice, although we had also met earlier in the year in an informal mentoring relationship set up in a project by the faculty. My sessions with Mentor A were useful primarily for gaining some overall insight into the university’s workings. I am sure that I could have made greater use of his expertise and experience to extend this, but did not really take this up. He and I had little discussion about my active project, and again, I could have pursued this more consciously. The sessions with Mentor B were useful primarily in terms of general thinking and strategy on academic careers, publishing, etc., rather than in terms of my active project.

  – The mentoring turned out to be very problematic. This is certainly partially my fault. Having said that, I think it would have been more useful for me to work with someone actually in my own field.

  – I was probably expecting a little more out of this. But I think that there is no guarantee with these mentor-mentee relationships. Nevertheless, I really enjoyed the interlocution and discussion.

• Feedback was gained from leadership mentors, but unfortunately only three responses were received. Their responses included:

  – All mentors reported the partnership maintained momentum (at least one was still continuing after the conclusion of the Program).

  – All mentors were clear about their role as a mentor for the PROPEL Program, but one believed their partnership worked so well because they didn’t have to follow an agenda.

  – Mentors reported the following changes in their mentee over the 12 months:

    • He seems a lot more clear about the direction he needs to take and how he will achieve particular goals.

    • Very impressive and he stayed impressive. Helpful for him to talk to me for chairing meeting etc. with extra responsibilities.

    • Developed more confidence as the program progressed.
– Feedback from mentors about the mentoring process of the PROPEL program generally included:

- The program was run very well for mentees. However, I would have liked more detail about what was expected for the mentors, e.g. different sorts of goals and strategies and how to help people and what mentoring is all about.
- Absolutely excellent. Maybe, guidelines could be strengthened or more comprehensive.
- Part way through — how those participants were chosen was not necessarily known to the wider UOW community. Generally good thing, maybe a bit more information about its role would be useful across the UOW.
- We were ok running it ourselves. Just more clarification in the beginning would have been helpful. It was very good.

4.3 Evaluation — Active Component

The Active Component was the most time-intensive part of the Program, with participants being required to propose a faculty-based project, gain approval from the Dean to undertake the project, plan and complete the project, and report on the project progress and outcomes at a presentation event as well as in a written report.

Participant feedback suggests this component was the most challenging part of the Program, for a variety of reasons, chiefly:

- time available to work on the project; and
- selecting a project which was ‘do-able’ within the scope of the Program.

The Active Component, despite its challenges, was viewed by participants as providing a valuable vehicle for leadership development, especially by:

- Increasing visibility and profile within the faculty.
- Trying out new things beyond usual comfort zone.
- Self-reflection to identify leadership development needs.
- Exposure to new leadership situations/challenges.
**Detailed feedback**

Following is a summary of participant feedback on this component (feedback received from 13 of the 15 participants).

- More than two-thirds of participants (69%) saw the Active Component as either ‘very valuable’ or ‘valuable’ in helping them advance their leadership development. The remaining 31% saw this component as being ‘of some value’.
- Participants rated a range of factors related to the Active Component in terms of the degree of challenge they presented, as shown in Figure 2.

**Figure 2: Degree of challenge experienced by participants during the Active Project.**

Further feedback on the challenges of the Active Component included:

- I designed the project to be achievable but it was actually much less challenging than I ever expected because everyone was so supportive.
- Project criteria were not that clear at the start of the Program.
- My main issue was that I was unable to gain much in the way of buy-in and support in 2011. Whilst I had gained some funding in 2010, and was able to work systematically and effectively on the project then, the structural changes occurring across the university (and in my school and faculty in particular) in 2011 have caused difficulties.
- I had initial confusion re what type of project would be appropriate and felt that some projects completed by other participants would have been easier as they were doing them anyway. So felt a little stupid as doing an extra thing. But have found very rewarding to do so overall good. Also some more deadlines throughout the year would help me as I find I work better with external deadlines, although if I had not changed my work conditions it would have been easier to complete.
– If had to ask for teaching buy-out wouldn’t have been granted.
– Finalising the project scope to relate to leadership development plan could have been emphasised more.
– I was given the project by the Dean. He was very supportive of the Program. I had some help from general staff which made the whole project much easier to deal with. I have also learnt to be better time manager.
– Everything progressed well.

• Just over half the participants (54%) had completed their project within the 12 months of the Program. Those who hadn’t completed the project indicated they needed a further 2-3 months to complete the project, but in some cases it was only the written report which remained to be completed.
• Slightly more than half the participants (54%) changed their project focus or scope during the Program. Reasons given for this included:
  – Smaller-scale project turned into something larger due to request from faculty.
  – Changed after feedback received at three-day workshop.
  – Realised that too big a task had been initially set.
  – Influenced by changes within school structure.
  – Became more targeted on area of focus for the Dean without replicating other projects.
  – Goals refined and focused over time.

• Only 38% of participants discussed the project with their mentor regularly. Only 46% found the project at least reasonably useful as a way of focussing the mentoring discussion on a practical example of leadership skills.
• Participants rated the value of a range of factors related to the Active Component to their personal leadership development, as shown in Figure 3.
Figure 3: Value of the Active Component, as rated by participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Project</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing visibility and profile within the Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying out new things beyond usual comfort zone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflection to identify leadership dev't needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing to new leadership situations/challenges</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding connections within Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationship with leaders in the Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving insight into strategically important issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness of other areas of University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming stepping stone to future leadership roles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing leadership skills developed in Program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding connections at University level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing visibility and profile at University level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationships with University leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing collaboration with other participants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants suggested the following improvements to the way the Program Coordinators supported them throughout the Active Component:

- I think the PROPEL Program is a very supportive framework for leadership development particularly for those on campus. For the three external participants access to all the support offered wasn’t always possible.
- They should become the role model. We should get more opportunities to discuss our project with them (coordinators).
- More finite criterion for project with a particular focus on scale and time.
- I found it quite difficult to know what I should be doing for my active project and would have valued some suggestions for topics and ideas for projects. However I appreciate that this was the first time this was run and so the organisers were likely waiting to see what we could come up with but that was a bit difficult especially since we didn’t have a Dean at the time so there was no-one in my faculty to negotiate my project with.
- I don’t think there was anything more the PROPEL Program coordinators could have done. I have learnt though that trying to carry out a separate project in a time of massive restructure of the university is extremely difficult. (I have well and truly learnt my limits!)
- I think it was there with the monthly catch-up meetings. It just disappointed me that not all participants prioritised these catch-ups. I would like to see these formalised with schedule (understand that things come up and change) but little engagement between participants that I saw. Thank you for making me do this! Perhaps just get on my back a little more!
- Facilitating more structured networking activities specifically related to keeping project on track.
- It was good that we were left to our own devises.
- I don’t think program coordinators’ involvement could have made it easier or worse. As a potential leader, I had to figure out a clear project that I can initiate, listen, discuss and lead — this is reality. It is the development of my skills that I was focussing on. I am happy with the ‘rough’ journey I went through. I have met PROPEL criteria — a project that should be finite and complete, which is the case now. I can now take it further if I and the faculty want to.

- Overall feedback on the Active Component included:
  - PROPEL like anything, the actual doing is very important. The Active Component is, I think, a great part of the Program.
  - This activity was on top of an already heavy workload this year but it was extremely valuable and rewarding and I am very appreciative of the impetus through PROPEL to make it happen.
  - We should invite the mentors to our project presentations.
  - Criteria need to be clearer at application stage, especially scale of projects. Don’t choose something too large. Choosing a project before commencing program is difficult. Form cohorts based on research, T&L etc to support project work — ‘project clusters’.
  - The active project gave us a chance to put into practise all we had learned during the PROPEL Program. It allowed me the chance to try out some of the things I had heard about and forced me to engage with a project which I might/ would have put aside due to time pressures otherwise. Completing this project brought great value to my faculty and helped build the team I work with. This helped me see the extension to my role as a leader within my team and focus on other parts of my responsibilities to the faculty.
  - I have thought that I should have withdrawn from the program given the situation here (UB), but I am glad I stuck with it. I’ve learnt a lot. Whilst my active project was not the most valuable part of the program for me, I think that was primarily to do with the situation in which I was trying to do it.
I think it would be good to follow up in 1 year to see how projects ended, where are they now. I think some more collaboration between participants so could identify areas of similarity and may have improved a number of projects. Overall it became a lot more work than I anticipated and took more time than I had allocated. Definitely worth it but told various things (interesting in themselves): “this will not help in the future so it is a waste of time — not ‘playing the game’ “(colleague); “did you really do what I wanted? “(Dean): “you will be able to get so much from this”(Dean); “don’t waste your time, you have more important things to do” (colleague): “wow this sounds interesting but what can you do?” (colleague).

Happy with choice of project — manageable. Active project was not especially suited to developing the types of skills I was focusing on achieving but still good to do and was a good contribution to the faculty.

Having to be committed to delivering on the project was important. You had to learn to manage time better.

I think this is the most important aspect of the PROPEL Program. It puts what we learnt into action.

Some participants chose projects that were closely aligned with their ‘core’ research or teaching work. I think it would be better that everyone was encouraged to take on a project which extended them into other areas.

4.4 Evaluation — Leadership Skills Component

The two events in the Leadership Skills Component — the three-day Leadership Skills Workshop and the Mid-Point Workshop — provided the major face-to-face elements of the Program. Both events were rated highly by participants, receiving an average satisfaction rating of 3.6 out of a possible 4 across all aspects of the events.

Participants valued most highly:

- Advice/Insights from senior leaders who presented as guest speakers.
- Practical and specific skills development, tools and examples.
- Opportunity to get to know and stay connected with the participant group.
- Feedback on their draft project plans.
- Personal reflections on and insights into own strengths and weaknesses.
- Sense of empowerment in managing their own development.

Opportunities to further improve this component were identified, including:

- Need for guest speakers to be specific and include real-world examples.
- Choice of facilitator who is attuned to academic world, less corporate focus.
- Opportunities to discuss projects, committees, assessment report in one-on-one settings.
- Allowing sufficient time for all scheduled sessions, plus more time for questions following guest speakers and small group activities.
**Detailed Feedback — Leadership Skills Workshop**

Following is a summary of participant feedback (received from all 15 participants).

“Value of the guest speakers in terms of your leadership development.”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Ms Jillian Broadbent — Ave. rating = 3.6  
Prof. Ken McKinnon — Ave. rating = 3.9  
Prof. Gerry Turcotte — Ave. rating = 3.6  
Prof. John Patterson — Ave. rating = 3.4  
A/Prof. Stephen Blanksby and Dr Todd Martin — Ave. Rating = 3.7  
Prof. Margaret Sheil — Ave. rating = 4.0

Overall average rating for guest speakers = 3.7

Positive comments included:

- Very inspiring, lots of valuable reflections and tips.
- Identifying self knowledge as an important aspect of leadership was very valuable to me.
- A much tougher style of leadership with highlights on the importance of knowledge of vision and direction and the ways to get there.
- Very pragmatic advice, solid advice, a realistic assessment of the day-to-day experience of academic leadership.
- Powerful account of key aspects of institutional leadership. Rich insights on key dimensions of leadership.
- His honesty, insight were so valuable. Due to his years of experience as a leader he could talk from such authority.
- Real issues, real solutions.
- Good ideas of family / life / work balance.
- I loved that he shared his personal story with us. He is very passionate of his role and that translated into his presentation.
- Entertaining night speaker. Not educative as day people but worked well for night.
- The slides were good. The presentation was clear and the speakers were very passionate about what they presented.
- Good contrast to the previous speakers.
- Good to hear about a successful team doing interdisciplinary research and how the team can work together.
- I view this person as my role model so it was great to hear her giving insight about leadership.
- Wonderful to hear the models for leadership from such a successful leader.
- Sharply observed, informative, precise, pragmatic.
- Great comments and practical statements that can be used. Cementing knowledge given by other speakers.
Constructive suggestions included:

- Broad overview of leadership good however did not (give) ideas of challenges and how to overcome them.
- Good at a more abstract level. Some more sense of how problems were dealt with in a practical way might have been good, but valuable for isolating principles of leadership.
- Some of his thunder was possible stolen from the previous speakers but he was still good.
- Some insight, value but needed greater specificity.
- I was expecting him to examine leadership in teaching but he talked more about leadership in general.
- I don’t like his emphasis / style. Stories/identity focussed on sacking/pulling down. But I appreciate this is a necessary skill.
- It did go for a bit too long.
- Perhaps a longer question and answer session would be good.

“Relevance of the facilitated sessions in terms of your leadership development.”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

‘Position’ — Ave. rating = 3.3  
‘Reflect’ — Ave. rating = 3.3  
‘Open’ — Ave. rating = 3.4  
‘Provide and Enable’ — Ave. rating = 3.4  
‘Link’ — Ave. rating = 3.7  

Overall average rating for facilitated sessions = 3.4

Positive comments included:

- She made me aware of certain aspects in my life and in my career that I never really think about.
- Liked the practical tips most.
- Thinking strategically is something I struggle with so this was valuable. Understanding my strengths, vision and purpose was worth thinking about.
- Some valuable insights on and strategies for managing emotions, dramas, etc.
- The understanding of yourself was excellent — again breaking down of complex human interaction in a form to make sense was useful.
- I have learnt techniques which I think it will be useful for me when I get back to work.
- I got a lot out of this session — the live coaching was great and allowed the focus to be seen and integrated.
- Really appreciated the info on managing time. Steps to delegating work: toolbox of strategies are really excellent.
- Questions technique session really useful. More practical examples would have been good.
- Excellent example of a good collaboration showing how well two different areas can work together.
Constructive suggestions included:

- Too slow and tedious, a bit generic. A deeper level would be better.
- Day 1 was quite a bit of sitting and listening. To find our voice more quickly and to be able to make the most of the speakers through questions it might have helped to have more ice-breaker activities on Day 1.
- (Facilitator) might not have been aware of the extent to which academic audiences nurse scepticism about the language of power and the desire for leadership and this makes academia a very sceptic environment, with a slight scepticism toward the replication of ‘corporate’ style language and practices to academia.
- Wanted to hear much more about leadership per se, drawing e.g. on Scott et al’s ‘Learning Leaders’ report (2008) and other literature — ie, overview of the field and of scholarship on it.
- Want more robust discussions about balancing choosing between different forms of academic practice.
- Would be good to get some more step-by-step processes to work through some strong points.
- It was difficult to stay focussed because (the facilitator) was very definite about things, “this is the only way.” Her positioning was perhaps not relevant to academics.

“Usefulness of the Report debrief session.”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Average rating = 3.1

Positive comments included:

- Chatting with fellow PROPEL participants is an inexplicably fantastic experience.
- Interesting to see the various focuses people had taken.
- Great team-building activity: we shared common experiences — more of this! (Small team stuff away from the room in free time).

Constructive suggestions included:

- This should probably be done in conjunction with a professional one-on-one session.
- I felt that this session made me feel very uncertain about what I was in for with my leadership assessment.
- I feel that it was too long and I don’t need that length of time to get through the report.
“Preparation for the Big Picture Component”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Average rating = 3.0

Positive comments included:

- Clear, straight-forward.
- I am a bit uncertain about what to do in the committee but there is info in the folder that will help me figure it out.
- I have not been in a committee before and I have not heard about some of the committees so I might need to prepare myself more before I attend the committees.

Constructive suggestions included:

- Need much more information about the university’s institutional structures and processes, about its formal and informal dynamics, and the practical and political issues associated with involvement in them. I know very little about these, and feel like I’m choosing blind.
- More info on ERA and all the other acronyms.

“Preparation to commence the Active Component (including project presentations).”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Average rating = 3.6

Positive comments included:

- Excellent discussion. Good to have feedback from peers and convenor.
- Extremely useful for my own project, but also in the way this was organised. The small groups really allowed for generous discussion and to see the connections between projects.
- Really helpful comments — made the project manageable.
- The ability to brainstorm projects helped my confidence grow and allowed me to understand more about the network of ‘propellers’.

Constructive suggestions included:

- Perhaps improve by providing templates earlier for project outlines and discuss earlier together with anticipated outcomes.
- I wish the project work was discussed before individually, followed up later in a forum, rather than solely in a forum.
“Anticipated value of the Network in terms of your leadership development.”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Average rating = 3.9

Positive comments included:

- To me a good network is everything.
- I value this workshop quite highly and will keep in touch with this network.
- Going the distance!!
- This is an amazing group of people and keeping us in touch and connected as a Network will benefit us all I’m sure.
- I’m really looking forward to it — I think it will be a great support.
- It has been an amazing open and free discussion with everyone in the group.

Constructive suggestions not received.

“Usefulness of the final session — Connecting the Dots.”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Average rating = 3.6

Positive comments included:

- Confrontational steps excellent! Valuable material on particular skills.
- The end of workshop was great, the singing was fantastic!

Constructive suggestions included:

- Perhaps lost some sense of overall flow.

“Confidence in managing your own development over the coming 12 months.”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Average rating = 3.6

Positive comments included:

- I know clearly now what I want to focus on and I have learnt some techniques from this workshop to deal with it.
- The program workshop and launch have really empowered me to manage my own development as the project progresses.
- I have definitely learnt a lot that will help over the next 12 months and beyond.
- I’ll need to find the right support, but feel confident I can do that to keep my momentum going.
- An immensely positive and even life-changing experience. I learnt valuable lessons about resilience, prioritising and my own skills.
Constructive suggestions included:

- Concerned that I will find myself much more focused on the practicalities of my project and less on my more general leadership orientations and skills. But the ongoing activities/network should invite this.

Any unanswered questions about any areas of the PROPEL Program.

- It was slightly unclear what ‘leader’ meant sometimes — are we here because we’re seen as managerial leaders or teachers or researchers. This is fine — and there are times when we are all three — but perhaps we could have a session where we identify our prime area and workshop that, that would be great.
- A nagging sense that leadership in PROPEL is institutional leadership, rather than e.g. research leadership. Still not enough sense of what leadership can look like at different levels of university, or the chances or trajectories, or expectations regarding leadership environment, etc.

“Other comments about the PROPEL Program generally.”

- Excellent — really worthwhile — great speakers.
- Very satisfying and challenging.
- Great start and great group of propellers! Should be a great year.
- Thank you — it has been fabulous to have this opportunity. Not only have I learned about and talked through a variety of ideas and strategies, but I have been inspired again.
- This is a wonderful opportunity and experience. Thank you for having the vision to put this program together.
- A great initiative.

“Satisfaction with workshop arrangements (venue, accommodation, materials, support).”

Average rating = 3.8

Positive comments included:

- The organisation and support was great.
- A great workshop all round.
- Workshop arrangements are excellent!
- There were some great moments when we went outside — walking in pairs, small tasks and drinks — these ‘non-planned’ open-ended (e.g. ‘chat about x’ and ‘discuss results’) really invigorated me and allowed me to connect with the ideas and with the other participants.
Constructive suggestions included:

- Perhaps some time during the day for other, small group activities.
- I think having some materials earlier would help in earlier needs — e.g. project planning. Also being oriented to the materials would be good at the start. Having more materials provided by the facilitator may also be beneficial.
- Would have liked one hour each day where we could review, reflect, think through ALL information.

**Detailed Feedback — Mid-Point Workshop**

Following is a summary of participant feedback (received from 10 of the 15 participants).

“Value of the guest speakers in terms of your leadership development.”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Prof. Lesley Head (Head of School and Research Leadership) — Ave. rating = 3.8
Prof. Gerard Sutton (Big challenges for leaders in the sector) — Ave. rating = 3.5

Overall average rating for guest speakers = 3.7

Positive comments included:

- I like that she was sincere about her answers, and what she talked about came from her experience.
- Good to hear about the experiences as a HoS and what can be learned from that experience.
- Practical and offered a lot of food for thought about career direction.
- This is a good example of a person who pursues two different paths. We need more examples/models.
- Extremely useful — concretised a range of issues I’ve been pondering since the three-day workshop.
- Good overview of the position of the sector, and the key challenges to leadership.
- The way he expressed his views and challenges faced by the university is an excellent example of the big picture needed as a good leader.

Constructive suggestions included:

- Wanted more reflection on implications of (current) trends for our working strategies and agendas and challenges.
“Relevance of the facilitated sessions in terms of your leadership development.”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

‘Having difficult discussions without damaging collegiality’ — Average rating = 3.8
‘Evaluation of your leadership project’- Average rating = 3.6

Overall average rating for facilitated sessions = 3.7

Positive comments included:

• Fantastic session. Great that (the Dean) could stay and contribute to this session and the next. The facilitator was also really good with answering all our difficult questions.
• Very relevant, practical in its emphasis, focussed on specificities of academic life.
• I like the interactive dialogue and Q&A are very useful.
• While I’m familiar with evaluation, this was a useful reminder.
• Evaluation discussion was really good. I wouldn’t have thought about evaluation in this light before.

Constructive suggestions included:

• Facilitator needs to find out what it IS like for academics so she can model conversations and situations which ARE the ones we have to deal with, to make the session more relevant for u, i.e. learn about this ‘other’ culture if you’re going to teach in it . . .
• I would appreciate if we did spend more time about the evaluation concepts and processes, as I think it is very relevant to our projects.

“Usefulness of group discussion session on projects.”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Average rating = 3.1

Positive comments included:

• Good for reflecting on project goals and progress.
• Great to have time to talk together.

Constructive suggestions included:

• More time needed!
• A little rushed. We need more time for discussion.
• Maybe one of our networking events could be a small group discussion time.
“Overall comments about the PROPEL Program generally.”

- Excellent. Really built on the atmosphere at the introductory workshop and extended what we had learned there.
- It’s another great workshop.
- The monthly network events are great as well as the continuous opportunity (given to participants) to shape the program and adapt to people’s interests.
- This was a very useful day for me, but also aware of the rushing (and the loss of a couple of sessions). This could have run over a longer period.

4.5 Evaluation — Big Picture Component

The Big Picture Component was rated one of the most valuable parts of the Program, with participants finding the opportunity to view the workings of university-level committees and their leaders very informative.

**Detailed Feedback**

Following is a summary of participant feedback on this component (feedback received from 13 of the 15 participants).

- 92% of participants saw the Big Picture Component as ‘very valuable’ or ‘valuable’ to their leadership development. Comments on the Component included:
  - I have been on Senate for four years so have been exposed to that level of committee business before, but research committee was very interesting.
  - I have had access to a wide range of university level operations in the past. This opportunity was useful to refresh my perspective.
  - Fascinating insight into various sets of university processes. My report e.g. on the ethics committee highlights various issues which came up regarding the conduct and assessment of research.
  - We need to attend more committees.
  - I found the Big Picture Component interesting as it helped me to see the way the university works and how it impacts on the staff members. Before I had thought that decisions were made at the university committees in isolation but it help me to see how the decisions/discussions impact on each member of the university committee.
  - I have learnt the most from this part of the Program — both in terms of meeting attendance at UB and from the PROPEL sessions I was able to attend.
  - Helped to improve my relationship with Dean and also develop further relationships with other faculty and showed me how I could assist in their development and really change someone’s satisfaction with their job. I could have impact in a way that appeals to me.
Good to be prompted to familiarise yourself with the big picture. I tried to look at other aspects such as flow of funding, basis of decision making etc.

Great to see UOW committees in action and especially the follow up meeting with the committee chairs.

It opened my eyes to how certain things are operated at UOW. I would have liked to attend more committees if I had time. But from what I saw on the two committees, gave me examples of how committees are run and examples of certain leaders.

This was an excellent opportunity to see how decisions are made at this level. Also to see how the different research leaders represent themselves at this forum. Excellent experience.

It was good to see the debates, and how the Chair managed the dynamics in meetings.

- One participant rated this component as ‘of some value’ as she already had already had experience as a member of a high-level committee. One participant did not manage to attend any committees.
- UOW participants attended the following range of committees (number of attendees in brackets):
  - University Research Committee (4)
  - University Research Standing Committee (3)
  - Academic Senate (2)
  - University Education Committee (2)
  - Thesis Examination Committee (2)
  - Student Support for Learning Subcommittee (1)
  - Excellence, Diversity and Innovation Subcommittee (1)
  - Ethics Policy Committee (1)
  - University Internationalisation Committee (1)

4.6 Evaluation — Interdisciplinary Component

The Interdisciplinary Component originally consisted of two planned Interdisciplinary Fora to be held during the 12-months of the Program.

The Interdisciplinary Component was withdrawn from the Program following the first Interdisciplinary Forum. This decision was based both on the feedback received from participants and the project leaders’ realisation that this component, while being definitely worthwhile in its own right, was not a good fit with the rest of the PROPEL Program.
Value of the Interdisciplinary Forum (held at end of the Mid-Point Workshop)

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Average rating = 3.0

Positive comments received:

- It was interesting. Sandra is a very good example for interdisciplinary researcher.

Constructive suggestions included:

- Perhaps one or two talks would be sufficient.
- Far, far less on the CONTENT of this research and far more on working in INTERDISCIPLINARY ways — issues, challenges, tips . . .
- Would have liked more on issues covered by the first presenter — i.e. the construction and development of interdisciplinary projects.
- It was a bit hard to relate to the discipline areas however it was interesting to hear commentary on how to make interdisciplinary research work.

4.7 Evaluation — Reflective Component

The Reflective Component consisted of both the Leadership Assessment Instruments and the Reflective Event held at the conclusion of the Program.

Leadership Assessment Instruments

The project leaders used a comparison of responses from the Pre-Program and End-of-Program questionnaires (both self-assessment and 360 degree feedback) to determine the extent of change in participants’ leadership ability over the 12 months of the Program. Some sections of the questionnaires proved to be more reliable in providing this data than others.

The ‘Dimensions of Academic Leadership’ scale did not show the same trend of responses pre- and post-program as the PROPEL scale. Responses to the ‘Dimensions’ scale, especially by 360 degree respondents, were widely divergent and did not show a generally upward trajectory from pre-program to post-program as would be expected, indicating that this scale has low validity for use with a cohort of academics not currently in leadership roles.

Average reported increase in leadership ability using the ‘Dimensions of Academic Leadership’ scale was 31% (participant responses) and 38% (360 degree responses). The range of responses was much wider using this scale than the PROPEL scale. Participants’ responses ranged from 168% increase to 84% decrease. 360 degree responses ranged from 175% increase to 192% decrease. In some cases participants reported an increase while 360 degree respondents reported a decrease, and vice versa.
The ‘PROPEL Scale’ section of the questionnaire proved much more useful for this purpose of measuring changes in leadership ability over time. On average, participants self-reported a 71% increase in leadership ability as measured by the ‘PROPEL scale’. Responses ranged from a 354% increase to a 16% percent decrease (only one decrease was recorded). As the PROPEL Program specifically targeted the attributes identified in this scale — Position, Reflect, Open, Provide, Enable, Link — an increase in leadership ability over the 12 months was the expected outcome. A decision was taken early on in the project (aimed at keeping the length of the questionnaire manageable) to limit the coverage of the PROPEL Scale in the 360 degree feedback questionnaire to a set of open responses on each PROPEL Leadership Domain, rather than asking for a rating against each attribute in each Domain. Therefore a comparison of self and 360 degree responses is not available.

The usefulness of the instruments and accompanying report were assessed by participants during the Leadership Skills Workshop. Participants indicated that this reflective exercise was very valuable in terms of managing their self-development. There were some concerns about the length of the questionnaires, especially the 360 degree feedback instrument.

“Usefulness of the Pre-Program Leadership Assessment Report in targeting your leadership development”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Average rating = 3.7

Positive comments included:

- Very useful and also affirming — let me know that my understanding of strategies is on track. Also great to see others’ perceptions.
- The leadership assessment really helped to solidify the things I needed to focus on.
- I’ve been given the chance to reflect productively on my work balance and priorities.
- Very helpful — motivates me to work on strengths and weaknesses.
- I value all comments in the report and I understand why certain comments were given to me. I will definitely work toward improving those certain issues.
- The document is excellent.

Constructive suggestions included:

- The leadership survey was great. Some people found it a bit long to answer but I would avoid reducing the open response sections as these were some of the best sections for feedback.
- The feedback I received was very useful — but my early career status meant that my peers and supervisor have a limited knowledge of how I operate.
**Reflective Event**

Following is a summary of participant feedback (received from 11 of the 15 participants).

“**Value of guest speakers in terms of your leadership development.**”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Prof. Geoff Scott — Ave. Rating = 4.0  
Prof. Kathy Eagar — Ave. Rating = 3.4  
Prof. Gordon Wallace — Ave. Rating = 2.8

Overall average rating for guest speakers = 3.4

Positive comments included:

- This speaker was the most fantastic speaker — real, quality advice.
- His session was mesmerising! There were practical ideas that were grounded in the literature. I wish I was invited to a university-level meeting chaired by him so that I could observe the dynamics.
- I saw how a high level person manages her projects by providing the big picture, maintaining necessary relationships, networking.
- Excellent as he distilled his advice down into 6 key points which made it easy to remember and apply

Constructive suggestions included:

- I couldn’t really see how to apply her leadership approach to my own career.
- Very inspirational but also specialised for his circumstances and situation. Difficult to apply to my own situation which it very different.

“**Value of reflective sessions in terms of your leadership development.**”

(1 — Not At All, 2 — Slightly, 3 — Moderately, 4 — Highly)

Leadership Reports — Ave. Rating = 3.4  
Sharing Leadership Lessons — Ave. Rating = 2.8

Overall average rating for reflective sessions = 3.1

Positive comments included:

- I think that what (the facilitator) was doing will help us develop our goals for the years to come.
- I found the session useful as it provided an opportunity to participants to share their views.
- It was great to hear from everyone and remember what we have learned and what challenges lay ahead.
Constructive suggestions included:

- Should have been a longer session, even 2 hours would have been worthwhile and allowed more time for discussion and reflection with the group.

“Comments about the PROPEL Program generally.”

- I have learnt a lot from the program and have found it very valuable. It has brought me to explicitly think through what my plans are for the next years, making clear to me which kinds of paths are most interesting to me, and how I might go about achieving them.
- A really outstanding program. Very well organised and supported. Informed (as far as I can tell) by contemporary scholarship on university leadership. Very well structured, with an ideal range of activities and materials.
- In some events I would have liked more material directed to generic work practices, including time management. To the extent we received such instruction, it was pitched at a generic corporate audience and really not tailored for academic staff, and thus far less useful.
- I don’t feel that I took full advantage of the program, particularly the mentoring. I’ve struggled with lack of time, in the context of a substantial teaching and research load — but this situation is hardly distinctive.
- In short, a great project in which to be involved, one I’ve gained from, and one I could have learned more from.
- This was a fantastic opportunity for all of us involved. The speakers organised were amazing in their quality and experience. We were really lucky to have such highly regarded leaders willing to come and speak to us about their experiences and attitudes. This was a testament to the organisers of the PROPEL Program. I really enjoyed participating and found that it gave me a new perspective on leadership and opened my eyes to the different leadership styles within my faculty. The Big Picture Component helped me to see how decisions made at a higher level influence the functions within my faculty and also how we as a faculty are bound by the decisions made at the university level.
- PROPEL gave me opportunity to network with people outside my discipline. It gave me a chance to look at things from different perspectives i.e. a wider and greater view. It also provided me with greater opportunity in my school and the faculty. I really enjoyed everything PROPEL brought.
4.8 Evaluation — Network Component

The participant network, which grew from a need (identified in the project development stage) to keep the group connected throughout the Program, became a fully fledged Network Component by the end of the pilot Program. This component was not formally evaluated in the same way as the other components. Indicators of its value to the participants came in comments made about the overall Program, including:

- Networking is a very important element that PROPEL brought to the program.
- The network meetings have been great to see others within the university who are similar to me and who have the same issues/thoughts has been really helpful.
- One of my goals in attending this program was to build networks within other faculties, and that has been achieved through the network of ‘Propellers’.
- One of the best parts of this program has been the meetings of the Network.
5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Overall recommendations

**Recommendation A**

*Leadership development should be provided to suitable ‘pre-leadership’ academics in order to support the succession planning process.*

The evaluation of the 2010–2011 pilot PROPEL Program confirmed that the project team’s original concept for a leadership development program for pre-leadership academics was a sound one.

The Program fitted neatly into the academic leadership development strategy of the university in which it was piloted (University of Wollongong UOW). While a little content overlap existed between PROPEL and other development programs on offer, the target group for the PROPEL Program was unique. Figure 4 maps the PROPEL Program against academic development offerings available to UOW academic staff at the time of the pilot Program.

**Figure 4: Summary of major development programs/processes available to academics at University of Wollongong, showing positioning of PROPEL Program.**

Evaluation results showed that 84% of pilot Program participants took on a new role with greater leadership responsibilities during the 12-month Program. This indicates that the selected participants were at a critical point in their careers at which leadership opportunities were beginning to become available. Importantly, 83% of these participants stated that they felt being involved in the PROPEL program had a very strong influence on their decision to take up these new roles. 87% of all participants decided on their preferred leadership pathway goal during the 12 months of the Program.
As a result of the pilot Program’s success, the project team strongly recommends that tertiary sector institutions consider the leadership development needs of high-potential ‘pre-leadership’ academics and the impact on succession planning of providing early leadership development for this cohort.

**Recommendation B**

A multi-component development program such as the PROPEL Program should be adopted to expose ‘pre-leadership’ academics to the wide range of issues, both self-focussed and organisational-focussed, which they face as potential leaders.

The blend of distinct components into the homogenous PROPEL Program was very successful, with the single exception of the Interdisciplinary Component. Participants were able to increase their understanding of academic leadership and the qualities and skills needed to succeed as a leader in the tertiary sector. They were also able to examine their own abilities and motivations relating to a possible leadership career.

Each component of the PROPEL Program addressed participants’ development needs at a variety of levels, as shown in Figure 5.

**Figure 5: PROPEL Leadership Program Components and their influence on areas of leadership development.**
Recommendation C

The PROPEL Resource should be utilised by institutions to build a multi-component leadership development program for ‘pre-leadership’ academics which can be customised to fit with existing academic development strategies.

As a result of the pilot Program, the project team has developed the PROPEL Resource — a web-based set of guidelines, materials and templates available for use by Australian tertiary sector institutions interested in delivering the PROPEL Program as part of their academic leadership development strategy. Part 3 of this report contains a selection of elements from the Resource. The full PROPEL Resource is available at: <research.uow.edu.au/propel>

5.2 Specific recommendations on the Program structure and content

The 2010-2011 pilot provided many opportunities to fine-tune the details of the PROPEL Program. A set of recommendations, either relating to individual components or to the Program structure, is outlined below.

All recommendations have been incorporated into the PROPEL Resource.

Recommendations on Program structure

Recommendation D

Remove the Interdisciplinary Component from the Program structure.

This component, while being definitely worthwhile in its own right, was not a good fit with the rest of the PROPEL Program, as evidenced by feedback from participants and observations of the project team.

Recommendation E

Add the Network Component to the Program structure.

Experiences gained through the participant network were highly valued by the participants and provided opportunities for development at many levels. The Network Component fits well with the other components in this Program and plays a connecting role across the 12 months.

Recommendation F

Schedule the Program over a full 12 month period.

While some shorter timeframes were discussed by participants, it was clear from the outcomes of the Active Component that sufficient time is needed to fully complete the projects. Twelve months allows time for learning to begin to be reflected in behaviour, allowing valuable reflection to take place. To maintain the momentum of the Program, participants need to be available at all key events. Careful scheduling is needed to ensure the face-to-face workshops do not clash with other commitments and responsibilities.
Recommendations on Program support

Recommendation G
Ensure senior leaders in the organisation are committed to the Program and provide active support.

Ensuring the support of ‘champions’ among senior leaders who are willing to devote time and energy to the development of their future successors is essential for the successful delivery of the Program. The Program needs the commitment of senior academics who will be personally involved in every aspect of the Program, even if the Program is coordinated by a central organisational development unit. The participants need to be able to share personal and professional experience freely with experienced academics, and know that they are available for support or guidance throughout the Program.

Recommendation H
Provide genuine support for Program participants by providing teaching relief.

To get the most from their involvement in the PROPEL Program, participants need to commit sufficient time to the activities (both face-to-face and self-paced). Faculties should provide participants with at least one hour teaching relief per week during session times. Without adequate support, participants will struggle to meet the expectations of the Program and their involvement will not produce the outcomes anticipated by the Faculty.

Recommendations on targeting the Program

Recommendation I
Involve Deans and Senior Executive in the nomination of participants.

Current Deans and Senior Executive need to be consulted and fully involved in the process of nominating academic staff for the Program. They will have a strong idea of the staff who have already come to their attention as possible succession planning candidates. However, there also needs to be a process for staff to express their interest in the Program. This could be done as part of the annual performance review process.

Recommendations on individual components

Recommendation J
Frequency of mentoring meetings should be adjusted as the Program progresses.

Many participants in the pilot Program found it difficult to meet with their mentor on a four-weekly basis. The expected frequency of meetings should reflect stages of the Program. More frequent meetings (two to three weekly) are recommended for the first couple of months as the relationship is established. From then on, six weekly meetings would take the pressure off both mentor and mentee without losing the impact of the Component.
Recommendation K
More specific training should be provided to participants on how to get the most from their mentoring relationship.

Participants are introduced to the concept of structured mentoring at the Program Launch. Sufficient time needs to be spent with participants to ensure they understand how to manage the relationship to meet their development needs.

Recommendation L
Active project selection guidelines need to be more specific.

A number of participants had difficulty selecting a suitable project, and others set out to complete a project plan which was far too grand-scale. The project selection guidelines need to be specific about the scope of projects, the time and resources required to complete, and the value of project topics in offering genuine development of leadership skills, rather than simply fulfilling an operational requirement of the faculty.

Recommendation M
Participants require more direct contact with Program Coordinators, as well as structured milestones, to ensure Active Project is on track.

The pilot Program took a hands-off approach with the participants’ projects to see how they would be able to manage the process of leading a project without intervention. Many were able to do this very well, but others struggled. The Program coordinators need to check in with participants at various times during the Program to ensure they are on track and provide help with any difficulties being faced. Milestones should also be set at points during the 12 months to encourage consistent activity on the project. These could be embedded in the Network Component schedule.

Recommendation N
Ensure high calibre leaders are secured as guest presenters at the Leadership Skills Workshop.

The impact of the Leadership Skills Workshop relied a good deal on the quality of the guest speakers. Institutions running the PROPEL Program should make every attempt to attract highly esteemed speakers with recognised leadership credibility.

Recommendation O
Allow for sufficient group discussion time at all face-to-face events.

Interactions among the participants were valued very highly by the pilot Program group. The schedules at all face-to-face events were found to be somewhat overloaded with guest speakers at the expense of group discussion and small group workshopping time. Group time allows the topics under discussion to be absorbed and applied to each participant’s personal situation.
Recommendation P

Engagement of a professional workshop facilitator for the face-to-face events who is attuned to the academic world is essential.

A professional facilitator needs to be engaged to deliver the face-to-face elements of the PROPEL Program. This facilitator needs to build the content of the sessions, based on the basic objectives of the Program. Experience from the pilot Program indicates that a facilitator who is not based in academia, or who takes a corporate or off-the-shelf approach to the content and delivery of face-to-face sessions, will meet strong resistance from the participant group.

Recommendation Q

Encourage participants to supplement their learning during the 12-month Program by attending short workshops dealing with specific skills (e.g. time management, financial management, conflict management).

The PROPEL Program provides a broad overview of leadership and opportunities to develop broad leadership abilities. In-depth training in specific skills is not the aim of the Program, however many participants recognise they need up-skilling in these areas and should be encouraged to attend suitable short sessions (either in-house or external).

Recommendation R

Include an optional Faculty element in the Big Picture Component.

Faculty knowledge needed to be developed in some participants. An option of attending faculty-level committees and/or individual meetings with faculty executive should be available to participants who feel they lack knowledge in this area.

Recommendation S

Remove the ‘Dimensions of Academic Leadership’ scale from both the self assessment and 360 degree feedback instruments.

This pre-existing scale was removed from the final versions of the instruments as it did not show a reliable trend of responses pre- and post-program. Responses, especially by 360 degree respondents, were widely divergent and did not show a generally upward trajectory from pre-program to post-program as would be expected, indicating low validity for use with this cohort.

Recommendation T

Reduce length and complexity of 360 degree feedback instrument.

Respondents to the pre-program 360 degree questionnaire found it very long and onerous to complete. During the pilot Program the questionnaire was reduced for the end-of-program assessment. Both the 360 degree and self-assessment questionnaires need to be a comfortable length (no more than 10–15 mins) and also need to include identical rating scales to allow direct comparison between participant and 360 degree responses and tracking of changes over time.
5.3 The PROPEL Model

The model of the PROPEL Program developed and trialled at UOW was based on a single institution providing all components of the Program. While three interstate participants took part, their experience was somewhat limited by the difficulty of attending all NSW-based events, as well as by a number of issues with mentoring and committee meeting attendances at their home universities. The project team have concluded that it is vital to keep the participant group connected during the Program, so to run the Program on a nation-wide basis is probably unrealistic.

There are two models for PROPEL which the project team believe would be successful.

Recommendation U
Run the PROPEL Program as a Single Institution Model.

The PROPEL Program will work very well as a single-institution program. In this case it is essential to bring in a variety of external guest speakers to broaden the participants’ views. A single institution would be unlikely to run the Program on an annual basis, as the availability of high quality participants would reduce over time. A three-year cycle is recommended for small to medium sized institutions. Large institutions could initially run the program more frequently.

The difficulty with a single institution model, if it were adopted by a number of institutions across the country, would be the limited availability of high calibre leadership speakers. Institutions would inevitably rely on local speakers and some of the benefits of the face-to-face elements of the Program would be diluted.

Recommendation V
Run the PROPEL Program as a Multi-Institution Model (geographically close institutions).

PROPEL would serve as a useful framework for a multi-institutional program, as long as the institutions were reasonably closely located to allow easy travel by participants. A small group of institutions could collaborate on the delivery of the Program in any number of ways. Once example is outlined below:

- A group of three metropolitan (or nearby regional) institutions establish an agreement to run the PROPEL Program on an annual cycle.
- Up to five places are made available per annum on the Program for each institution.
- One institution hosts to the Program Components which include group face-to-face activities — Leadership Skills, Reflective, Active and Network. The responsibility for these components is rotated through the institutions annually.
- The Mentoring and Big Picture Components are managed locally by each participating institution.
- A PROPEL Coordinator is identified in each institution to provide support and liaison for participants.
- Financial arrangements are negotiated to suit the participating institutions. For example, an attendance fee can be determined to spread the costs evenly across all participating institutions each year.
Table 15: Division of the PROPEL Program into ‘local’ and ‘centralised’ elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of Program</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant selection</td>
<td>• Call for expressions of interest and nominations.</td>
<td>Final review of selected applicants by the PROPEL Coordinators group to ensure only suitable and well supported applicants are accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Invite applications from nominated staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Selection committee determines successful applicants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant information session</td>
<td>Arranged and attended locally.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor matching</td>
<td>Arranged locally.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Launch</td>
<td>Local meeting arranged with participants and mentors after the main Launch.</td>
<td>Arranged and attended by participants centrally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment and 360 degree feedback</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Online questionnaire, data collection and report development managed centrally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills Workshop</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Arranged and attended centrally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network meetings</td>
<td>Meetings can be rotated through participating institutions.</td>
<td>• Email group managed centrally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meetings can be held centrally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee attendances</td>
<td>Locally arranged and attended.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring meetings</td>
<td>Locally arranged and attended.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project work</td>
<td>Locally completed and reported.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-point Workshop</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Arranged and attended centrally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Presentation Event</td>
<td>Local presentation to faculty, mentors.</td>
<td>Arranged and attended centrally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Event</td>
<td>Local recognition of achievement.</td>
<td>Arranged and attended centrally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A selection of elements from the *PROPEL Resource* is included in this report.

The full *PROPEL Resource*, including templates, information products and participant materials, is available online at <research.uow.edu.au/propel>.

Included in this section are:

1. *PROPEL Mentoring Component Framework*
2. *PROPEL Active Component Framework*
3. *PROPEL Leadership Skills Component Framework*
4. *PROPEL Network Component Framework*
5. *PROPEL Big Picture Component Framework*
6. *PROPEL Reflective Component Framework*
The PROPEL Program is an initiative of The University of Wollongong, Australia.
<research.uow.edu.au/propel>
Support for the development of this Program has been provided by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.
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1. THE IMPORTANCE OF MENTORING TO ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

The importance of mentoring for future leaders cannot be overemphasised. Studies of university leaders have shown that learning from others is among the top three most significant influences on their learning how to lead and their leadership effectiveness (Drew, Ehrich & Hansford, 2008; Scott, Coates & Anderson, 2008). Being in a mentoring partnership with a successful academic leader offers pre-leadership academics an invaluable opportunity to learn from the leader’s knowledge, experience and insight.

Mentoring is both an opportunity for self-development and a leadership skill which itself must be learned and practised. At universities, as in other organisations, leaders are mentors of other staff (Drew et al., 2008). Pre-leadership academics who experience a successful mentoring partnership will develop a mentoring ‘mindset’ which they carry forward into future leadership roles.

2. ORGANISATIONAL AIMS OF THE PROPEL MENTORING COMPONENT

Through establishing appropriate mentoring partnerships between pre-leadership academics and successful academic leaders, the PROPEL Mentoring Component will contribute to achieving the following outcomes:

- Developing and retaining pre-leadership academics with recognised leadership potential.
- Providing a pool of candidates for future leadership positions who are equipped with leadership skills (including mentoring skills).
- Acknowledging the personal/professional qualities of successful academic leaders and providing them an opportunity to share their knowledge, skills and experiences.
- Raising awareness among current leaders of the importance of nurturing future leaders.
- Fostering of a culture of working collaboratively across faculties and disciplines.
3. DEFINING MENTORING IN THE PROPEL CONTEXT

“Mentoring is an alliance of two people that creates a space for dialogue which results in reflection, action and learning” (Rolfe, 2006). Mentoring is best defined as a relationship rather than an activity. In essence it is simply about one person guiding another in their personal and/or professional development.

The PROPEL Mentoring Component provides a structure for such partnerships. Each PROPEL participant is assigned a mentor for the duration of the Program (12 months). Mentoring is carried out through regular intentional dialogue between the two partners and should involve agreed objectives and clearly defined responsibilities and expectations.

The mentoring process must be facilitated and supported by the coordinators of the PROPEL Program.

While informal mentoring partnerships often exist among academic staff, a structured mentoring program offers a number of advantages:

- Partnerships are not based on working relationships or friendships.
- Opportunities to be mentored are available to those staff without strong networks within the university.
- The Program Coordinators ensure mentoring partners are well matched and continue to support the partnerships to maintain momentum and resolve any issues.

4. BENEFITS TO PROPEL PARTICIPANTS FROM THE MENTORING COMPONENT

The PROPEL Mentoring Component supports participants as they work through the various Program Components. Participants will gain both direct and indirect support.

Direct support to:

- Develop specific leadership skills identified through the Leadership Skills Component.
- Plan and carry out the leadership project during the Active Component.
- Reflect on learnings from meetings attended during the Big Picture Component.
- Be self-reflective throughout the Program, and especially in preparation for elements of the Reflective Component.
- Benefit from knowledge and skills of an experienced academic leader.
- Experience firsthand and learn effective mentoring techniques.
Indirect support to:

- Extend collaborative networks.
- Take a focused approach to planning.
- Increase confidence in their leadership abilities.
- Increase motivation to pursue academic leadership pathways.
- Build a personal leadership development plan with both short and long term goals.
- Establish contacts and networks to support their development.
- Better balance demands of academic life.
- Reduce any sense of isolation.

5. IDENTIFYING AND SELECTING MENTORS

Potential mentors should be identified from academic leaders within the university (and may include staff recently retired from an academic leadership career). Potential mentors should be invited, not directed, to take part in the Program.

Criteria for selection as a PROPEL mentor should include:

- Leadership experience in teaching and/or research.
- Membership (current or past) of a university-level committee.
- Attendance at in-house or external mentoring training, if this is provided.
- Demonstrated competencies of a good mentor:
  - A willingness and capacity to commit time to a mentoring partnership.
  - Recognised leadership capabilities and strengths.
  - A demonstrated interest in sharing knowledge and experience with colleagues.
  - Strong communication and interpersonal skills.
6. SUPPORT FOR MENTORS AND PROPEL PARTICIPANTS

Most universities would acknowledge that mentoring is a time-consuming task. Senior leaders are often called on to take part in organisational development programs such as PROPEL, and each request they accept takes time away from their primary responsibilities. Universities which are committed to developing their academic staff and recognising the contributions of their experienced leaders should explore ways to compensate both mentors and participants for time dedicated to professional development.

One model of providing this compensation is through negotiating buy-out of a small amount of face-to-face teaching for both the Program participants and mentors, possibly one hour per teaching week. The PROPEL Program Coordinators should attempt to negotiate such an arrangement with faculties participating in the Program.

7. MENTORING TRAINING AND FOLLOW-UP

As part of the PROPEL Program Launch, mentors and participants will receive some mentoring training prior to the commencement of the partnerships. The training focuses on preparing to be mentored, being an effective mentor, and maintaining a worthwhile mentoring partnership.

Supporting materials are provided to participants at the Launch, including structured tools for planning, goal setting and monitoring outcomes achieved.

The PROPEL Coordinators should provide follow-up support at regular intervals to assist partners maintain momentum and revisit goals. Support can be in the form of catch-up meetings with each partnership, group meetings focusing on mentoring, and mentor coaching from experienced mentors.

8. MATCHING PARTICIPANTS WITH MENTORS

Program participants should be matched with experienced academic leaders OUTSIDE THEIR OWN FACULTY. However, where the participant has specific reasons to find a mentor within their discipline these should be considered.

Partnerships are established cross-faculty to:

- Broaden the participant’s experience beyond the borders of their own discipline.
- Ensure the mentoring partnership is not conflicted by any professional or personal issues within the faculty.
Mentoring partnerships will be determined by the PROPEL Coordinators based on:

- Participant’s stated professional development needs in relation to leadership (this information is collected as part of the PROPEL application process).
- Alignment of participant’s needs with the professional/personal abilities and circumstances of the mentor.
- Gender (where a preference has been identified by the participant or mentor).
- Any specific requests.

Both participants and mentors must be given the option of declining their selected partner and being rematched prior to the commencement of the Program.

9. SCHEDULE OF MENTORING COMPONENT ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program preparation stage:</th>
<th>Pool of mentors invited and confirmed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program nomination stage:</td>
<td>PROPEL participants nominated and selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring partnerships determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option to be rematched offered to both mentors and participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Launch Event:</td>
<td>Mentors and participants introduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring training session provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program start date:</td>
<td>Three-day Leadership Workshop attended by participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentors welcome to attend certain sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 month:</td>
<td>Initial meetings of mentoring partnerships held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring agreements completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule of meetings set for next 11 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During next 2 months:</td>
<td>Fortnightly mentoring meetings held (approx. 1 hour duration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During next 9 months:</td>
<td>Six-weekly mentoring meetings held (approx. 1 hour duration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months from start date:</td>
<td>Final reflection day attended by participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation — mentors invited to attend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. FOCUS OF PROPEL MENTORING PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships should be encouraged to complete a Mentoring Agreement at their initial meeting, which will clarify the following details of the partnership:

- objectives and desired outcomes
- duration of partnership
- frequency of meetings
- acceptable level and methods of communication outside the scheduled meetings
- confidentiality
- no-fault exit clause.

Mentoring partners are expected to schedule and hold regular face-to-face meetings. The length of meetings can be determined by the participant and mentor, but should be around one hour duration.

The first meeting should be organised for no later than one month after the start of the Program. Meetings should then be scheduled fortnightly for the first two months, to allow the partnership to settle in quickly, and then reduced to a six-weekly schedule to take some time pressure off both mentors and participants. Meetings should be planned to align with other elements of the PROPEL Program, such as attendance at committee meetings and milestones in the Active Project.

During their mentoring discussions, the partners should focus on:

- Working through the results of self-assessment and 360 degree feedback instruments completed by the participant at the commencement of the Program.
- Preparing an individual development plan for the coming 12-months.
- Developing the leadership skills the participant has chosen to focus on.
- Supporting the participant as they plan and carry out their leadership action project.
- Preparing for and debriefing following participant attendance at committee meetings.
- Self-reflection and reflection on the PROPEL Program.
- Setting longer-term leadership goals (beyond the PROPEL Program) and developing action plans to achieve them.
11. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MENTORING PARTNERS AND THE PROPEL COORDINATORS

The mentor and participant are entering into a voluntary partnership. To facilitate this, both the mentor and participant need to work to maintain the effectiveness of the mentoring partnership. This will involve both partners:

- Being willingly involved in the PROPEL Program.
- Being comfortable with the mentoring match.
- Being committed to the partnership.
- Discussing and agreeing on specific time-framed goals/objectives for the partnership to work towards.
- Agreeing on and respecting the ground rules of the partnership.
- Treating information or advice shared by either partner confidentially.
- Giving and receiving advice or recommendations in good faith.
- Regularly discussing how the mentoring partnership is progressing and making any adjustments.
- Referring issues that arise, which are beyond the scope of the partnership, to a third person (e.g. PROPEL Coordinators) but only with the permission of both partners.
- Agreeing to a ‘no fault’ conclusion of the partnership by either partner if, for any reason, it is no longer appropriate or helpful to continue.

11.1 ROLE OF THE PARTICIPANT

For the mentoring partnership to be successful, the participant must be committed to making the partnership work and focused on their goals.

The participant should:

- Approach the mentoring partnership with clear and realistic ideas of what they want to achieve.
- Lead the mentoring partnership by clarifying to the mentor the kind of advice and feedback they need.
- Be proactive in their communication with the mentor, including a commitment to meet regularly.
- Prepare for each mentoring meeting, keep a record of the discussion and act on suggestions.
- Be open to advice and welcome constructive feedback.
- Be considerate and appreciate the value of the mentor’s time.
- Listen to the mentor’s advice and act on it where they consider it appropriate.

It is the sole responsibility of the participant to decide whether or not to act on advice given by their mentor, including whether to seek further advice.
11.2 ROLE OF THE MENTOR

The mentor may serve as a sounding-board, adviser and coach, depending on the personalities and needs of the mentor and participant. The mentor's role is to ask good questions and to lead the participant through explorations of his/her own abilities, goals and professional development plans.

One of the main roles of the mentor is to help participants take stock of where they are now and where they want to be. This is done successfully through building a climate of trust; encouraging the participant to explore ideas and take risks; confronting difficult issues; serving as a role model; and developing the participant’s vision.

The mentor’s role does not include taking action on behalf of the participant, such as intervening with supervisors or acting as an advocate. If action is required on any issue, it is the participant who must initiate it through the appropriate channels.

11.3 ROLE OF THE PROPEL COORDINATORS

The PROPEL Coordinators should:

- Set up and manage the process for selecting mentors and matching partnerships.
- Provide information and training to both partners plus ongoing support and assistance where needed.
- Provide a strategy to monitor and evaluate the outcomes of the partnerships.
- Be available to assist if any problems arise which the partners have difficulty resolving.

12. ADDRESSING PARTNERSHIP CONCERNS

While many positive outcomes will be achieved from the mentoring partnerships, difficulties may arise from time to time. Mentoring partners are encouraged to be open and honest about issues and look for a solution. Where participants wish to explore issues which are outside the agreed scope of the mentoring partnership the mentor should refer the participant to other more appropriate sources of support. The PROPEL Coordinators may be called on for assistance at any time during the mentoring partnership.

Partners are encouraged to agree, at their initial meeting, to a fault-free closure of the partnership at any time without blame, fault finding or recrimination.
13. PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

Mentoring partners must agree to confidentiality. Conversations should be regarded as private and information disclosed should not be passed on, used or in any other way revealed. Privileged or sensitive information should not be shared between mentoring partners.

At certain points during the PROPEL Program, the PROPEL Coordinators may collect personal information and request feedback on the mentoring partnership from both participants and mentors. The PROPEL Coordinators must ensure the confidentiality of all information received and ensure they do not identify individual respondents as part of any Program evaluation reports.

14. REFERENCES
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1. THE IMPORTANCE OF PRACTICE-BASED LEARNING TO ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

The teaching profession has long recognised that learners need to actively participate in an activity in order to fully appreciate its implications (Engeström, 1996; Leontiev, 1978). This has not always been reflected in non-Education fields, but is increasingly being applied to academic leadership.

A study of 513 university leaders strongly endorsed “role-specific, practice-based, peer-supported and self-managed learning” as the most effective means for learning about leadership (Scott, Coates & Anderson, 2008, p. xvii). Similarly, Drew, Ehrich & Hansford (2008) identified learning through action as important for university leaders, while Bailey, Cimini & Coffey (2008) described projects and cross-functional teams as a highly effective tool for the development of leaders.

2. ORGANISATIONAL AIMS OF THE PROPEL ACTIVE COMPONENT

Through providing pre-leadership academics with the opportunity to lead a self-directed project with strategic significance to their faculty, the PROPEL Active Component contributes to achieving the following outcomes:

- Providing a pool of candidates for future leadership positions who are equipped with leadership skills which include project leadership and change management.
- Developing and retaining pre-leadership academics with recognised leadership potential.
- Increasing understanding of the range of conflicting interests that universities are facing.
- Raising awareness among current leaders of the importance of nurturing future leadership.
3. OVERVIEW OF THE PROPEL ACTIVE COMPONENT

Each PROPEL participants chooses one project which they will lead during the 12-month Program. The project is identified and agreed upon through consultation between the participant, their Dean and the PROPEL Coordinators. All selected projects must meet the criteria set out in Part 5 of this Framework.

Participants commence planning for their project at the PROPEL Leadership Skills Workshop at the beginning of the Program. They then lead the project to completion, ideally by the end of their training year. Participants receive support for their project from their PROPEL mentor and the PROPEL Coordinators.

At the end of the Program, participants prepare a presentation and a final report in which the leadership project is explained and the participant reflects on what has gone well, what could have been done differently, and what has been learned about leadership from undertaking the project.

4. BENEFITS TO PROPEL PARTICIPANTS FROM THE ACTIVE COMPONENT

By undertaking a self-directed project, PROPEL participants are able to put into practice many of the leadership skills they are developing through other components of the Program. The project provides a practical avenue for participants to apply what they have learned, try out new approaches, and reflect on their performance to identify strengths and areas needing further development. Participants and mentors are able to use the project as a practical focal-point for mentoring discussions.

The project has added benefits of:

- Elevating participants’ profiles within their faculty and the university.
- Raising participants’ awareness of what is happening around them and how other areas of their university operate.
- Giving participants an insight into the strategically important issues in their faculty/university.
- Providing a vehicle for collaboration with other PROPEL participants.
- Expanding participants’ connections within and outside their faculty/university.
- Acting as a stepping stone to other leadership roles/responsibilities in the future.
5. CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING SUITABLE PROJECTS

The PROPEL Program is designed to provide lasting benefit to both the participant, in terms of their career development, as well as the university in terms of succession planning. It is critical that projects undertaken by PROPEL participants are genuinely valuable to the university and provide substantial learning opportunities for participants.

Projects selected should meet the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects need to be . . .</th>
<th>Value to participants</th>
<th>Value to faculties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligned with the needs of the faculty.</td>
<td>Projects of strategic or operational importance to the faculty will generate greater interest and support, increasing participants’ likelihood of successful completion.</td>
<td>Faculties will gain tangible outcomes from taking part in the PROPEL Program which contribute to their strategic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable to the participant’s career development.</td>
<td>Low-priority or ‘make-work’ projects will not extend participants’ capabilities and will lessen their motivation to complete the project.</td>
<td>Participation in PROPEL should be seen as one aspect of developing staff into valuable future leaders. Projects should reflect this in their priority to the faculty and the level of expertise they demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused in an area which will expand the participant’s knowledge and connections beyond their current role.</td>
<td>Projects are a practical way to develop new connections and understanding at a faculty-wide or university-wide level.</td>
<td>Participants who become confident operating beyond their own discipline boundaries are a valuable resource for their faculty and university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistically achievable within the 12-month timeframe.</td>
<td>Participants will have a limited amount of time to dedicate to project activities. Projects which can be completed within the time available will motivate participants and reward their efforts.</td>
<td>Unrealistic expectations will result in incomplete or inadequately developed projects, which are of little benefit to the participant or the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable beyond the 12-month PROPEL program.</td>
<td>Participants’ connection with a project which provides long-term benefits to the faculty will increase their leadership credibility.</td>
<td>Projects which have long-term relevance and can be integrated into faculty business offer a better return on investment for faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable, to a certain degree, within and outside the university.</td>
<td>Exploring transferability in projects will give participants the opportunity to look outside their own faculty’s/university’s way of operating, and will encourage active collaboration and broaden participants’ connections.</td>
<td>Dissemination of project outcomes across faculties will provide university-wide benefits. Dissemination to other institutions will provide opportunities to collaborate and form connections, and contribute to the development of the tertiary sector as a whole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS

When considering a project topic, participants should be especially mindful to:

- Keep the scope of the project manageable within the 12-month time frame. Better to start with a small-scale project which can be augmented than to attempt something too grand-scale for the time and resources which will be available to complete the project.

- If choosing a project which is already part of the participant’s responsibilities, identify a distinct element of that project which offers the opportunity for leadership development and expand that part to form the PROPEL project.

The final selection and approval of projects takes place through a process of consultation involving participants, Deans and the PROPEL Coordinators. Projects must be selected and approved prior to the Leadership Skills Workshop, through the following process:

- Once accepted onto the PROPEL Program, participants are given the set of project criteria (refer to Section 5) and asked to begin thinking of suitable projects with strategic significance to their faculty. Deans are also provided with the set of project criteria.

- At the PROPEL Launch, participants are given further information and advice from PROPEL Coordinators on selecting and managing appropriate projects and negotiating project approval.

- After the Launch, participants meet with Deans to discuss the suggested project and gain approval.

- Participants provide the PROPEL Coordinators with a one-page project plan prior to attending the Leadership Skills Workshop.

- PROPEL Coordinators ensure all projects meet the criteria for the Active Component, especially the requirement that projects are manageable within the 12-month time frame and provide genuine leadership development opportunities.
7. RESPONSIBILITIES RELATED TO THE ACTIVE COMPONENT

7.1 THE PROPEL PARTICIPANT
Leading the project to a successful completion will depend entirely on the participant’s level of commitment. Participants need to:

- Plan their project carefully and consult fully with stakeholders (including Deans).
- Identify and keep to project milestones.
- Make sufficient time available on a regular basis to progress their project.
- Seek advice and take action to overcome obstacles.

7.2 THE PARTICIPANT’S DEAN AND FACULTY
The Dean’s role is key to ensuring the project is successfully completed. Selected projects should provide a genuine benefit to the faculty. Deans need to show both the participant and other faculty staff that they value the project and expect a successful outcome. Deans will:

- Meet with the participant at the commencement of the PROPEL Program and outline what they expect the project to deliver.
- Meet with the participant at the half-way point in the project to review progress.
- Provide the participant with support to overcome obstacles if needed.

7.3 THE PROPEL COORDINATORS
The PROPEL Coordinators will provide the following support:

- Advice on the identification and selection of suitable projects.
- Coordination of the project selection process.
- Information to participants and faculties on all aspects of the Active Component.
- Templates for participants to use in planning and managing their projects.
- Opportunities at the Leadership Skills Workshop for projects to be discussed and planning to commence.
- Information and support on evaluating project processes and outcomes.
- Regular contact with participants to check how projects are progressing.
- Opportunities to discuss projects at PROPEL Network meetings.
- Ongoing assistance to participants and faculties where needed.
8. SUPPORT AND TRAINING FOR PARTICIPANTS

8.1 SUPPORT FROM THE PROPEL MENTOR

The PROPEL mentor will actively support the participant throughout the life of the project. Each mentoring session should touch on the progress of the project and review any difficulties the participant has faced. The mentor will provide feedback on project planning and implementation strategies, and will also help the participant explore alternative ways of achieving a successful outcome.

8.2 SUPPORT FROM THE PROPEL NETWORK

PROPEL participants can provide each other with feedback and support through the PROPEL Network. Participants will be able to refer to the Network for advice and feedback on their project plans and strategies. A Network email list will be established for this purpose.

The PROPEL Network will hold regular catch-up meetings throughout the Program. The topics of these meetings will be driven by the participants themselves, but should include workshopping common project difficulties or hearing from guest speakers who have strong project management skills.

8.3 TRAINING FOR PARTICIPANTS

Participants receive training in a variety of leadership skills at the PROPEL Leadership Skills Workshop at the commencement of the Program. This includes training in communications, planning and change management. Participants also receive a number of templates to assist in managing their projects. The Workshop also gives participants the opportunity to begin planning their project and receive critical feedback from the Coordinators, facilitators and other participants.

Training in project evaluation techniques is provided at the PROPEL Mid-Point Workshop.

In-depth project management training is not provided as part of the PROPEL Program.
9. TIMELINE FOR PROJECT ACTIVITIES

During the Leadership Skills Workshop participants will:

- Discuss their project with the other participants, Coordinators, and presenters.
- Learn about project planning, change management, overcoming obstacles.
- Relate what they are learning about leadership to the reality of running their projects.
- Formulate ideas, plans and strategies for their projects.
- Develop a first draft project plan.
- Present their plans to a round table of other participants and Coordinators and receive feedback.

After the Workshop (within 1–2 months) participants will:

- Discuss the project and draft plans with their mentor at the first meeting.
- Finalise their project plan and submit to the Dean for endorsement.
- Schedule project-work time into their workload.

Half-way through the Program participants will:

- Meet with their Deans to discuss progress of the project.
- Attend a mid-point event at which all participants give a brief progress report on their project and receive feedback from the group and the Coordinators. Common difficulties which are identified will be workshopped and project evaluation strategies discussed.

Near the end of the Program (prior to the Reflective Event) participants will:

- Attend a Project Presentation Event at which they present outcomes of their projects and reflections on what they have learned about leadership through undertaking the project.

At the end of the Program participants will:

- Attend a Reflective Event at which they will look back on their experiences over the past year (including the leadership project).
- Prepare a final project report and submit to the PROPEL Coordinators and Deans. (If a project is still ongoing, a progress report can be submitted and arrangements made with the Dean to either continue leading the project or hand it on).
10. ACTIVE PROJECT COMPONENT PRESENTATION AND REPORT

The project presentation and final report serve to:

• Set fixed deadlines for participants to work towards in their project timelines.

• Ensure participants remain committed to developing their project throughout the year.

• Give participants the opportunity to showcase their achievements to the PROPEL Coordinators, other participants and Deans.

• Give participants a structure in which to consider and present their reflections on the leadership skills they have learned and practised by undertaking the project.

Presentation format — each participant will prepare a 10 minute presentation which should briefly explain the project, showcase the outcomes achieved, indicate where difficulties arose and how they were overcome, and point to the leadership lessons learned along the way. A poster will also be prepared.

The Project Presentation Event is attended by participants and PROPEL Coordinators. Deans and Heads of School can also be invited to attend.

Report format — each participant will prepare a detailed project report which should include an executive summary; background to the project; project details; project outcomes and recommendations; project evaluation strategy and findings; and reflection on the project as a leadership development activity

The final project report is submitted to the PROPEL Coordinators and the participant’s Dean.

11. ADDRESSING PROBLEMS

The primary purpose of the Active Component is to give participants a chance to practice their leadership skills. If a project has stalled or is not fulfilling this purpose for any reason, it is important to address this problem as early as possible in the Program.

If a participant is experiencing significant problems with the progress or completion of their selected project, s/he should advise the PROPEL Coordinators without delay. It may be necessary to make changes to the original project plans, or even to select a new project, to ensure the participant completes the Active Component successfully within the time remaining.
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1. THE IMPORTANCE OF SKILLS-BASED LEARNING TO ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

While many qualities of effective leaders in higher education relate to personal characteristics, it is abundantly clear from the literature that leadership skills can be taught (Tait, 1996).

Research undertaken during the development stage of the PROPEL Program produced a set of leadership skills (both generic and academic-specific) which are seen by academics as both essential for excellent academic leadership and teachable. This set of skills and attributes is known as the PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains (see Section 5).

PROPEL participants attend a number of face-to-face sessions as part of the PROPEL Leadership Skills Component. Sessions are aimed at examining and developing these identified leadership attributes.

2. ORGANISATIONAL AIMS OF THE PROPEL LEADERSHIP SKILLS COMPONENT

Through providing pre-leadership academics with the opportunity to develop many of the skills considered essential for academic leadership, the PROPEL Leadership Skills Component contributes to achieving the following outcomes:

- Providing a pool of candidates for future leadership positions who are equipped with many important leadership skills.
- Developing and retaining pre-leadership academics with recognised leadership potential.
- Increasing understanding of the range of attributes required by university leaders.
- Raising awareness among current leaders of the importance of nurturing future leadership.
- Acknowledging the personal/professional qualities of successful academic leaders and providing them an opportunity to share their knowledge, skills and experiences.
3. BENEFITS TO PROPEL PARTICIPANTS FROM THE LEADERSHIP SKILLS COMPONENT

By focusing on specific leadership attributes which have been recognised as essential to successful academic leaders, PROPEL participants will be able to increase their skill levels in a broad range of areas. In particular, they will be able to:

- Explore what academic leadership means, and understand the existing culture of leadership in higher education.
- Increase awareness and skills in each of the PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains.
- Gain awareness of what’s important in research leadership and teaching leadership.
- Practice generic and specific leadership skills through case studies and role plays.
- Recognise the differences between leadership skills and management skills.
- Recognise where they are at in terms of their current leadership behaviours, skills, styles.
- Understand how they can be a leader without having a formal leadership role.

4. OVERVIEW OF THE PROPEL LEADERSHIP SKILLS COMPONENT

The Leadership Skills Component of the PROPEL Program is the closest to the traditional, workshop-based method of leadership development of all the six Components. The Leadership Skills Component exposes participants to a combination of guest speakers and facilitated sessions designed to cover all aspects of leadership identified by the PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains (see Section 5).

The Component consists of two face-to-face workshops:

- Leadership Skills Workshop — a three-day workshop held at the commencement of the Program.
- Mid-Point Workshop — a one-day workshop held at the half-way point of the Program.
## 5. PROPEL LEADERSHIP ATTRIBUTE DOMAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>Think and work strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within UOW and the wider context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Understand the higher education context and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Know your direction and your vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Seek, identify and seize on strategic opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Convert vision into strategy then into operational plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Drive initiatives, gain alignment and commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Assess and manage risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Make strategic use of available resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Take a big-picture view of the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Develop political awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Understand how the system works in a multi-faceted organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Balance demands from above and below, but always be a strong advocate for your Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Champion the ideas and visions of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFLECT</th>
<th>Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Move from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Understand your personal strengths, limitations and motivators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Develop maturity by making sense of and learning from experience, including admitting to mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Commit to ongoing personal and professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Develop strategic, creative and lateral thinking abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Be true to your personal values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Develop your skills as a negotiator and influencer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Develop resilience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN</th>
<th>Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Be accessible, visible and approachable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Take time to listen and to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Communicate clearly, openly and honestly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Demonstrate integrity and develop trust by being consistent and transparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Give staff both positive and negative feedback and be prepared to hear and act on feedback about yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Take a genuine interest in your staff as people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>See diversity as positive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROVIDE**

Provide a supportive environment in which your staff will thrive

1. Be of service to staff, offer your guidance to help them achieve.
2. Give staff opportunities which empower them and build their confidence.
3. Have strategies in place to find out about staff needs.
4. Lead academic staff in ways which suit their unique communication/work needs and styles.
5. Appreciate the breadth of academic work and avoid privileging one aspect over another.
6. Balance your academic leadership role with administrative leadership demands.
7. Understand organisational rules and apply them fairly and consistently.
8. Respect staff and be professional, patient and cooperative in dealings with them.
9. Foster team collegiality.
10. Demonstrate academic integrity and leadership in teaching, research and community engagement equally.

**ENABLE**

Enable your unit to always move forward

1. Make decisions quickly and with confidence.
2. Provide both formal and informal structures for consultation and reflection which include staff in decision making processes.
3. Don’t leave things to chance.
4. Identify and solve problems early and deal effectively with adversarial staff.
5. Look positively at ways to move forward.
6. Initiate change responsibly and manage it sensitively.
7. Be well organised, have good time management and delegation skills.
8. Engage staff and inspire innovation and creativity with your drive, energy and enthusiasm.
9. Motivate staff and convey a sense of progress by celebrating successes and ensuring tangible outcomes from meetings and forums.
10. Take a ‘can do’ attitude — commit to action, take responsibility and deliver results.
11. Build high performing teams with a culture of shared responsibility and success.
12. Demonstrate passion for your discipline in teaching and research.

**LINK**

Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline

1. Establish external networks to share views and ideas and to consult for advice.
2. Don’t become isolated either as an individual or Unit.
3. Put genuine structures in place to promote and reward collaboration.
4. Mentor others.
6. THE LEADERSHIP SKILLS WORKSHOP

The Leadership Skills Workshop marks the start of the PROPEL Program. It is a three-day residential event which is attended by all participants as well as the PROPEL Coordinators.

While the main objective of the Workshop is for participants to develop a range of leadership skills, the event is also the beginning of a 12-month association between the participants and the PROPEL Program and as such needs to achieve many other outcomes for participants as well. These include:

- forming a cohort
- understanding the PROPEL Program structure
- examining different forms of academic leadership
- developing leadership skills
- becoming inspired to lead
- beginning the Active Project Component
- beginning the Reflective Component
- preparing for the Big Picture Component
- planning and preparing for their own leadership development.

The structure of the Workshop is a combination of guest speakers and facilitated sessions. The PROPEL Coordinators are responsible for arranging the workshop program and determining the balance of guest speakers and sessions.

An example program for a Leadership Skills Workshop is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30am</td>
<td>Arrivals and refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Introductory Session and Welcome (Program Coordinators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Opening Address (e.g. VC or Chancellor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Leadership Keynote Speaker (e.g. distinguished university leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Position’ (Facilitator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Leadership in Teaching — GUEST SPEAKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15pm</td>
<td>Leadership Assessment Debrief (Program Coordinators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00pm</td>
<td>Drinks, Dinner, GUEST SPEAKER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>Day 1 review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00am</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Reflect’ (Facilitator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15am</td>
<td>Leadership in Research — GUEST SPEAKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Open’ (Facilitator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15pm</td>
<td>Preparation for Big Picture Component (Program Coordinators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30pm</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Provide’ (Facilitator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Enable’ (Facilitator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45pm</td>
<td>Preparation for Active Component (Program Coordinators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00pm</td>
<td>Drinks, Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30pm</td>
<td>Project work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>Day 2 review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00am</td>
<td>Workshop Topic Session — ‘Link’ (Facilitator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15am</td>
<td>Project work presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30am</td>
<td>PROPEL Network (Program Coordinators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td>Connecting the Dots (Program Coordinators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea and Departures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. THE MID-POINT WORKSHOP

At around six months into the Program, the one-day Mid-Point Workshop is held. Like the Leadership Skills Workshop, this workshop supports a number of components of the Program. The purpose of this workshop is to:

- Further explore and develop specific leadership skills which were not covered during the Leadership Skills Workshop.
- Provide a formal face-to-face opportunity for participants and Coordinators to come together as a group to maintain Program momentum.
- Provide an opportunity for participants to discuss the progress of their Active Component project, act as a milestone for participants to keep their project work on track and provide information on project evaluation strategies.
- Support the Big Picture Component by providing guest speakers who will examine various academic leadership roles.
The structure of the Workshop is a combination of guest speakers and facilitated sessions. The PROPEL Coordinators are responsible for arranging the workshop program and determining the balance of guest speakers and sessions.

An example program for a Mid-Point Workshop is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00am</td>
<td>Registration and coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15am</td>
<td>Welcome and opening activity <em>(Program Coordinators)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30am</td>
<td>Leadership Skills Session <em>(Facilitator)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45am</td>
<td>Big Picture Session — GUEST SPEAKERS <em>(e.g. a day in the life of a Head of School or Research Leader)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45pm</td>
<td>Leadership Skills Session <em>(Facilitator)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch <em>(with invited guests, e.g. university executives, mentors)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Active Component Session <em>(e.g. update from each participant on their progress plus a facilitated session on project evaluation)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45pm</td>
<td>Participant activity <em>(e.g. role play, case study, debate)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30pm</td>
<td>What’s ahead in the PROPEL Program <em>(Program Coordinators)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. SELECTING AND BRIEFING THE WORKSHOP FACILITATOR

Engagement of a professional leadership development facilitator is essential for both workshops in this Component of the Program.

The responsibilities of the facilitator include:

- Building the content of the facilitated leadership development sessions of the Leadership Skills Workshop and Mid-Point Workshop, based on the basic objectives of the PROPEL Program and the PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains.
- Delivery of these sessions to the participant group.

The PROPEL Coordinators need to select a facilitator who is attuned to the academic world. A facilitator who is not based in academia, or who takes a corporate or off-the-shelf approach to the content and delivery of face-to-face sessions, will meet strong resistance from the participant group. The facilitator needs to be aware of the extent to which academic audiences nurse scepticism toward the replication of ‘corporate’ style language and practices to academia.
The facilitator will be expected to build the Workshop content based on the PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains. There is no pre-existing content provided in the form of handouts or PowerPoints for the leadership skills sessions. This is to allow the facilitator to source and use material which they are comfortable and experienced in presenting and which suits the particular needs of the institution running the Program.

9. SELECTING GUEST SPEAKERS

A key feature of the Leadership Skills Workshop and Mid-Point Workshop are the guest speakers. The PROPEL Coordinators should make every effort to attract outstanding tertiary sector leaders to present as part of the Program. It is especially important to source some of the guest speakers from outside the host institution in order to provide participants with a sector-wide overview of leadership.
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1. THE IMPORTANCE OF NETWORKING TO ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

For future leaders, the importance of establishing a strong network of colleagues cannot be overemphasised. Studies of university leaders have shown that learning from others is among the top three most significant influences on their learning how to lead and their leadership effectiveness (Drew, Ehrich & Hansford, 2008; Scott, Coates & Anderson, 2008). Learning from experienced leaders takes place during the Mentoring and Leadership Skills Components of the PROPEL Program, but learning from peers is an equally valuable experience which is enhanced when a formal network is established.

Scott et. al. (2008) recommend that “universities investigate ways of setting up learning networks for people in the same role”. Forming close ties to others at a similar stage of their leadership career offers pre-leadership academics an invaluable opportunity to get to know and learn from the people who will most likely be in leadership positions alongside them in the future.

2. ORGANISATIONAL AIMS OF THE PROPEL NETWORK COMPONENT

Through establishing networks among pre-leadership academics, the PROPEL Network Component will contribute to achieving the following outcomes:

- Developing and retaining pre-leadership academics with recognised leadership potential.
- Providing a pool of candidates for future leadership positions who have broadened their attitudes towards and understanding of the tertiary sector.
- Forming connections based on mutual experience and trust among a cohort of future leaders.
- Fostering of a culture of working collaboratively across faculties and disciplines.

3. DEFINING ‘NETWORK’ IN THE PROPEL CONTEXT

‘Network’ in the PROPEL context is defined as the connection formed among the participant group for the duration of the Program. The definition of the Network can include the Program Coordinators, as they play an active role in this Component.

This is not to be confused with ‘networking’, which is identified in the Leadership Skills Component and refers to building and utilising a network of internal and external contacts to enhance leadership effectiveness.
4. BENEFITS TO PROPEL PARTICIPANTS FROM THE NETWORK COMPONENT

The PROPEL Network Component supports and connects participants as they work through the various Program Components. Participants will gain both direct and indirect support.

Direct support to:

- Plan and carry out the leadership project during the Active Component.
- Reflect on learnings from meetings attended during the Big Picture Component.
- Be self-reflective throughout the Program, and especially in preparation for elements of the Reflective Component.
- Benefit from knowledge and skills of other Program participants.
- Connect with staff in leadership and other key positions within the university through invitation to Network meetings as guest speakers.
- Receive feedback on any difficulties they are facing with elements of the Program or other general issues.
- Broaden their understanding and appreciation of the similarities and differences between their faculty and others.

Indirect support to:

- Increase confidence in their leadership abilities.
- Develop specific leadership skills identified through the Leadership Skills Component.
- Increase motivation to pursue academic leadership pathways.
- Build a personal leadership development plan with both long and short term goals.
- Extend collaborative networks.
- Establish other contacts and networks to support their development.
- Better balance demands of academic life.
- Reduce any sense of isolation.
5. HOW THE NETWORK COMPONENT OPERATES

The Network Component should generally follow the model outlined below, but can be as flexible and adaptable as the Program Coordinators and participants require.

The Network Component consists of:

- An email group containing all participants and the Program Coordinators. This list allows easy communication among the group.

- A blog site. This will be a place for participants to record thoughts and experiences during the Program. A blog may or may not suit the interests of different participant groups.

- Regular meetings of the Network. These meeting should take place around once per month. Meetings can contain a mix of the following elements:
  - Guest speakers — providing further insight or follow-up on areas identified as important for leadership development. For example, the university finance director would be a valuable speaker.
  - Pre-set discussion topics — providing guided discussion on any topic of interest to the group, or a topic relevant to the current stage of the PROPEL Program. For example, topics which the group feels were not comprehensively covered by the face-to-face workshops, or discussion of committee meeting experiences and active project progress.
  - Unstructured discussion time — providing participants the opportunity to chat informally about any issues they are having (with the Program, or generally); ideas they would like to share (including suggestions offered by the participants’ mentors); experiences they have had since they last met.

6. SUPPORT FOR THE PROPEL NETWORK

Initially at least, the Network should be administered by the PROPEL Program Coordinators to ensure it runs effectively. This will include setting up an email list and blog site (optional), scheduling monthly meetings throughout the Program, arranging meeting venue and catering, and organising any guest speakers requested by the participants.

If the cohort of participants is working well together, the responsibility for administering the Network should be handed over to them. One suggested model is to get participants to form pairs and allocate the coordination of each Network meeting to one pair. In this way, the participants are more invested in the success of the Network and can drive the agenda more directly.
7. FOCUS OF PROPEL NETWORK MEETINGS

The PROPEL Network is participant driven, and should reflect the needs, interests and motivations of the group. At the same time, it should mirror the progress of other Components of the Program. For example, discussion of committee meetings should be set as a topic once all participants have attended at least one meeting; progress of the active projects should be a regular discussion topic, especially prior to the Mid-Point Workshop and again prior to the Project Presentation Event.

There needs to be a good balance between pre-set discussion topics, guest speakers and unstructured discussion time. Too much focus on structured elements will limit participants' opportunity to chat informally about issues/ideas/experiences they have had since their last meeting. What will tend to happen is that informal discussion will take place anyway and overtake the pre-set topics. However, if Network meetings are too unstructured they will not offer the full range of benefits anticipated and will not fully support the other Program Components. Discussion will be dominated by the stronger personalities and those with the most concerns to air. Meeting attendance rates will fall if the Network is not addressing the needs and interests of all participants.

8. SCHEDULE OF NETWORK COMPONENT ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the Leadership Skills Workshop:</th>
<th>Introduce the Network Component. Encourage the participant group to discuss how they want the Network to operate and the benefits they expect to gain from it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within two weeks of the Workshop:</td>
<td>Establish the participant email list and blog site (optional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month after Workshop:</td>
<td>First Network meeting. Arranged by Program Coordinators. Discussion topics should include any unresolved issues/questions raised at the Leadership Skills Workshop (workshop evaluations should provide an insight into this). Optional guest speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each month until end of Program:</td>
<td>Four-weekly Network meetings arranged by either the Program Coordinators or the participants themselves. Discussion topics should mirror the stages of other Components in the Program. Active projects should be discussed regularly. Optional guest speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. NETWORK GROUND RULES

The participant group should be encouraged to discuss the ground rules for their network, probably during the Leadership Skills Workshop. Network meetings will be a forum where sensitive information or personal details may be discussed, and as such all participants need to be in agreement about the limits of disclosing information during meetings and the requirement to keep information shared confidential.

10. REFERENCES
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1. THE IMPORTANCE OF SEEING THE ‘BIG PICTURE’

Academic leaders need to have a big picture vision and know how to get there by understanding the structures and systems that will enable the enactment of that vision. These include “policy formation, managing relationships, working with challenging staff, involvement in various aspects of planning, and attending meetings” (Scott, Coates & Anderson, 2008).

Potential future leaders need to gain understanding about how their university and the university sector work in order to see the big picture and develop inspired leadership visions. At the same time they need to become aware of the — often conflicting — pressures confronting universities and staff in universities.

2. THE PROPEL BIG PICTURE COMPONENT

The Big Picture Component will allow PROPEL participants insight into how universities work on a day to day basis through attendance at university-level committee meetings.

Each participant will attend at least two meetings, ideally one in the teaching and learning area and one in the research area. For each committee attended, the participant will arrange an appointment with the committee Chair to discuss observations and gain further insights. The participant will then write a short general reflective report which will be given to the committee Chair. In addition, there will be discussion sessions held among the PROPEL participant group where meeting experiences will be shared.

Attending high-level committee meetings will help PROPEL participants develop a realistic picture of how their university operates and enable them to “connect the dots”, to experience the complexity of academic management.

3. IDENTIFYING APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES

Committees identified to be included in the Big Picture Component will:

- Be at university governance level.
- Have a regular schedule of meetings.
- Deal with topics which give an insight into issues of significance to the university as a whole.
- Be active in developing options and solutions. (Committees which are mainly concerned with approvals are not preferred.)
Chairs of selected committees will be contacted by the PROPEL Coordinators to seek approval for PROPEL participants to attend a set number of committee meetings during the 12 months of the Program.

Other events may also be suitable for PROPEL participants to attend, such as faculty or university planning meetings. Attendance at such events can be negotiated between the participant, PROPEL Coordinators and the event coordinator.

4. SELECTION OF COMMITTEES TO ATTEND

A full list of committees will be available to participants at the PROPEL Leadership Skills Workshop. Participants will be asked to state their preferences for the committees they wish to attend.

Participants are expected to attend at least two different committees during the 12-month PROPEL Program. One committee should have a teaching focus and the other should have a research focus. In addition, participants may also choose to attend a committee with an overall governance focus.

The PROPEL Coordinators will allocate participants to committees as appropriate.

5. SUPPORT FOR PARTICIPANTS TO COMPLETE THE BIG PICTURE COMPONENT

Supporting materials will be provided to participants, including structured tools for recording and reviewing their observations during committee meetings. These will help participants focus on:

- Leadership skills and style demonstrated by the Chair.
- Other committee members who adopt a leadership role.
- Dynamics in the room and how they are managed effectively.
- Types of topics on the agenda.
- How issues are dealt with and resolved.
- How the committee deals with situations where they can’t reach agreement.
- External forces affecting the university or the faculty.
- How academic and administrative issues overlap.
- Connections between vision, strategy and operational planning.

The PROPEL Coordinators will provide follow-up support at regular intervals to ensure participants are managing to attend their selected committee meetings and are meeting with the committee Chairs for follow-up discussions. The PROPEL Coordinators will liaise with committee Chairs if any difficulties arise.
6. **SCHEDULE OF MEETING ATTENDANCES AND FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSIONS**

The schedule of meeting attendances is to be arranged as best suits the participant and the committee Chairs. As a guide:

- First committee attendance — within the first three months of the PROPEL Program.
- Second committee attendance — about half-way through the PROPEL Program.

Participants will be expected to attend at least one meeting of each committee during the 12 months. Where the committee Chair approves, participants may arrange to attend a number of consecutive meetings of the same committee. This will allow progress and development of issues to be observed.

After each committee attendance, participants are required to schedule an appointment with the committee Chair to discuss their observations. This discussion should take place as soon as possible following the committee meeting.

For each committee attended, participants will write a short general reflective report which will be given to the committee Chairs.

7. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

All PROPEL participants will be required to provide the committee Chair with a signed confidentiality agreement which states that they will not disclose any confidential or sensitive information they have received as a result of their participation in that committee.

Participants will be advised that they should step out of a committee meeting at any time that the committee is discussing sensitive matters regarding the participant’s own faculty.

8. **REFERENCES**
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1. THE IMPORTANCE OF REFLECTION TO ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

During the development stage of the PROPEL Program, research was undertaken into the skills and attributes needed by good academic leaders. From this research a list of attributes was produced, which was summarised into a set of six PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains.

Reflective skills and behaviours were identified so frequently by respondents that they were included as one of the six domains.

Domain 2: REFLECT
Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes

1. Move from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role.
2. Understand your personal strengths, limitations and motivators.
3. Develop maturity by making sense of and learning from experience, including admitting to mistakes.
4. Commit to ongoing personal and professional development.
5. Develop strategic, creative and lateral thinking abilities.
6. Be true to your personal values.
7. Develop your skills as a negotiator and influencer.
8. Develop resilience.

PROPEL Program participants are encouraged to actively reflect on academic leadership, and on themselves as leaders, throughout the Program.

2. ORGANISATIONAL AIMS OF THE PROPEL REFLECTIVE COMPONENT

Through establishing a process for pre-leadership academics to reflect on leadership and on themselves as possible future leaders, the PROPEL Reflective Component will contribute to achieving the following outcomes:

- Providing a pool of candidates for future leadership positions who are equipped with leadership skills (including reflective skills).
- Developing and retaining pre-leadership academics with recognised leadership potential.
- Raising awareness among current leaders of the importance of nurturing future leaders.
3. OVERVIEW OF THE REFLECTIVE COMPONENT

The Reflective Component puts processes in place which give participants the opportunity to stop and reflect on themselves both as academics and as potential academic leaders. The PROPEL Program targets more than just one type of leadership, giving participants the opportunity to reflect on the kind of leadership they are interested in and suited to at a formative point in their academic careers.

The Reflective Component consisted of two distinct elements:

- PROPEL Leadership Assessment Instruments
- PROPEL Reflective Event

As well as these elements, reflective activity is also built in to each of the other PROPEL Program Components in various forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Reflective elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>• Discussing ‘where am I now’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifying ‘where I want to be’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Considering development needed to get there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>• Evaluating the project in terms of where things could have been done better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Considering and reporting on leadership lessons learned through undertaking the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>• Group reflective time provided after each guest speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership Assessment Reports debriefed as a group and individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses considered ahead of completing the Individual Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Picture</td>
<td>• Reflection on personal/professional characteristics of committee Chair and comparison with participant’s own style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>• Sharing reflections on leadership generally and specific experiences during the PROPEL Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. PROPEL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

The PROPEL Leadership Assessment Framework consists of a set of leadership assessment instruments developed specifically for the PROPEL Program:

1. A **Leadership Self-Assessment** instrument — completed at the beginning, mid-point and end of the program to track participants’ own perceptions of their development over the 12 months of the Program.

2. A **360 Degree Feedback** instrument — completed by supervisors, colleagues and reports of the participants at the beginning and again at the end of the Program to give participants an objective view of their leadership capabilities.

Results from these assessments are presented to participants in the form of a PROPEL Leadership Assessment Report which is updated throughout the year each time the assessments are completed.

The purpose of these instruments is to allow participants to:

- Gauge their current leadership abilities.
- See how their abilities develop over the course of the Program.
- Gain insight into how they are viewed by their colleagues.
- Identify areas for improvement which can be focussed on during the Program.

The instruments are not intended to act as a screening tool for selection of staff with leadership ability/potential. Their intended use is as a professional development tool only.

The PROPEL Leadership Assessment Framework is summarised below.
5. SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Pre-Program Questionnaire

The questionnaire is administered to Program participants following the Program Launch. Participants should be given around one week to complete the questionnaire. Responses need to be received by the PROPEL Coordinators at least two weeks prior to the Leadership Skills Workshop to allow time for the Leadership Assessment Reports to be developed and printed.

All questionnaires can be administered on paper, however coding into an online survey application is preferred.

Mid-Point Questionnaire

This questionnaire is shorter than the pre-program questionnaire, and is intended mainly to capture changes in participants’ thoughts and feelings about their leadership direction and expectations. The questionnaire is administered to Program participants following the Mid-Point Workshop. Participants should be given around one week to complete the questionnaire. Responses from the mid-point questionnaire are incorporated into the Leadership Assessment Report and an updated report forwarded to participants.

End-of-Program Questionnaire

This questionnaire is a repeat of the pre-program questionnaire. It allows changes in participants’ ratings of their leadership ability to be compared directly to their ratings at the start of the Program. The questionnaire is administered to Program participants prior to the Reflective Event. Participants should be given around one week to complete the questionnaire. Responses from the end-of-program questionnaire are incorporated into the Leadership Assessment Report, and need to be received by the PROPEL Coordinators at least two weeks prior to the Reflective Event to allow time for updated reports to be developed and printed.

6. 360 DEGREE FEEDBACK PROCESS

The 360 Degree Feedback questionnaire mirrors parts of the self-assessment questionnaire to allow participants to directly compare their self-ratings on various skills with ratings given by their colleagues.

Program participants should be asked to nominate between two and five colleagues in each of the following categories to be invited to complete a questionnaire:

- Supervisors — those who have a leadership or management or supervisory role in the participant’s work.
- Peers — those who are a colleague/peer of the participant.
- Reports — those who are led, managed or supervised by the participant.
Pre-Program Questionnaire

Program participants are asked to nominate a list of respondents following the Program Launch. Respondents should be given around two weeks to complete the questionnaire. Responses need to be received by the PROPEL Coordinators at least two weeks prior to the Leadership Skills Workshop to allow time for the Leadership Assessment Reports to be developed and printed.

All questionnaires can be administered on paper, however coding into an online survey application is preferred.

End-of-Program Questionnaire

This questionnaire is a repeat of the pre-program questionnaire. It allows changes in colleagues’ ratings of participants’ leadership ability to be compared directly to ratings given at the start of the Program. The questionnaire is administered to Program prior to the Reflective Event. It is desirable, but not essential, that the same colleagues respond to the end-of-program questionnaire as the pre-program questionnaire. Respondents should be given around one week to complete the questionnaire. Responses from the end-of-program questionnaire are incorporated into the Leadership Assessment Report, and need to be received by the PROPEL Coordinators at least two weeks prior to the Reflective Event to allow time for updated reports to be developed and printed.

7. LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT REPORTS

A Pre-Program Leadership Assessment Report is developed for each participant based on data collected in the self-assessment questionnaire and the 360 degree feedback questionnaire. Reports are provided to participants during the Leadership Skills Workshop at the start of the Program. During a debriefing session at the Workshop, participants are encouraged to read through their reports carefully and begin to digest the implications of the ratings and comments for their development.

During the Program, the individual Leadership Assessment Reports are updated at the Program mid-point (6 months) and at the end of the Program (12 months) with information from the additional self-assessment and 360 degree feedback questionnaires. The End-of-Program Report allows participants to see the changes in themselves over the course of the Program, as well as any differences in how others perceive them. Discussion and debrief of the End-of-Program Reports forms part of the final event of the Program, the Reflective Event.
8. PROPEL REFLECTIVE EVENT

The final event of the 12 month Program is the Reflective Event. This full-day event allows participants to get together one final time to ‘put together the pieces’ they experience during the Program and start to consider their future directions and future leadership development needs.

The PROPEL Coordinators are responsible for arranging the program for this event and determining the balance of guest speakers and facilitated sessions. An example of a program for the Reflective Event is given below.

| 9.30am  | Registration and coffee |
| 9.45am  | Welcome and Reflections — PROPEL Coordinators |
| 10.00am | GUEST SPEAKER — e.g. university leader or leadership scholar |
| 11.00am | Morning Tea |
| 11.15am | PARTICIPANT REFLECTIVE SESSION |
|         | • Leadership Assessment Reports debrief. |
|         | • Techniques for constructive self-reflection. |
|         | • Planning for the next phase of leadership development. |
| 12.30pm | Lunch |
| 1.30pm  | PARTICIPANT REFLECTIVE SESSION |
|         | Sharing what everyone has learned about leadership (insights, experiences, ongoing challenges, questions). |
| 2.30pm  | PROGRAM EVALUATION SESSION |
|         | Discussion, feedback and suggestions for improvement of the PROPEL Program as a leadership development vehicle. |
| 3.00pm  | Afternoon drinks and nibbles |
| 3.15pm  | PROPEL Graduation |

The Reflective Event concludes with a PROPEL ‘Graduation’ and celebratory drinks, attended by participants, Coordinators, university executive, deans and leadership mentors. A member of the university executive presents each participant with a plaque/certificate and a reads brief description of their achievements during the Program.
## 9. SCHEDULE OF REFLECTIVE COMPONENT ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program preparation stage</strong></td>
<td>Self assessment and 360 degree feedback questionnaires coded into an online survey application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Program Launch Event**     | PROPEL participants given information on the assessment process.  
                                | 360 degree feedback respondent names requested (due asap).  
                                | Pre-Program self assessment questionnaire released following event (due in one week). |
| **One week after Launch**    | Pre-Program 360 degree feedback questionnaire released (due in two weeks).            |
| **Two weeks after Launch**   | Self-Assessment responses received and collated into Reports.                         |
| **Three weeks after Launch** | 360 degree responses received and collated into Reports.                               |
| **Leadership Skills Workshop** | Printed copies of Reports distributed at the Leadership Skills Workshop and a debriefing session conducted. |
| **Mid-Point Workshop**       | Mid-point self assessment questionnaire released following workshop (due in one week). |
| **One week after Workshop**  | Self-Assessment responses received and added into Reports.  
                                | Updated Reports distributed to participants (in soft copy).                           |
| **Project Presentation Event** | Participants given information on the final assessment process.  
                                | 360 degree feedback respondent names requested (due asap).  
                                | End-of-Program self assessment questionnaire released following event (due in one week). |
| **One week after Event**     | End-of-Program 360 degree feedback questionnaire released (due in two weeks).         |
| **Two weeks after Event**    | Self-Assessment responses received and Reports updated.                                |
| **Three weeks after Event**  | 360 degree responses received and Reports updated.                                     |
| **Reflective Event**         | Printed copies of Reports distributed at (or prior to) the Reflective Event and a debriefing session conducted. |
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Appendix A

UOW PROPEL Survey —
YOU decide the future of university leadership

The UOW PROPEL Leadership Development Program will prepare academic staff for their future leadership careers. The leadership attributes which **you value most highly** in academic leaders will be built into the Program. This survey will take about **15 minutes to complete**. If you need to close the survey and return to it later, just click on the link in your email again to resume.

The PROPEL project team are very grateful for your time. If you have any problems or questions please call Karen Lovasz on ext 8218 or klovasz@uow.edu.au

YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE ANONYMOUS. Details you provide will not be used to identify individual respondents and your email address is not linked to this survey. At the end of the survey you will have the option to enter the draw for one of three $150 Myer vouchers (a contact phone number will be required to enter the draw).

Please tick the "I Agree" option below.

- [ ] I agree to proceed with this survey.

You will be shown 13 blocks of statements about the skills and characteristics of an effective university leader.

These statements derive from interviews with UOW staff (both leaders and non-leaders) as well as other studies of university leadership.

There are three questions about your views on each statement:

- How important is this attribute for leaders in Universities?
- Is this attribute more important in Universities than in industry?
- Can this attribute be taught?

There will also be a number of background questions about you and your role at UOW. If you are concerned that the information you provide would be sufficient to identify you, please leave the question about your Faculty blank.

1. **Your gender**

- [ ] Female
- [ ] Male

2. **Your age __________**
3. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders IN UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>Valuable, not essential</td>
<td>Essential for any leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the higher education context and environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages change sensitively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a genuine interest in their staff as people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters team collegiality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is well organised, (e.g. good time management, delegates effectively).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Your level

- Level A
- Level D
- Level B
- Level E
- Other ________

5. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders IN UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>Valuable, not essential</td>
<td>Essential for any leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives positive feedback to staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates leadership in teaching, research and community engagement equally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is always a strong advocate for their own Unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commits to ongoing personal and professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deals effectively with adversarial staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders IN UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>Valuable, not essential</td>
<td>Essential for any leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks positively at ways to move forward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands organisational rules and applies them fairly and consistently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives negative feedback to staff when required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates academic integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts genuine structures in place to promote and reward collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please select the option which best describes YOUR academic leadership experience:

- [ ] Currently in a HIGH LEVEL leadership role at UOW — e.g. Associate Dean or above; Head of School; Director of University Research Strength or Strategic Research Initiative.
- [ ] Currently in a MIDDLE LEVEL leadership role at UOW — e.g. Chief Investigator on grant; Subject Coordinator; Committee Chair; Director of Faculty Research Centre.
- [ ] Not currently in a leadership role at UOW, but have previous academic leadership experience.
- [ ] Have not held an academic leadership role.
8. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders in Universities?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sees diversity as positive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes external networks to share views and ideas and to consult for advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has resilience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a ‘can do’ attitude (e.g. commits to action, takes responsibility and delivers results).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balances demands from above and below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders in Universities?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has political awareness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t allow their Unit or themselves to become isolated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds high performing teams with a culture of shared responsibility and success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has maturity to make sense of and learning from experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has strategies in place to find out about staff needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Please show the percentage of your work time which is dedicated to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders IN UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>Valuable, not essential</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads academic staff in ways which suit their unique communication and work styles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equally important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes the transition from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role.</td>
<td></td>
<td>More important in Uni’s</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks, identifies and seizes on strategic opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>More important in industry</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes time to listen and to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t leave things to chance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders in UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>Valuable, not essential</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential for any leader</td>
<td>Equally important</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides both formal and informal structures for consultation and reflection.</td>
<td>More important in Uni’s</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors others.</td>
<td>More important in industry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has direction and vision.</td>
<td>Equally important</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is true to own personal values.</td>
<td>More important in Uni’s</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates clearly, openly and honestly.</td>
<td>Equally important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How long have you worked in academia?

_____ years

14. Your cultural background

- Raised in Australia
- Raised overseas — English-speaking background
- Raised overseas — Non-English-speaking background
15. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders IN UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions quickly and with confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works to be of service to staff (e.g. offers guidance to help them achieve).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a strong negotiator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses and manages risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates staff by celebrating successes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders IN UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinks strategically, creatively and laterally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates integrity and develops trust by being consistent and transparent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drives initiatives by gaining alignment and commitment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates passion for their discipline in teaching and research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows respect for staff by being professional, patient and cooperative in dealings with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Have you found the academic leaders you have worked with (at UOW or elsewhere) to be:

- Mostly good leaders
- Mostly average leaders
- Mostly poor leaders
- I'd rather not comment

18. How satisfied do you feel with your current work environment?

- Very satisfied
- Generally satisfied
- Not satisfied
- I'd rather not comment

19. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders in Universities?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>Valuable, not essential</td>
<td>Essential for any leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a big-picture view of the organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models a quality of excellence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions the ideas and visions of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives staff opportunities which empower them and build their confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates change responsibly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders IN UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equally important</td>
<td>More important in Uni's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converst vision into strategy then into operational plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspires innovation and creativity in staff by demonstrating drive, energy and enthusiasm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands how the system works in a multi-faceted organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates the breadth of academic work and avoids privileging one aspect over another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify the core issue or opportunity in any situation from a mass of information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Your faculty (you may leave this question blank if you feel it would directly identify you)

- Arts
- Commerce
- Creative Arts
- Education
- Engineering
- Health & Behavioural Sciences
- Informatics
- Law
- Science
- Sydney Business School
- Graduate School of Medicine
- Other__________________
22. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders IN UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>Valuable, not essential</td>
<td>Essential for any leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands own personal strengths, limitations and motivators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and solves problems early.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes strategic use of available resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is accessible, visible and approachable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balances academic leadership role with administrative leadership demands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Please read the 5 statements below and indicate your opinions by ticking the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How important is this attribute for leaders IN UNIVERSITIES?</th>
<th>Is this more important in Universities than in industry?</th>
<th>Can this be taught?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>Valuable, not essential</td>
<td>Essential for any leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is prepared to hear and act on feedback about themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits to and learns from their mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes staff in decision making processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys a sense of progress by ensuring tangible outcomes from meetings and forums.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a strong influencer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Is there anything you would like to add about the leadership attributes you value most highly?

25. I would like to enter the draw for the Myer vouchers, and can be contacted on the following phone number (mobile preferred) if I am a winner.

THANK YOU! You have now completed the survey.

Please tick the "I Agree" option below and move to the next screen where your responses will be submitted. If you do not want to submit your responses, please close your browser window now.

- I agree to submit my responses.
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1 The intent of the PROPEL Program

1.1 PROPEL aims to develop leadership skills in pre-leadership academic staff which will prepare them for possible leadership roles throughout their career.

1.2 PROPEL aims to enhance participants’ skills and broaden their understanding of leadership in three areas – generic leadership ability, leadership in teaching, and leadership in research.

1.3 PROPEL will not train participants for any particular leadership role, such as Head of School, but rather will lay the foundations of their ability to lead others in the university environment. This leadership ability can be applied in many contexts, not only in formal leadership roles.

1.4 It is the intention of PROPEL to target staff who are not yet in institutional leadership roles but who have already demonstrated characteristics of leadership in the way they work, and who have shown they are open to new ideas and fresh approaches to working with others and with their university.

2 Definitions

2.1 PROPEL – Program for Preparing Early Leaders. A pilot 12-month development program for UOW academic staff.

2.2 PROPEL Coordinators – The group consisting of the three PROPEL Project Leaders and the PROPEL Project Manager will be referred to as the PROPEL Coordinators.

2.3 Pre-Leadership Academic – For the purposes of PROPEL a pre-leadership academic is defined as a member of academic staff who has not held an institutional leadership role (see 2.4)

2.4 Institutional Leadership Role – For the purpose of selecting participants for PROPEL, leadership roles are divided into two groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Leadership Roles (NOT eligible)</th>
<th>Other Leadership Roles (Eligible to apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of School or Discipline</td>
<td>Chief Investigator on grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean or above</td>
<td>Subject Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of University Research Strength or Strategic Research Initiative</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Faculty Research Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period of acting in an ‘Institutional Leadership Role’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Participant numbers and sources

3.1 Training future academic leaders requires a lot of personal face-to-face opportunity for discussion and reflection that cannot be offered in a “mass teaching” or “distance learning” format. For this reason, the maximum number of pre-leadership academic staff that can be accepted into PROPEL is limited to 15 per annum.

3.2 Twelve (12) participants will be selected from University of Wollongong staff. One participant will be sought from each of the nine Faculties at UOW plus the Graduate
School of Medicine, the Sydney Business School and the Woolyungah Indigenous Centre.

3.3 The three (3) remaining places will be filled by applicants from other Australian universities. The value of mixing participants from different universities is two-fold: UOW participants will gain from the wider perspective brought to PROPEL by academics from outside UOW; participants from other universities will become PROPEL ambassadors, helping to disseminate information about the program and possibly even instigating uptake of PROPEL at other Australian universities.

4 Eligibility guidelines

4.1 All applicants for PROPEL must be pre-leadership academic staff who have not held an institutional leadership role (see definition at 2.3 and 2.4).

4.2 Applicants must be members of academic staff employed at level A, B or C (staff at level D and E may apply but will be considered only if they meet the definition of a pre-leadership academic).

4.3 Applicants must be employed on a permanent or fixed-term basis. Fixed-term staff must be on a contract of at least three (3) years with at least two (2) years of their contract remaining as at the close-off date for applications (see 6.6).

4.4 Applications from sessional teaching staff (including postgraduate students) will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

5 Selection criteria

5.1 Applicants for PROPEL will be assessed in four areas:
   • Characteristics of leadership (see 5.3);
   • Energy and enthusiasm for new ideas and ways of working;
   • Interest in collaborative and interdisciplinary work;
   • Strong research and teaching performance (relative to opportunity, but not necessarily in equal measure).

5.2 Applicants will also be expected to describe how participation in PROPEL will be of benefit to:
   • themselves at this current point in their career; AND
   • their Faculty and UOW as a whole.

5.3 Characteristics of leadership include, but are not limited to:
   • Direction, vision, originality;
   • Role model who demonstrates a quality of excellence and is passionate about their discipline (in either teaching, research or both);
   • Genuine interest in people and the ability to connect with staff on a personal level;
   • Genuine regard for diversity and seeing difference as positive.
   • Personal traits including drive, energy, enthusiasm, positive attitude, conviction, cooperativeness, patience, consideration;
   • Maturity, self-understanding, self-motivation, being true to own personal values;
   • Comfortable working in complex situations of ambiguity and incomplete information.

5.4 Applicants who are currently studying towards a HDR qualification will need to clearly demonstrate how they will manage their time to allow them to commit the required time and energy to PROPEL to make the most of their inclusion as a participant.

6 Application process

6.1 UOW Senior Executive and Deans will be given information on PROPEL in May 2010 and will be requested to nominate staff they feel would most benefit from participation
in the program. Nominated staff will be contacted by the PROPEL Coordinators and invited to submit an application. A ‘Participant Information Pack’ will be sent to all interested staff.

6.2 Nominated staff who express an interest in applying will be invited to attend a PROPEL Applicant Information Session to be held on 15 June 2010.

6.3 Staff wishing to apply for PROPEL will need to submit an application on the form provided.

6.4 Applicants will need to provide the following details with their applications:
- Employment details to establish their eligibility;
- A current CV;
- A statement related to the selection criteria (see Section 5);
- Names and contact details of three referees, including their current Head of School and/or Dean. (The selection committee will have the freedom to contact any additional UOW staff for further information if required to assist the selection process.)

6.5 Applications will close on 30 July 2010. Applications received after this date will only be accepted at the discretion of the PROPEL Coordinators.

6.6 Applications will be assessed by a selection committee consisting of the DV-C Academic, the DV-C Operations and the PROPEL Coordinators. The selection committee will meet in early August 2010.

6.7 The selection committee may wish to interview some or all applicants to discuss their applications in further detail. Applicants who know they will not be available for interview in early August should advise the PROPEL Coordinators.

6.8 Applicants will be advised of the committee’s decision as soon as possible following the meeting.

7 Participants from outside UOW

7.1 Applicants for PROPEL from other Australian universities will need to meet the eligibility criteria outlined at Section 3 and follow the application process outlined at Section 6.

7.2 All applications must be forwarded to UOW by the closing date and will be considered by the selection committee alongside applications from within UOW.

Last updated: 30 July 2010
Program for Preparing Early Leaders

PROPEL
a one-year intensive leadership program for pre-leadership academics

2010 applicant information
THE PROPEL VISION

TO DEVELOP FUTURE ACADEMIC LEADERS WHO:

- TRULY LIVE THE LEARNING-TEACHING-RESEARCH NEXUS
- LIVE COLLABORATION
- THINK BEYOND DISCIPLINARY BOUNDARIES
- REACT QUICKLY TO INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL CHALLENGES
- INSPIRE PEOPLE
- GENUINELY CARE ABOUT THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR STAFF.

PROPEL is a collaborative project of the UOW Social Innovation Network, funded by the Australian Teaching and Learning Council.

PROJECT LEADERS AND COORDINATORS
Prof. Rob Castle, DV-C (Academic)
Prof. Sara Dolnicar, Faculty of Commerce
A/Prof. Wilma Viale, Faculty of Education
Ms Karen Lovasz, PROPEL Project Manager

ENQUIRIES: klovasz@uow.edu.au or 02 4252 8218
An invitation . . .

The environment within which the tertiary education sector is operating has become an unprecedented dynamic one. The key challenge for us is to learn how to not only survive in this rapidly-changing environment, but also how to prosper in the future by capitalising on the opportunities that present themselves. Doing so will require a new generation of leaders in the tertiary sector who are open-minded, understand the necessity for true teaching-research nexus, value diversity and interdisciplinarity, and are able to quickly understand and adapt to external pressures.

UOW is leading the way in preparing for this future. The PROPEL Program is a unique leadership program which aims to equip early career academics with both the required skill-set and mind-set of successful future academic leaders. A very small number of carefully selected participants will have the opportunity to participate in the PROPEL program in 2010. Please consider nominating yourself or a colleague to be part of the first cohort to undertake this exciting program.

Gerard Sutton

Professor Gerard Sutton AO
Vice-Chancellor
University of Wollongong
Overview of PROPEL

Most universities offer some form of leadership training program, however a recent study of over 500 university leaders concluded that “current approaches to leadership development in higher education need to be radically reconceptualised” (Scott, Coates & Anderson 2008).

Unlike many other leadership programs, PROPEL’s major focus is on breaking down the borders between disciplines and closing the gap between learning, teaching and research. As a PROPEL participant you will be immersed in collaboration and interdisciplinarity. You will work together with your peers and academic leaders across all faculties as you complete the SIX ELEMENTS of the program over a twelve-month period. Through this process you will develop your leadership skills more fully than you ever could in a discipline-specific environment.

Mentoring Component
Each PROPEL participant will be assigned an experienced academic leader to be their mentor throughout the program. Through the mentoring relationship you will develop your own leadership skills and will also develop your ability to mentor others; a valuable which you can carry forward into future leadership roles.

Leadership Skills Component
All PROPEL participants will attend a three-day residential workshop at the commencement of the program which will cover a blend of generic and academic-specific leadership issues and skills. Workshop presenters will include high-level academic leaders from the research, teaching and executive leadership fields. At the end of the workshop you will choose a number of leadership skills which you will work on developing, with the help of your mentor, throughout the 12-month program.

Interdisciplinary Component
“Global problems and challenges cut across traditional boundaries of the academic disciplines” (Teaching-Research Nexus, 2008). The PROPEL program explores the benefits that can be obtained by approaching an issue from different directions. As a participant you will attend at least two Interdisciplinary Fora, each centred around a specific over-arching topic (e.g. water, youth).

Big Picture Component
PROPEL participants will gain a realistic insight into how universities operate by attending a number of high-level committee meetings. Through your involvement on these committees, you will gain an appreciation of the big picture and experience some of the complexity of academic management.

Active Component
“Practice-based, peer-supported and self-managed learning” is seen by university leaders as the most effective means for learning about leadership (Scott, Coates & Anderson, 2008). As a participant you will choose a project which you will lead during the program. At the end of the year you will produce a report reflecting on your achievement of the leadership task.

Reflective Component
At the end of the PROPEL program a one-day event will be held at which you and your fellow participants will reflect on your journey throughout the training year.
May 2010  Applications open for the 2010 PROPEL program.

15 June 2010  Information session for applicants.

30 July 2010  Applications close.

August 2010  Participants selected and mentoring partnerships determined.

September 2010  Mentors and participants introduced and attend mentoring training.

27-29 September 2010  Leadership Workshop (residential).

Participants select specific leadership skills which they want to develop, and also choose ‘Big Picture’ committee meetings to attend and an Action Project to complete.

October 2010  Mentoring meetings commence (one hour per month).

Mentors and participants work on plans for developing the selected leadership skills.

November 2010  Network gatherings commence.

One-hour each month for participants, mentors and program co-ordinators including leadership guest speakers and networking time.

November 2010  Participants attend first Big Picture committee meeting.

December 2010  Interdisciplinary Forum #1.

December 2010  Mentors and participants work on plan for leadership Action Project.

January to July 2011  Participants continue work on Action Project with support from mentors.

March 2011  Participants attend second Big Picture committee meeting.

May 2011  Interdisciplinary Forum #2.

July 2011  Reflection Day to conclude program.

August 2011  Final mentoring meetings held to conclude partnerships.

**WHAT MAKES PROPEL DIFFERENT?**

PROPEL is a **single, homogeneous program** which brings together the multiple facets of leadership development.

PROPEL focuses on **leadership in three areas**: generic leadership ability, leadership in teaching and leadership in research.

PROPEL begins the **pro-active development** of effective and capable leaders well before they commence their first leadership roles.
Is PROPEL for me?
PROPEL aims to develop leadership skills in pre-leadership academic staff, preparing them for possible leadership roles throughout their career. To gain the full benefit of participating in PROPEL, you must be prepared to commit sufficient time to the program. This will include attending the three-day workshop and the one-day reflection session, around 12 mentoring sessions, 10 network gatherings and at least two fora and committee meetings. You will also need to regularly devote time to the development and implementation of your leadership project. All together the time commitment is estimated at around three hours per week spread across the 12-month program. To support your involvement in the program, Deans of all Faculties have committed to providing one-hour per week face-to-face teaching relief for PROPEL participants.

Am I eligible to apply?
The PROPEL Program is open to:
- Academic staff at Level A, B or C (Level D and E may be considered on a case-by-case basis).
- Permanent or fixed-term staff.
- Staff who have NOT held an institutional leadership role (defined as Head of School or Discipline; Associate Dean or above; Director of University Research Strength or Strategic Research Initiative).

Staff who have held other leadership roles are eligible to apply. These roles can include Chief Investigator on grant; Subject Coordinator; Committee Chair; Director of Faculty Research Centre. Staff who have acted for a period in an institutional leadership role but have not held the role substantively are also eligible to apply.

What is the selection process?
If you are interested in applying you must register with the Project Manager at klovasz@uow.edu.au. You will then be invited to an information session to learn more about the program. Applications must be submitted on the form provided by 30 July.

A selection committee will assess applicants on:
- characteristics of leadership (see opposite page);
- energy and enthusiasm for new ideas and ways of working;
- interest in collaborative and interdisciplinary work;
- strong research and teaching performance (relative to opportunity, but not necessarily equal);
- how participating in PROPEL will benefit both the applicant and their Faculty.

The committee will also contact applicants’ nominated referees and Heads and Deans and may interview some or all applicants. Twelve participants will be selected for the 2010 program from across UOW. See the PROPEL website for full selection criteria. research.uow.edu.au/propel
Research behind the program

Understanding leadership in the academic environment
The PROPEL program is underpinned by original research into academic leadership. Project Leaders aimed to identify those skills and personal characteristics found in excellent university leaders, and particularly those which are specific to the academic environment. The research also aimed to identified which of those skills and characteristics are able to be taught. These questions were examined both from the perspective of current academic leaders and academics who are not in leadership roles. The results of this research have directly informed development of the PROPEL Program content and structure, as well as the participant selection criteria.

Characteristics of leadership
PROPEL Project research has identified certain characteristics as necessary to excellent university leadership but difficult to teach. Participants will be selected for the PROPEL program who already demonstrate many of these identified characteristics:
- Direction, vision, originality.
- Role model who demonstrates a quality of excellence and is passionate about their discipline (in either teaching, research or both).
- Genuine interest in people and the ability to connect with staff on a personal level.
- Genuine regard for diversity and seeing difference as positive.
- Personal traits including drive, energy, enthusiasm, positive attitude, conviction, cooperativeness, patience, consideration.
- Maturity, self-understanding, self-motivation, being true to own personal values.
- Comfortable working in complex situations of ambiguity and incomplete information.

PROPEL leadership development
PROPEL Project research has provided insight into a range of teachable leadership skills and attributes which are highly valued by academic staff. These will form the basis of the PROPEL leadership development program and are summarised in six key statements:

- **POSITION**  Think and work strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within UOW and the wider context.
- **REFLECT**  Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes.
- **OPEN**  Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal level.
- **PROVIDE**  Provide a supportive environment in which your staff will thrive.
- **ENABLE**  Enable your unit to always move forward.
- **LINK**  Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline.
The PROPEL project benefits from the rich leadership experience of a range of university and industry leaders.

PROPEL MENTORS
Prof. Hugh Brown, Faculty of Engineering
Prof. Brian Ferry, Faculty of Education
Prof. Barry Harper, Faculty of Education
Prof. Sandra Jones, Faculty of H&BS
Prof. Leon Kane-Maguire, Faculty of Science
Ms Yvonne Kerr, Dean of Students
Prof. Roger Lewis, Faculty of Engineering
A/Prof. Pauline Lysaght, Faculty of Education
Prof. Fazel Naghdy, Faculty of Informatics
Mr Ron Perrin, Faculty of Commerce
A/Prof. Paul Sharrad, Faculty of Arts
Prof. David Steel, Faculty of Informatics
Prof. Julie Steele, Faculty of H&B
Prof. Simon Ville, Faculty of Commerce

UOW PROJECT TEAM
Dr Lois Burgess, Faculty of Commerce
Prof. Kathy Eagar, Sydney Business School
A/Prof. Helen Hasan, Faculty of Commerce
Prof. Lesley Head, Faculty of Science
A/Prof. Garry Hoban, Faculty of Education
Prof. Sandra Jones, Faculty of H&B
A/Prof. Tim Scrase, Faculty of Arts
Prof. Stephen Tanner, Faculty of Creative Arts
A/Prof Michael Zanko, Faculty of Commerce

LEADERSHIP ADVISORY BOARD
Emeritus Prof. Ken McKinnon
(Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Wollongong)
Prof. Rob Whelan (President, UOW Dubai)
Prof. John Patterson (DV-C Operations, UOW)
Prof. Malcolm Wright
(Professor of Marketing, University of South Australia)
Prof. Peter Goodyear
(Professor of Education, University of Sydney)
Prof. Carmel Diezmann
(Centre for Learning Innovation, QUT)
Mr Peter Keeble (Education Consultant)
Ms Maria Gray-Spence
(Regional Director, NSW Dept of Education and Training)
Ms Jai Waters
(A/Dir. Strategy & Development, TAFE Illawarra Institute)
Mr David Farmer
(General Manager, Wollongong City Council)
Dr David M Williams (CEO DMW Group)
Ms Karen van Druten (Leadership Consultant)

Support for this project has been provided by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council Ltd, an initiative of the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. The views expressed in the project do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Learning and Teaching Council.

research.uow.edu.au/propel
Please submit one hard copy of your application to Karen Lovasz - PROPEL, Faculty of Commerce, 40.G06A. The closing date for applications to be received is Friday 30 July, 2010.

You will need to complete all FIVE PARTS of this application:

PART 1 Your Details
PART 2 Your Referees
PART 3 Dean’s Support
PART 4 Statement against the Selection Criteria
PART 5 Current CV

If you have any questions about this form or the application process, please contact the PROPEL Project Manager Karen Lovasz on x8218 or klovasz@uow.edu.au

PART 1 – YOUR DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>School or Dept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Level and Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Permanent □ Fixed-Term □

Please give details of fixed-term contract: Start date □ End date □

Please select the options which best describe the academic leadership roles you have held at UOW:

- HIGH LEVEL leadership roles
  e.g. Associate Dean or above; Head of School or Discipline; Director of University Research Strength or Strategic Research Initiative.

- I have acted in a high level leadership role, but have not held the role substantively.

- MIDDLE LEVEL leadership roles
  e.g. Chief Investigator on grant; Subject Coordinator; Committee Chair; Director of Faculty Research Centre.

- I have not held a leadership role at UOW, but have academic leadership experience elsewhere.

  Please give details.

- I have not held an academic leadership role.

Will you be studying towards a HDR qualification between September 2010 and September 2011? (see page 3)

- NO □ YES □

Please give details.
PART 2 – YOUR REFEREES

Please give details for three referees who can be contacted by the selection committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referee 1</th>
<th>Must be either your current Dean or current Head of School / Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 3 – DEAN’S SUPPORT

Comments on this application:

Dean’s Signature

Date
PART 4 – YOUR STATEMENTS AGAINST THE SELECTION CRITERIA

A. Please attach a brief statement describing how participation in the PROPEL Program will be of benefit to YOU at this current point in your career as well as to your FACULTY and UOW as a whole.  

*(Limit 2,500 characters)*

B. Please attach a brief statement describing how you meet the following selection criteria:  

*(Limit 5,000 characters)*

1. Characteristics of leadership (see below for details).
2. Energy and enthusiasm for new ideas and ways of working.
3. Interest in collaborative and interdisciplinary work.
4. Strong research and teaching performance (relative to opportunity, but not necessarily equal).

Characteristics of leadership include, but are not limited to:

- Direction, vision, originality;
- Role model who demonstrates a quality of excellence and is passionate about their discipline (in either teaching, research or both);
- Genuine interest in people and the ability to connect with staff on a personal level;
- Genuine regard for diversity and seeing difference as positive.
- Personal traits including drive, energy, enthusiasm, positive attitude, conviction, cooperativeness, patience, consideration;
- Maturity, self-understanding, self-motivation, being true to own personal values;
- Comfortable working in complex situations of ambiguity and incomplete information.

HDR STUDENTS ONLY:

If you will be studying towards a HDR qualification between September 2010 and September 2011, please include a brief statement which clearly shows how you will manage your time to fully commit to the PROPEL Program.

PART 5 – CURRENT CV

Please attach a copy of your current CV to your application.

INTERVIEWS: You may be asked to attend a very brief interview to allow the PROPEL selection committee to explore your application in further detail.

Applicants who know they will not be available for interview in early to mid August should advise the PROPEL Project Manager.

Applicant’s Signature

________________________________________

Date

________________________________________
How much more inspiring would it be to discover and rehearse your leadership abilities in advance of your first leadership role?

Once established in leadership positions, it is natural to develop fixed views and ways of working. Making fundamental changes to leadership styles at this stage would be difficult.

For this reason, the PROPEL program will select academic staff who have shown potential to be leaders and will develop their skills, perspective and confidence before they are faced with real leadership challenges.

Faculties will gain from PROPEL:

- One participant selected from each Faculty.
- Twelve months of leadership development through mentoring, active project work, forums and workshops, strategic committee involvement, reflection and peer support.
- All attendance, travel and accommodation costs for participant covered by the Program.
- Completion of a project which has Faculty significance.
- Increased opportunity for inter-Faculty collaboration.
- A highly skilled candidate for future leadership positions.

Faculties will contribute . . .

- Active involvement in selecting the best participants for the Program.
- Three days of participant’s time to attend the leadership workshop 27-29 September (recess).
- One hour teaching relief per week during session for participant and a mentor for 12 months.
- Opportunity for participant to engage with Faculty-level committees and attend strategic events.
- Support and encouragement for participant and recognition of their time and effort.

Overview of PROPEL

The Program will run for 12 months commencing September 2010.

Participants will complete six components:

MENTORING  Participants will be matched with a mentor from outside their own Faculty. Cross-Faculty partnerships will broaden the participants’ experience beyond their own discipline.

LEADERSHIP SKILLS  The Program will commence with a three-day workshop, focusing on generic, teaching and research leadership skills. At the end of the workshop, participants will select specific skills from each area which they will work on developing, with the help of their mentor, over the next 12 months.

INTERDISCIPLINARY  Two Interdisciplinary Fora will be held to explore the benefits of approaching an issue from different directions.

BIG PICTURE  Participants will attend high-level committee meetings and strategic events to gain insight into the day-to-day workings of the University.

ACTIVE  Participants will choose one project, with significance to their Faculty, which they will lead during the Program.

REFLECTIVE  Throughout the training year participants will reflect on their experiences and will present them at a one-day event at the end of the Program.

In addition to the six Program components, participants will be encouraged to form a community of practice for peer support, discussion and expanding their networks.

Further information . . .

Sara Dolnicar  x3862  Wilma Vialle  x4434  Karen Lovasz  x8218  research.uow.edu.au/propel
The People Behind the Program

PROPEL is a collaborative project of the UOW Social Innovation Network, funded by the Australian Teaching and Learning Council (ALTC).

Project Leaders
Prof. Rob Castle  DV-C (Academic)
Prof. Sara Dolnicar  Faculty of Commerce
A/Prof. Wilma Vialle  Faculty of Education

Project Manager
Ms Karen Lovasz  Faculty of Commerce

UOW Project Team
Faculty of Arts  A/Prof. Tim Scrase
Faculty of Commerce  Dr Lois Burgess, A/Prof. Helen Hasan, A/Prof Michael Zanko
Faculty of Creative Arts  Prof. Stephen Tanner
Faculty of Education  A/Prof. Garry Hoban
Faculty of H&B  Prof. Sandra Jones
Faculty of Science  Prof. Lesley Head
Sydney Business School  Prof. Kathy Eagar

Leadership Advisory Board
Emeritus Prof. Ken McKinnon  Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Wollongong
Prof. Rob Whelan  President, UOW Dubai
Prof. John Patterson  DV-C Operations, UOW
Prof. Malcolm Wright  Professor of Marketing, University of South Australia
Prof. Peter Goodyear  Professor of Education, University of Sydney
Prof. Carmel Diezmann  Centre for Learning Innovation, Queensland University of Technology
Mr Peter Keeble  Education Consultant
Ms Maria Gray-Spence  Regional Director, NSW Dept of Education and Training
Ms Jai Waters  Acting Director Strategy & Development, TAFE Illawarra Institute
Mr David Farmer  General Manager, Wollongong City Council
Dr David M Williams  CEO DMW Group
Ms Karen van Druten  Leadership Consultant

PROPEL Mentors
Dean of Students  Ms Yvonne Kerr
Faculty of Arts  A/Prof. Paul Sharrad
Faculty of Commerce  Mr Ron Perrin, Prof. Simon Ville
Faculty of Creative Arts  Prof. Diane Wood Conroy
Faculty of Engineering  Prof. Hugh Brown, Prof. Roger Lewis
Faculty of Education  Prof. Brian Ferry, Prof. Barry Harper, A/Prof. Pauline Lysaght
Faculty of H&B  Prof. Sandra Jones, Prof. Julie Steele
Faculty of Informatics  Prof. Fazel Naghdy, Prof. David Steel
Faculty of Science  Prof. Leon Kane-Maguire, A/Prof. Gordon Waitt
Selecting the Best Participants

Eligibility

- Level A, B or C (staff at Level D or E may be considered on a case-by-case basis).
- Permanent or fixed-term. (Fixed-term staff must be on a contract of at least 3 years with at least 2 years of their contract remaining.)
- Pre-leadership academic staff who have NOT held an institutional leadership role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional leadership roles (NOT ELIGIBLE):</th>
<th>Other leadership roles (ELIGIBLE):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Head of School or Discipline;</td>
<td>- Chief Investigator on grant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Associate Dean or above;</td>
<td>- Committee Chair;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Director of University Research Strength or Strategic Research Initiative.</td>
<td>- Subject Coordinator;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Director of Faculty Research Centre;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Period of acting in ‘Institutional Leadership Role’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection Criteria

- Characteristics of leadership (see below).
- Energy and enthusiasm for new ideas and ways of working.
- Interest in collaborative and interdisciplinary work.
- Strong research and teaching performance (relative to opportunity, but not necessarily in equal measure).

Applicants will need to demonstrate how participation in PROPEL will benefit themselves (at current point in their career) AND the Faculty/UOW. Applicants who are studying towards a HDR qualification will be asked to clearly show how they will manage their time to fully commit to the PROPEL Program.

Characteristics of Leadership

Some of the most critical leadership characteristics are the most difficult to teach. Applicants will be selected for PROPEL who already possess and demonstrate many of these characteristics:

- Direction, vision, originality.
- Role model who demonstrates a quality of excellence and is passionate about their discipline (in either teaching, research or both).
- Genuine interest in people and the ability to connect with staff on a personal level.
- Genuine regard for diversity and seeing difference as positive.
- Personal traits including drive, energy, enthusiasm, positive attitude, conviction, cooperativeness, patience, consideration.
- Maturity, self-understanding, self-motivation, being true to own personal values.
- Comfortable working in complex situations.

Key Dates

20 April Deans invited to consider and nominate candidates.
15 June Information session for applicants.
30 July Applications close.
Early Aug Deans, Heads and other nominated referees may be contacted for further information
9 Aug Participants selected.
Aug- Sept Mentors and participants matched, introduced and attend joint mentoring training.
27 Sept Program commences with 3-day residential workshop.
Appendix F

Program for Preparing Early Leaders (PROPEL) — Participant Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Over the last 12 months, the PROPEL Program has aimed to create real developments in your leadership skills, abilities and confidence.

To objectively measure this development, you have been asked to assess your leadership experience and abilities prior to commencing the Program, at the Program mid-point, and now again at the end of the Program.

End-of-program phase

This questionnaire allows you to assess your leadership experience and abilities, as well as your readiness to lead, now that you have almost completed the Program. It should take around 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Confidentiality of Your Responses

Your responses will be added to your Leadership Assessment Report and an updated version will be made available to you in September. You may choose to share your results with other PROPEL participants and/or your leadership mentor if you wish.

The PROPEL Coordinators will keep your responses confidential and will only use them to assess changes in your leadership abilities over the 12-month Program. Results will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Program in achieving its aims. Any published reports resulting from the PROPEL Program pilot will contain only aggregated and de-identified information.

To indicate you are happy to proceed with the questionnaire and allow the use of your responses for the purposes described above, please check the 'I Agree' box. If you would like to discuss any aspect of this self-assessment process before completing the questionnaire, please contact the PROPEL Project Manager Karen Lovasz on 02 4252 8218 or klovasz@uow.edu.au

☐ I agree to complete this self-assessment questionnaire and understand the confidentiality arrangements described above

Your Name

First Name __________________________
Surname __________________________

[Image]
1. Since commencing the PROPEL Program 12 months ago, have you taken on any new roles or responsibilities (either temporarily or permanently)?

- Yes
- No

2. In the last 12 months, how many academic leadership positions (or positions with a leadership component) have you APPLIED FOR at your current university or elsewhere? (Include successful and unsuccessful applications)

- None
- 1–2
- 3–5
- More than 5

3. Have you commenced any leadership positions OUTSIDE ACADEMIA in the last 12 months?

- No
- Yes __________________________

4. Have you applied for promotion in the last 12 months?

- No
- Yes, unsuccessfully
- Yes, successfully ______________________________

5. Over the past 12 months have you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studied towards any formal management qualifications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed any external management/leadership training or any in-house leadership programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had any formal mentors (apart from your PROPEL leadership mentor)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership career direction

The following questions relate to your thoughts about an academic leadership career.

6. Do you see yourself moving into an INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP role (such as head of school or higher) at some point in your career?
   
   - Definitely
   - Probably
   - Maybe
   - Probably not
   - Definitely not

7. Do you feel you would have the skills and confidence to take on an institutional leadership role right now?
   
   - Definitely
   - Probably
   - Maybe
   - Probably not
   - Definitely not

8. Do you see yourself moving into a RESEARCH-FOCUSED leadership role at some point in your career?
   
   - Definitely
   - Probably
   - Maybe
   - Probably not
   - Definitely not

9. Has the PROPEL Program helped you understand and evaluate the various academic leadership pathways open to you?
   
   - Yes — very much
   - Yes — a little
   - No

10. Over the last 12 months, have you decided on your preferred leadership pathway (even if your decision is not to pursue an academic leadership career at all)?

   - No
   - Yes_________________________

Please turn to SECTION 1 of your Leadership Assessment Mid-Point Report.

Last September, and again in February, you were asked how you felt about the challenges of moving into an institutional leadership role (such as Head of School or higher) at some point in your career.

Please have a look back over your responses (in the blue and orange boxes on your report).

11. The Pre-Program and Mid-Point Questionnaires asked: "What do you think would be the most challenging aspects of moving into an institutional leadership position?"

    Having almost completed the 12-month Program, would you make any changes to your previous list? (Consider both your capabilities and the external environment.)

12. The Pre-Program and Mid-Point Questionnaires asked: What would help you to overcome these challenges?" Having almost completed the 12-month Program, would you make any changes to your previous list? (Consider both your capabilities and the external environment.)
At the beginning of the PROPEL Program you completed the 'Dimensions of Academic Leadership' self-assessment questionnaire, which assesses academic leadership across 6 dimensions:

- Credibility
- Curiosity
- Collegiality
- Capabilities
- Character
- Confidence

You will now be completing this scale again to measure any changes in your self-assessment against each of these dimensions. **When answering the following questions, please consider how well you believe you meet (or WOULD meet, if you took on a leadership role today) the demands placed on you as an academic leader.** Some questions may be difficult to answer for those with limited leadership experience. If you feel you can't predict how you would meet a particular demand, please select 'Unable to say'.

### 13. Credibility: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Do you possess adequate academic credentials and experience in your area of academic enquiry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Do your immediate and wider peers 'rate you' as an intellectual force in your field?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Do you actively illustrate by your actions the importance of using your position to enable others to succeed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Do you deploy, when required, the necessary influencing and political skills to progress your academic work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Curiosity: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Are you capable of consistently setting yourself academic challenges?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Are you capable of consistently setting academic challenges for others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Do you challenge your academic team (students, colleagues) to perform at the highest levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Do you consistently demonstrate innovative approaches to your academic work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Do you demonstrate academic inquisitiveness and encourage this creative thinking in your academic group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Do you make time to foster and facilitate creative thinking in your academic group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Are you sufficiently flexible and adaptable to new ideas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 15. Collegiality: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Do you offer support and mentorship to those in your immediate team?</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Do you consistently contribute to the ongoing success of all of your team members?</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Do you make regular contributions to the progression of your discipline through peer refereeing and reviewing, external examining etc?</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Do you make a great contribution to the work of learned societies in your discipline?</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Do you make contributions to the progress of your academic unit (Dept/School)?</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Do your peers value your contributions to the academic unit?</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Do you make a fair contribution to the administrative and other demands across the Unit?</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Do you make contributions to the development of your professional or regulatory body through examining, chairing relevant committees etc? (where relevant)</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Do you have a reputation as a significant influence on aspects of your profession's development? (where relevant)</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Do you contribute to the development of the academic reputation of your institution through membership of relevant academic committees and groups?</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Do you 'put something back' into the institution's academic processes and practices (are you perceived to be a good 'academic citizen')?</td>
<td>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</td>
<td>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</td>
<td>Largely — show regular evidence</td>
<td>Fully — a real strength</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Capabilities: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Do you have access to adequate ‘intelligence’ about the issues where the greatest intellectual opportunities will exist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Are you sufficiently up to date and current in your knowledge of academic thinking in your field?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Do you spend sufficient time personally and collectively scanning the intellectual horizons of other disciplines?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Do you adequately turn opportunities into tangible plans?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Are you open to routinely revisiting your academic plan to respond to changing contexts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Do you routinely help connect team members so as to maximize intellectual opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Do you consistently connect team members to external colleagues in order to develop academic networks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Do you protect your team networks from the wider organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Do you set your team the highest standards of academic contribution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Do you hold team members adequately to account for delivery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Do you intervene to deal with conflict in the team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12 Do you adequately engage the team in changes to your activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13 Do you give sufficient recognition to peer celebration when academic achievements arise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14 Do you routinely review progress with individuals and offer encouragement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Character: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Do you exhibit the highest levels of academic integrity (compliance with ethical standards etc)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Do you behave in your team in ways which avoid inappropriate favouritism?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Are your contributions to your academic field beyond reproach and challenge from any hint of plagiarism?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Do you give full credit to your team for their academic contributions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Do you have the capacity to maintain momentum when you find yourself in an academic cul-de-sac?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Do you maintain adequate resources of energy to help you progress your academic endeavours?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Do you have a noticeable reputation in one or more areas of academic enquiry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Have you found your ‘academic voice’?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 If you lead a team, does your team have a distinctive presence beyond your personal contribution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Confidence: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Do you have an appropriate sense of inner intellectual confidence which guides your academic leadership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Is your inner confidence also guided by a set of moral and ethical values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Do you project an appropriate sense of external confidence about your academic work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Do you adequately develop and encourage the confidence of your team members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next part of this questionnaire builds on the 'Dimensions of Academic Leadership' scale by focusing on additional leadership attributes which are considered important to academic leadership by academic staff at UOW.

As in the pre-program self-assessment, you will again be asked to assess your leadership abilities against the 6 PROPEL leadership attribute domains:

- Position
- Reflect
- Open
- Provide
- Enable
- Link

When answering the following questions, please consider how well you believe you meet (or WOULD meet, if you took on a leadership role today) the demands placed on you as an **academic leader**. Some questions may be difficult to answer for those with no leadership experience. If you feel you can't predict how you would meet a particular demand, please select 'Unable to say'.
19. Position (Think and act strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within your university and the wider context): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Do you take a 'big picture' view of your organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 How well do you assess and manage risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Do you really understand how the system works?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 How proactive are you in driving initiatives by gaining alignment and commitment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Reflect (Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 How successfully are you moving from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Are you committed to ongoing personal and professional development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 How well do you make sense of and learn from experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Do you fully understand your personal strengths and limitations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Can you admit to and learn from your mistakes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Do you approach situations by thinking strategically, creatively and laterally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 21. Open (Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal levels): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Do you make sure you are accessible, visible and approachable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 How well can you listen without pre-judging?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Do you communicate with colleagues and staff clearly, openly and honestly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Are you consistent in your actions and decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Do you act on feedback you receive about yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Do you have strategies in place to find out about staff needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Can you say 'no' to staff and colleagues without undermining working relationships?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 To what extent do you value diversity in your workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 22. Provide (Provide a supporting environment in which your staff will thrive): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 How well do you appreciate the breadth of academic work and the multi-faceted nature of the university organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Are you able to lead academic staff in ways which suit their unique needs and communication styles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Do you consistently deal with staff in a respectful and professional manner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Do you understand the organisational rules and apply them fairly and appropriately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Do you demonstrate balanced leadership in teaching, research and community engagement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Enable (Enable your unit to always move forward): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 How well do you make timely and confident decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Do you make sure you don’t leave things to chance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Are you able to initiate change responsibly and manage it sensitively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 How well organised are you (especially time management)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Are you able to make the most strategic use of available resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Do you always take a 'can do' attitude?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Link (Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Do you regularly consult and share views and ideas with others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Can you maintain a constructive climate in which disagreements can be tolerated without always being resolved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Do you build external networks which you can turn to for advice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn to the OVERVIEW SECTION of your Leadership Assessment Mid-Point Report. Please review the development goals you identified for yourself during the first part of the Program.

25. Please comment on whether you feel you have made progress towards each goal.

   a. GOAL 1 ____________________________________________________________
   b. GOAL 2 ____________________________________________________________
   c. GOAL 3 ____________________________________________________________
   d. GOAL 4 ____________________________________________________________

THANK YOU — That concludes the PROPEL Self-Assessment Questionnaire.
Appendix G

PROPEL Self-Assessment Questionnaire (MID-POINT) — Program for Preparing Early Leaders (PROPEL)

Participant Self-Assessment Questionnaire

The PROPEL Program aims to create real development in your leadership skills, abilities and confidence over the 12 month Program.

To objectively measure this development, you are being asked to assess your leadership experience and abilities prior to commencing the Program, at the Program mid-point, and again at the end of the Program.

PROGRAM MID-POINT PHASE

This questionnaire is a much-shortened version of the Pre-Program Assessment Questionnaire. Its purpose is to help you gauge changes in your leadership abilities and readiness which may have occurred over the last six months, and also to help you clarify your leadership development goals. The questionnaire also includes some opportunities for you to give feedback on your experiences of PROPEL so far.

It should take around 15–30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Have your Pre-Program Report with you when completing this questionnaire as some questions will refer to your earlier answers.

Confidentiality of your responses

A report will be prepared for you based on your responses. You may choose to share your results with other PROPEL participants and/or your leadership mentor.

The PROPEL Coordinators will keep your responses confidential and will only use them to assess changes in your leadership abilities over the 12-month Program. At the conclusion of the Program, results will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Program in achieving its aims. Any published reports resulting from the PROPEL Program pilot will contain only aggregated and de-identified information.

To indicate you are happy to proceed with the questionnaire and allow the use of your responses for the purposes described above, please click ‘I Agree’. If you would like to discuss any aspect of this self-assessment process before completing the questionnaire, please contact the PROPEL Project Manager Karen Lovasz on 02 4252 8218 or klovasz@uow.edu.au

I agree to complete this self-assessment questionnaire and understand the confidentiality arrangements described above.

☐ Yes  ☐ No (If you do not agree to the confidentiality arrangements please do not proceed with this questionnaire)

Your Name

First Name _________________________ Surname _______________________________
Please turn to SECTION 1 of your Pre-Program Report.

Last September you were asked how you felt about the possibility of moving into an institutional leadership role (such as Head of School or higher) at some point in your career. Please have a look back over your responses (in the blue boxes) to answer the following questions.

1. The Pre-Program Questionnaire asked: "Do you see yourself moving into an institutional leadership role (such as Head of School or higher) at some point in your career?"

   Your rating options were:
   - Definitely
   - Probably
   - Maybe
   - Probably not
   - Definitely not

   **Since joining the PROPEL Program, how do you feel now?** (Choose one of the following answers)
   - I feel the likelihood is much the same as my Pre-Program rating
   - I now feel I am MORE likely to move into an institutional leadership role at some point
   - I now feel I am LESS likely to move into an institutional leadership role at some point

2. The Pre-Program Questionnaire asked: "Do you have a time frame in mind?"

   Your rating options were:
   - Next 12 months
   - 1–2 years
   - 3–5 years
   - More than 5 years
   - Unsure
   - Never

   **Since joining the PROPEL Program, how do you feel now?** (Choose one of the following answers)
   - I feel the time frame is much the same as my Pre-Program rating
   - I now feel I could move into an institutional leadership role SOONER
   - I now feel it will take LONGER to move into an institutional leadership role
3. The Pre-Program Questionnaire asked: "Do you feel you would have the skills and confidence to take on an institutional leadership role right now?"

Your rating options were:

- Definitely
- Probably
- Maybe
- Probably not
- Definitely not

Since joining the PROPEL Program, how to you feel now? (Choose one of the following answers)

- I feel much the same as my Pre-Program rating
- I am feeling MORE skilled and confident now
- I am feeling LESS skilled and confident now

4. The Pre-Program Questionnaire asked: "What do you think would be the most challenging aspects of moving into such a leadership position?"

Since joining the PROPEL Program, would you make any changes to your original list? (Consider both your capabilities and the external environment.)

5. The Pre-Program Questionnaire asked: "What would help you to overcome these challenges?"

Since joining the PROPEL Program, would you make any changes to your original list?

6. Do you feel the PROPEL Program is helping you prepare for the challenges of moving into a leadership role?

Is there anything else you would like the Program to provide?

7. Since joining the PROPEL Program, have you:

- Acted in an 'institutional' leadership role (defined as Head of School, Associate Dean, Dean, Director of University Research Strength or Strategic Research Initiative)?
- Applied for any leadership positions ('institutional' or otherwise) at your current university or elsewhere?
- Been appointed to a leadership role at your current university or elsewhere?
- None of the above
- Other: _______________


Development Goals
As a PROPEL participant you are working towards your individual leadership development goals.

Please turn to SECTION 2 and SECTION 3 of your Pre-Program Report.

Last September you were asked to rate your academic leadership abilities across the six dimensions of the Kennie Scale:

- **Credibility** — personal, peer, professional, political
- **Curiosity** — challenge, creativity
- **Collegiality** — team, discipline, academic unit, profession, institution
- **Capabilities** — horizon scanning, sense-making, performing, connecting, celebrating
- **Character** — integrity, resilience, distinctiveness
- **Confidence** — inner, outer

You were also asked to rate yourself against the six PROPEL leadership attribute domains:

- Position — think and work strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within your university and the wider context
- Reflect — reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes
- Open — open out to your staff on both the professional and personal level
- Provide — provide a supporting environment in which your staff will thrive
- Enable — enable your unit to always move forward
- Link — create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline

Have another look through your ratings and those of your supervisors/peers/reports

8. **Based on your self-assessment, the 360 degree feedback you received and your experiences in the PROPEL Program so far, which development goals have you identified for yourself?** (Please list and check any that apply)

   - Goal 1
   - Goal 2
   - Goal 3
   - Goal 4

9. **Do you feel you have made progress towards some or all of these goals so far in the Program?** Please give brief comments.

   - Goal 1
   - Goal 2
   - Goal 3
   - Goal 4
10. How many times have you met with your mentor in total?  ___________

11. How long are your meetings (on average)? (Choose one of the following answers)
   - Half an hour   - One-and-a-half hours
   - 45 minutes    - Two hours
   - One hour      -

12. How valuable would you rate the Mentoring Component of the Program to date in helping you work towards your leadership development goals? (Choose one of the following answers)
   - Very valuable   - Of some value
   - Valuable        - Of little value

Comment ______________________

13. UOW PARTICIPANTS ONLY — Please tick the committees you have attended so far:
   (Check any that apply)
   - Academic Senate
   - Uni Education C'tee
   - SSLS
   - EPRS
   - EDITS
   - eLTS
   - Uni Research C'tee
   - URC — Standing
   - Ethics Policy C'tee
   - Thesis Examination C'tee
   - Uni Internationalisation C'tee
   - International Alliances C'tee
   - Other: ______________

14. How valuable would you rate the Big Picture Component of the Program to date in helping you work towards your leadership development goals? (Choose one of the following answers)
   - Very valuable
   - Valuable
   - Of some value
   - Of little value

Comment ______________________

15. How far do you feel your PROPEL active project has progressed?
   - 0%
   - 10%
   - 20%
   - 30%
   - 40%
   - 50%
   - 60%
   - 70%
   - 80%
   - 90%
   - 100%
16. Do you expect that your project will be completed by September this year? (Choose one of the following answers)

- Yes
- No — please comment
- Unsure — please comment

Comment ______________________

17. How valuable would you rate the Active Component of the Program to date in helping you work towards your leadership development goals? (Choose one of the following answers)

- Very valuable
- Valuable
- Of some value
- Of little value

18. Do you have any additional comments or feedback on your experiences in the PROPEL Program to date? Is it having an impact on you? Is it meeting your expectations?

That concludes the PROPEL Mid-Point Questionnaire.

A copy of your responses will be forwarded to you for your reference.

Once you click ‘Submit’ your responses cannot be changed.
Appendix H

Program for Preparing Early Leaders (PROPEL) — Participant Self-Assessment Questionnaire

The PROPEL Program aims to create real development in your leadership skills, abilities and confidence over the coming 12 months. To objectively measure this development, you will be asked to assess your leadership experience and abilities prior to commencing the Program, at the Program mid-point, and again at the end of the Program.

Pre-program phase

This questionnaire establishes a baseline assessment of your current leadership experience and abilities, as well as your current readiness to lead. It also establishes your current understanding and commitment to collaboration and the teaching-research nexus (two specific areas of focus for the PROPEL Program). It should take around 25 minutes to complete the questionnaire. If you need to leave the questionnaire and return to it later, just click the link in the invitation email to pick up where you left off.

Confidentiality of Your Responses

A report will be prepared for you based on your responses. This report will be made available to you at the Leadership Skills Workshop in September. You may choose to share your results with other PROPEL participants and/or your leadership mentor if you wish.

The PROPEL Coordinators will keep your responses confidential and will only use them to assess changes in your leadership abilities over the 12-month Program. At the conclusion of the Program, results will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Program in achieving its aims. Any published reports resulting from the PROPEL Program pilot will contain only aggregated and de-identified information.

To indicate you are happy to proceed with the questionnaire and allow the use of your responses for the purposes described above, please check the 'I Agree' box. If you would like to discuss any aspect of this self-assessment process before completing the questionnaire, please contact the PROPEL Project Manager Karen Lovasz on 02 4252 8218 or klovasz@uow.edu.au

☐ I agree to complete this self-assessment questionnaire and understand the confidentiality arrangements described above

Your Name

First Name _______________________
Surname _______________________


The following questions relate to your CURRENT level of leadership experiences and opportunities.

1. **How long have you been in an academic career?**
   - [ ] Less than 2 years
   - [ ] 2–4 years
   - [ ] 5–7 years
   - [ ] 8–10 years
   - [ ] More than 10 years

2. **How long have you been in your current role?**
   - [ ] Less than 2 years
   - [ ] 2–4 years
   - [ ] 5–7 years
   - [ ] 8–10 years
   - [ ] More than 10 years

3. **Have you ACTED in an 'institutional leadership' role?** (E.g. Head of School, Associate Dean, Dean, Director of University Research Strength or Strategic Research Initiative.)
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

4. **Have you held any formal leadership roles as an academic?** (E.g. Subject Coordinator, Committee Chair, Director of Faculty Research Centre, CI on Grant.)
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

5. **Have you held any leadership positions outside academia?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

6. **Do you have, or are you studying towards, any formal management qualifications?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7. **Have you completed any external management/leadership training or any in-house leadership programs?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

8. **Have you had any formal mentors prior to the PROPEL Program?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
The following questions relate to your CURRENT level of interest in leading and readiness to lead.

9. Do you see yourself moving into an institutional leadership role (such as head of school or higher) at some point in your career?
   □ Definitely □ Maybe □ Definitely not
   □ Probably □ Probably not

10. Do you have a time frame in mind?
   □ Next 12 months  □ 1–2 years  □ 3–5 years  □ More than 5 years  □ Unsure  □ Never

11. Do you feel you would have the skills and confidence to take on an institutional leadership role right now?
   □ Definitely □ Maybe □ Definitely not
   □ Probably □ Probably not

12. What do you think would be the most challenging aspects of moving into such a leadership position? (Consider both your capabilities and the external environment.)

13. What would help you to overcome these challenges?

14. How many leadership positions have you applied for at your current university or elsewhere? (These may be 'institutional' leadership roles, middle level leadership roles, or positions with a leadership component. Include both successful and unsuccessful applications.)
   □ None  □ 1–2  □ 3–5  □ More than 5
The PROPEL Project 4

Academic leadership scale
The next part of this questionnaire focuses on leadership abilities specific to the academic environment.

You will be completing the 'Dimensions of Academic Leadership' self-assessment questionnaire, developed by Dr Tom Kennie, Ranmore Consulting, UK. This scale assesses academic leadership across 6 dimensions:

- Credibility
- Curiosity
- Collegiality
- Capabilities
- Character
- Confidence

As PROPEL participants you are commencing the Program with a wide range of academic leadership experience, ranging from limited to acting in high-level leadership roles.

When answering the following questions, please consider how well you believe you meet (or WOULD meet, if you took on a leadership role today) the demands placed on you as an academic leader. Some questions may be difficult to answer for participants with limited leadership experience. If you feel you can't predict how you would meet a particular demand, please select 'Unable to say'.

Some people may find a few of these questions a bit confronting. Please answer frankly, as the results are for your development. Answers to individual questions will not be shown to others in the Program or to your Dean/Head of School. Only an average 'score' for each dimension will be included in any reports developed for ongoing assessment during the Program.
15. Credibility: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Do you possess adequate academic credentials and experience in your area of academic enquiry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Do your immediate and wider peers 'rate you' as an intellectual force in your field?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Do you actively illustrate by your actions the importance of using your position to enable other to succeed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Do you deploy, when required, the necessary influencing and political skills to progress your academic work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Curiosity: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Are you capable of consistently setting yourself academic challenges?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Are you capable of consistently setting academic challenges for others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Do you challenge your academic team (students, colleagues) to perform at the highest levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Do you consistently demonstrate innovative approaches to your academic work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Do you demonstrate academic inquisitiveness and encourage this creative thinking in your academic group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Do you make time to foster and facilitate creative thinking in your academic group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Are you sufficiently flexible and adaptable to new ideas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Collegiality: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Do you offer support and mentorship to those in your immediate team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Do you consistently contribute to the ongoing success of all of your team members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Do you make regular contributions to the progression of your discipline through peer refereeing and reviewing, external examining etc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Do you make a great contribution to the work of learned societies in your discipline?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Do you make contributions to the progress of your academic unit (Dept/School)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Do your peers value your contributions to the academic unit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Do you make a fair contribution to the administrative and other demands across the Unit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Do you make contributions to the development of your professional or regulatory body through examining, chairing relevant committees etc? (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Do you have a reputation as a significant influence on aspects of your profession's development? (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Do you contribute to the development of the academic reputation of your institution through membership of relevant academic committees and groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Do you 'put something back' into the institution's academic processes and practices (are you perceived to be a good 'academic citizen')?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 18. Capabilities: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Do you have access to adequate 'intelligence' about the issues where the greatest intellectual opportunities will exist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Are you sufficiently up to date and current in your knowledge of academic thinking in your field?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Do you spend sufficient time personally and collectively scanning the intellectual horizons of other disciplines?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Do you adequately turn opportunities into tangible plans?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Are you open to routinely revisiting your academic plan to respond to changing contexts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Do you routinely help connect team members so as to maximize intellectual opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Do you consistently connect team members to external colleagues in order to develop academic networks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Do you protect your team networks from the wider organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Do you set your team the highest standards of academic contribution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Do you hold team members adequately to account for delivery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Do you intervene to deal with conflict in the team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12 Do you adequately engage the team in changes to your activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13 Do you give sufficient recognition to peer celebration when academic achievements arise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14 Do you routinely review progress with individuals and offer encouragement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Character: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Do you exhibit the highest levels of academic integrity (compliance with ethical standards etc)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Do you behave in your team in ways which avoid inappropriate favouritism?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Are your contributions to your academic field beyond reproach and challenge from any hint of plagiarism?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Do you give full credit to your team for their academic contributions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Do you have the capacity to maintain momentum when you find yourself in an academic cul-de-sac?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Do you maintain adequate resources of energy to help you progress your academic endeavours?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Do you have a noticeable reputation in one or more areas of academic enquiry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Have you found your ‘academic voice’?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 If you lead a team, does your team have a distinctive presence beyond your personal contribution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Confidence: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Do you have an appropriate sense of inner intellectual confidence which guides your academic leadership?</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Is your inner confidence also guided by a set of moral and ethical values?</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Do you project an appropriate sense of external confidence about your academic work?</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Do you adequately develop and encourage the confidence of your team members?</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
<td>![Table Cell]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next part of this questionnaire builds on the 'Dimensions of Academic Leadership' scale by focusing on additional leadership attributes which are considered important to academic leadership by academic staff at UOW.

Attributes are divided into 6 domains:

- Position
- Reflect
- Open
- Provide
- Enable
- Link

Once again when answering the following questions, please consider how well you believe you meet (or WOULD meet, if you took on a leadership role today) the demands placed on you as an academic leader. Some questions may be difficult to answer for those with no leadership experience. If you feel you can’t predict how you would meet a particular demand, please select 'Unable to say'.
21. Position (Think and act strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within your university and the wider context): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Do you take a 'big picture' view of your organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 How well do you assess and manage risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Do you really understand how the system works?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 How proactive are you in driving initiatives by gaining alignment and commitment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Reflect (Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes: How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 How successfully are you moving from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Are you committed to ongoing personal and professional development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 How well do you make sense of and learn from experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Do you fully understand your personal strengths and limitations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Can you admit to and learn from your mistakes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Do you approach situations by thinking strategically, creatively and laterally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Open (Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal levels): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Do you make sure you are accessible, visible and approachable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 How well can you listen without pre-judging?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Do you communicate with colleagues and staff clearly, openly and honestly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Are you consistent in your actions and decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Do you act on feedback you receive about yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Do you have strategies in place to find out about staff needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Can you say 'no' to staff and colleagues without undermining working relationships?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 To what extent do you value diversity in your workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Provide (Provide a supporting environment in which your staff will thrive): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 How well do you appreciate the breadth of academic work and the multi-faceted nature of the university organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Are you able to lead academic staff in ways which suit their unique needs and communication styles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Do you consistently deal with staff in a respectful and professional manner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Do you understand the organisational rules and apply them fairly and appropriately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Do you demonstrate balanced leadership in teaching, research and community engagement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Enable (Enable your unit to always move forward): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 How well do you make timely and confident decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Do you make sure you don’t leave things to chance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Are you able to initiate change responsibly and manage it sensitively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 How well organised are you (especially time management)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Are you able to make the most strategic use of available resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Do you always take a 'can do' attitude?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Link (Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline): How well do you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fail to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — show regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Do you regularly consult and share views and ideas with others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Can you maintain a constructive climate in which disagreements can be tolerated without always being resolved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Do you build external networks which you can turn to for advice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. How would you (briefly) define "Nexus: Teaching-Learning-Research"?

Definition from the UOW Teaching-Research Nexus web page . . . "...the many ways in which teaching informs research and research informs teaching; this mutually supportive relationship operating to the benefit of both." Please answer the rest of the questions in this section based on this definition.

28. In your discipline, do you see the Nexus as . . .

- 1 — Truly important
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — A motherhood statement

29. Do you see incorporating the Nexus in your work as . . .

- 1 — A good investment of time
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — A waste of time

30. How valuable do you believe the Nexus is for undergraduate teaching?

- 1 — Critical
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Of no value

31. Do you believe focusing on the Nexus in your teaching will . . .

- 1 — Stimulate and challenge you
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Add nothing to your understanding

32. Do you believe focusing on the Nexus in your work will . . .

- 1 — Enhance your career
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Hold your career back

33. To what degree does research currently inform your TEACHING?

- 1 — Very strongly
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Not at all
34. To what degree do you currently focus on teaching implications when developing your RESEARCH?

- 1 — Very strongly
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Not at all

35. Please describe (briefly) one example of how you have integrated the Nexus in your work.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration

36. Can you name any disciplines which would complement your research activities?

37. Can you name any disciplines which could benefit from including your discipline in their research activities?

38. Have you made any contacts in any of these disciplines (within or outside your university)?

- Yes
- No

39. Have you specifically discussed common research areas with any of your contacts?

- Yes
- No

40. Have you applied for, or are you developing applications for, any grants with researchers outside your own discipline?

- Yes
- No

41. Have you written, or are you currently writing, any joint publications with researchers outside your own discipline?

- Yes
- No

42. Do you see interdisciplinary collaboration as . . .

- 1 — A good investment of time
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — A waste of time

43. Do you believe interdisciplinary collaboration . . .

- 1 — Increases publication chances
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Limits publication chances
44. Do you believe interdisciplinary collaboration will . . .

☐ 1 — Stimulate and challenge you  ☐ 4
☐ 2  ☐ 5 — Add nothing to your understanding
☐ 3

45. Do you see building interdisciplinary collaboration as . . .

☐ 1 — Easy  ☐ 4
☐ 2  ☐ 5 — Difficult
☐ 3

46. Do you see the results of long-term interdisciplinary collaboration as . . .

☐ 1 — Rewarding  ☐ 4
☐ 2  ☐ 5 — Frustrating
☐ 3

47. Do you believe interdisciplinary collaboration will . . .

☐ 1 — Enhance your career  ☐ 4
☐ 2  ☐ 5 — Hold your career back
☐ 3

That concludes the PROPEL Self-Assessment Questionnaire.

Results of this assessment will be collated and individual reports distributed at the Leadership Skills Workshop in September.
Appendix I

Program for Preparing Early Leaders (PROPEL) — 360 degree feedback questionnaire

Thank you for accepting our invitation to take part in this feedback process. The PROPEL participants and the Program Coordinators greatly appreciate your time to complete this questionnaire.

Your responses, along with responses from others who have been invited to complete this questionnaire, will be summarised in a report which will be provided to you in late September.

It should take around 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. If you need to leave the questionnaire and return to it later, just click the link in the invitation email to pick up where you left off.

If you have any questions or would like further information prior to completing the questionnaire, please contact the PROPEL Project Manager, Karen Lovasz on 02 4252 8218 or klovasz@uow.edu.au.

Consent to participate

- I have been given information about the PROPEL Program and understand that the Program has been developed as part of an Australian Learning and Teaching Council grant project at the University of Wollongong.

- I have been advised of the potential risks and burdens associated with participating in this feedback process, if any, and have had an opportunity to ask questions I may have about my participation. I understand that my responses will be confidential and I will not be identified by name or workplace in any published materials generated from this project.

- I am aware that my responses WILL BE POTENTIALLY IDENTIFIABLE to the participant for whom I am giving feedback due to the small respondent numbers (between 2 and 5 respondents with the same working relationship to the participant).

- I understand that my participation is voluntary, I am free to refuse to participate and I am free to reverse my decision to participate and withdraw any responses I have provided, either in part or completely, at any time up until 10 September 2011. My refusal to participate or withdrawal of consent will not influence my relationship with the PROPEL project and/or the project leaders.

- I understand that if I have any enquiries about the process, I can contact the project manager Karen Lovasz on 02 4252 8218 or klovasz@uow.edu.au or, if I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way the project is or has been conducted, I can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, Office of Research, University of Wollongong on 02 4221 4457.
By clicking the 'I Agree' check box below I am indicating my consent to providing feedback on the PROPEL participant via this online questionnaire, and allowing the Program Coordinators to present my feedback to the participant in a summarised report. I understand that my detailed responses will be confidential to the participant and the project leaders, however some aggregated and de-identified data may be included in reports to the ALTC and journal articles/conference papers. I consent for it to be used in that manner.

☐ I Agree to complete this feedback questionnaire

**Your Name**

First Name __________________________
Surname __________________________

**Name of PROPEL participant for whom you are completing this feedback**

First Name __________________________
Surname __________________________

1. Did you complete a PROPEL 360 degree feedback questionnaire for [participant] at the start of the Program in September 2010?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. What is your working relationship with [participant]? (Please select the option which best applies)

☐ I have a leadership or management or supervisory role in his/her work
☐ I am his/her colleague/peer
☐ He/She has a leadership or management or supervisory role in my work

3. How long have you worked with [participant]?

☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 1–2 years ☐ 3–5 years ☐ More than 5 years
The following questions relate to your perceptions of [participant]'s current level of interest in leading and readiness to lead.

4. **Do you see [participant] moving into an 'institutional' leadership role (such as Head of School or above) at some point in his/her career?**
   - [ ] Definitely
   - [ ] Probably
   - [ ] Maybe
   - [ ] Probably not
   - [ ] Definitely not

5. **Within what time frame do you think [participant] may move into such a role?**
   - [ ] Next 12 months
   - [ ] 1–2 years
   - [ ] 3–5 years
   - [ ] More than 5 years
   - [ ] Unsure
   - [ ] Never

6. **Do you feel [participant] would have the skills and confidence to take on such a leadership role right now?**
   - [ ] Definitely
   - [ ] Probably
   - [ ] Maybe
   - [ ] Probably not
   - [ ] Definitely not

7. **What do you think would be the most challenging aspects for [participant] of moving into such a leadership position?** (Consider both his/her capabilities as well as the external environment.)

8. **What do you think would help him/her to overcome these challenges?**

The next part of this questionnaire focuses on leadership abilities specific to the academic environment.

You will be completing the 'Dimensions of Academic Leadership' scale, developed by Dr Tom Kennie, Ranmore Consulting, UK. This scale assesses academic leadership across 6 dimensions:

- Credibility
- Curiosity
- Collegiality
- Capabilities
- Character
- Confidence

When answering the following questions, please consider how well you believe [participant] meets (or WOULD meet, if he/she took on a leadership role today) the demands placed on him/her as an academic leader.

Some questions may be difficult to answer for participants with limited leadership experience. If you feel you can't predict how the participant would meet a particular demand, please select 'Unable to say'.

Please answer frankly, as the participant will be using the results to plan his/her leadership development.
9. Credibility: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 Possess adequate academic credentials and experience in their area of academic enquiry.</th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Their immediate and wider peers 'rate them' as an intellectual force in their field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Actively illustrates by their actions the importance of using their position to enable others to succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Deploys, when required, the necessary influencing and political skills to progress their academic work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Curiosity: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Is capable of consistently setting themselves academic challenges.</th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Is capable of consistently setting academic challenges for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Challenges their academic team (students, colleagues) to perform at the highest levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Consistently demonstrates innovative approaches to their academic work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Demonstrates academic inquisitiveness and encourages this creative thinking in their academic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Makes time to foster and facilitate creative thinking in their academic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Is sufficiently flexible and adaptable to new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Collegiality: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Offers support and mentorship to those in their immediate team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Consistently contributes to the ongoing success of all of their team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Makes regular contributions to the progression of their discipline through peer refereeing and reviewing, external examining etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Make a great contribution to the work of learned societies in their discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Makes contributions to the progress of their academic unit (Dept/School).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Their contributions to the academic unit are valued by their peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Makes a fair contribution to the administrative and other demands across the unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Makes contributions to the development of their professional or regulatory body through examining, chairing relevant committees etc. (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Has a reputation as a significant influence on aspects of their profession’s development. (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Contributes to the development of the academic reputation of their institution through membership of relevant academic committees and groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>‘Puts something back’ into the institution’s academic processes and practices (is perceived to be a good ‘academic citizen’).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Capabilities: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Has access to adequate 'intelligence' about the issues where the greatest intellectual opportunities will exist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Is sufficiently up to date and current in their knowledge of academic thinking in their field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Spends sufficient time personally and collectively scanning the intellectual horizons of other disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Adequately turns opportunities into tangible plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Is open to routinely revisiting their academic plan to respond to changing contexts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Routinely helps connect team members so as to maximize intellectual opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Consistently connects team members to external colleagues in order to develop academic networks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Protects their team networks from the wider organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Sets their team the highest standards of academic contribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Holds team members adequately to account for delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Intervenes to deal with conflict in the team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12 Adequately engages the team in changes to their activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13 Gives sufficient recognition to peer celebration when academic achievements arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14 Routinely reviews progress with individuals and offers encouragement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Character: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Exhibits the highest levels of academic integrity (compliance with ethical standards etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Behaves in their team in ways which avoid inappropriate favouritism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Their contributions to their academic field are beyond reproach and challenge from any hint of plagiarism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Gives full credit to their team for their academic contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Has the capacity to maintain momentum when they find themselves in an academic cul-de-sac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Maintains adequate resources of energy to help them progress their academic endeavours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Has a noticeable reputation in one or more areas of academic enquiry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Has found their 'academic voice'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 If a team leader, their team has a distinctive presence beyond their personal contribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Confidence: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Has an appropriate sense of inner intellectual confidence which guides their academic leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Their inner confidence is guided by a set of moral and ethical values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Projects an appropriate sense of external confidence about their academic work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Adequately develops and encourages the confidence of their team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final part of this questionnaire focuses on broad leadership attributes which are considered important by academic staff at UOW.

Attributes are divided into six domains. Please take a moment to read through the definitions of each domain below.

- **POSITION** — Think and act strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within your university and the wider context.
- **REFLECT** — Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes.
- **OPEN** — Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal levels.
- **PROVIDE** — Provide a supporting environment in which your staff will thrive.
- **ENABLE** — Enable your unit to always move forward.
- **LINK** — Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline.

That concludes the PROPEL 360 Degree Feedback Questionnaire.

Thank you once again for your interest and your time. Results of this assessment will be collated and an individual report distributed to [participant] in late September. Once you click 'Next' your responses will be submitted.
Appendix J

Program for Preparing Early Leaders (PROPEL) — 360 degree feedback questionnaire

Thank you for accepting our invitation to take part in this feedback process. The PROPEL participants and the Program Coordinators greatly appreciate your time to complete this questionnaire.

PROPEL will create real development in the leadership skills, abilities and confidence of Program participants over the coming 12 months. To objectively measure this development, participants' leadership abilities will be assessed in a 360 degree feedback process prior to the start of the Program and again at the end of the Program.

Your responses will be included in a report, along with responses from others who have been invited to complete this questionnaire about this participant, and the report will be provided to the participant at the commencement of the PROPEL Program in late September.

This questionnaire establishes a baseline assessment of the participant’s current leadership abilities, as well as his/her current readiness to lead. It also establishes his/her current commitment to interdisciplinary collaboration and the teaching-research nexus (two specific areas of focus for the PROPEL Program).

It should take around 25 minutes to complete the questionnaire. If you need to leave the questionnaire and return to it later, just click the link in the invitation email to pick up where you left off. If you have any questions or would like further information prior to completing the survey, please contact the PROPEL Project Manager on 02 4252 8218 or klovasz@uow.edu.au

Consent to participate

- I have been given information about the PROPEL Program and understand that the Program has been developed as part of an Australian Learning and Teaching Council grant project at the University of Wollongong.

- I have been advised of the potential risks and burdens associated with participating in this feedback process, if any, and have had an opportunity to ask questions I may have about my participation. I understand that my responses will be confidential and I will not be identified by name or workplace in any published materials generated from this project.

- I am aware that my responses WILL BE POTENTIALLY IDENTIFIABLE to the participant for whom I am giving feedback due to the small respondent numbers (between 2 and 5 respondents with the same working relationship to the participant).
I understand that my participation is voluntary, I am free to refuse to participate and I am free to reverse my decision to participate and withdraw any responses I have provided, either in part or completely, at any time up until 10 September 2011. My refusal to participate or withdrawal of consent will not influence my relationship with the PROPEL project and/or the project leaders.

I understand that if I have any enquiries about the process, I can contact the project manager Karen Lovasz on 02 4252 8218 or klovasz@uow.edu.au or, if I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way the project is or has been conducted, I can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, Office of Research, University of Wollongong on 02 4221 4457.

By clicking the 'I Agree' check box below I am indicating my consent to providing feedback on the PROPEL participant via this online questionnaire, and allowing the Program Coordinators to present my feedback to the participant in a summarised report. I understand that my detailed responses will be confidential to the participant and the project leaders, however some aggregated and de-identified data may be included in reports to the ALTC and journal articles/conference papers. I consent for it to be used in that manner.

☐ I Agree to complete this feedback questionnaire

Name of PROPEL participant for whom you are completing this feedback

First Name ______________________
Surname ______________________

1. What is your working relationship with the participant? (Please select the option which best applies)
   ☐ I have a leadership or management or supervisory role in the participant's work
   ☐ I am a colleague/peer of the participant
   ☐ The participant has a leadership or management or supervisory role in my work

2. How long have you worked with the participant?
   ☐ Less than 1 year
   ☐ 1–2 years
   ☐ 3–5 years
   ☐ More than 5 years

The following questions relate to your perceptions of [participant]'s current level of interest in leading and readiness to lead.

3. Do you see the participant moving into an 'institutional' leadership role (such as head of school or above) at some point in his/her career?
   ☐ Definitely
   ☐ Probably
   ☐ Maybe
   ☐ Probably not
   ☐ Definitely not
4. Within what time frame?

- Next 12 months
- 1–2 years
- 3–5 years
- More than 5 years
- Unsure
- Never

5. Do you feel the participant would have the skills and confidence to take on such a leadership role right now?

- Definitely
- Probably
- Maybe
- Probably not
- Definitely not

6. What do you think would be the most challenging aspects for the participant of moving into such a leadership position? (Consider both his/her capabilities as well as the external environment.)

7. What do you think would help him/her to overcome these challenges?

The next part of this questionnaire focuses on leadership abilities specific to the academic environment.

You will be completing the 'Dimensions of Academic Leadership' scale, developed by Dr Tom Kennie, Ranmore Consulting, UK. This scale assesses academic leadership across 6 dimensions:

- Credibility
- Curiosity
- Collegiality
- Capabilities
- Character
- Confidence

PROPEL participants are commencing the Program with a wide range of academic leadership experience, ranging from very limited to acting in senior leadership roles.

When answering the following questions, please consider how well you believe [participant] meets (or WOULD meet, if he/she took on a leadership role today) the demands placed on him/her as an academic leader.

Some questions may be difficult to answer for participants with limited leadership experience. If you feel you can't predict how the participant would meet a particular demand, please select 'Unable to say'.

Please answer frankly, as the participant will be using the results to plan his/her leadership development. Answers to individual questions will only be seen by the participant and the Program Coordinators. Only an average 'score' for each dimension based on all 360 degree responses will be included in any reports developed for ongoing assessment during the Program.
### 8. Credibility: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Possess adequate academic credentials and experience in their area of academic enquiry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Their immediate and wider peers 'rate them' as an intellectual force in their field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Actively illustrates by their actions the importance of using their position to enable others to succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Deploys, when required, the necessary influencing and political skills to progress their academic work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Curiosity: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Is capable of consistently setting themselves academic challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Is capable of consistently setting academic challenges for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Challenges their academic team (students, colleagues) to perform at the highest levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Consistently demonstrates innovative approaches to their academic work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Demonstrates academic inquisitiveness and encourages this creative thinking in their academic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Makes time to foster and facilitate creative thinking in their academic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Is sufficiently flexible and adaptable to new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Collegiality: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Offers support and mentorship to those in their immediate team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Consistently contributes to the ongoing success of all of their team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Makes regular contributions to the progression of their discipline through peer refereeing and reviewing, external examining etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Make a great contribution to the work of learned societies in their discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Makes contributions to the progress of their academic unit (Dept/School).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Their contributions to the academic unit are valued by their peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Makes a fair contribution to the administrative and other demands across the unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Makes contributions to the development of their professional or regulatory body through examining, chairing relevant committees etc. (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Has a reputation as a significant influence on aspects of their profession’s development. (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Contributes to the development of the academic reputation of their institution through membership of relevant academic committees and groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 'Puts something back' into the institution's academic processes and practices (is perceived to be a good 'academic citizen').</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Capabilities: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Has access to adequate 'intelligence' about the issues where the greatest intellectual opportunities will exist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Is sufficiently up to date and current in their knowledge of academic thinking in their field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Spends sufficient time personally and collectively scanning the intellectual horizons of other disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Adequately turns opportunities into tangible plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Is open to routinely revisiting their academic plan to respond to changing contexts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Routinely helps connect team members so as to maximize intellectual opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Consistently connects team members to external colleagues in order to develop academic networks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Protects their team networks from the wider organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Sets their team the highest standards of academic contribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Holds team members adequately to account for delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Intervenes to deal with conflict in the team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12 Adequately engages the team in changes to their activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13 Gives sufficient recognition to peer celebration when academic achievements arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14 Routinely reviews progress with individuals and offers encouragement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Character: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Exhibits the highest levels of academic integrity (compliance with ethical standards etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Behaves in their team in ways which avoid inappropriate favouritism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Their contributions to their academic field are beyond reproach and challenge from any hint of plagiarism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Gives full credit to their team for their academic contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Has the capacity to maintain momentum when they find themselves in an academic cul-de-sac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Maintains adequate resources of energy to help them progress their academic endeavours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Has a noticeable reputation in one or more areas of academic enquiry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Has found their 'academic voice'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 If a team leader, their team has a distinctive presence beyond their personal contribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Confidence: How well do you believe this person meets (or would meet) these demands on him/her as an academic leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequately — fails to meet this on many occasions</th>
<th>Adequately — but with occasional lapses</th>
<th>Largely — shows regular evidence</th>
<th>Fully — a real strength</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Has an appropriate sense of inner intellectual confidence which guides their academic leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Their inner confidence is guided by a set of moral and ethical values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Projects an appropriate sense of external confidence about their academic work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Adequately develops and encourages the confidence of their team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next part of this questionnaire builds on the ‘Dimensions of Academic Leadership’ scale by focusing on additional leadership attributes which are considered important to academic leadership by academic staff at UOW.

Attributes are divided into 6 domains:

- Position
- Reflect
- Open
- Provide
- Enable
- Link

When answering the following questions, please consider what the participant is CURRENTLY doing with respect to each domain (either strengths or limitations). Giving actual examples where possible will be helpful.

14. Position . . ."Think and act strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within your university and the wider context."

For example

- taking a big-picture view
- assessing and managing risk
- understanding the system
- driving initiatives
- gaining alignment and commitment

a. What does the participant currently do well? ______________________________

b. Where could the participant improve? ______________________________

c. Please give a specific example, if possible ______________________________
15. Reflect . . . "Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes"

For example

- moving from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role
- learning from experience
- committing to their own development
- understanding strengths and limitations
- admitting to and learning from mistakes
- thinking strategically, creatively and laterally.

a. What does the participant currently do well? ____________________________

b. Where could the participant improve? ____________________________

c. Please give a specific example, if possible ____________________________

16. Open . . . "Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal levels"

For example

- being accessible, visible and approachable
- listening without pre-judging
- communicating clearly and openly
- being consistent in their actions and decisions
- acting on feedback about themselves
- being able to say 'no' without undermining relationships
- valuing diversity.

a. What does the participant currently do well? ____________________________

b. Where could the participant improve? ____________________________

c. Please give a specific example, if possible ____________________________
17. Provide . . . "Provide a supporting environment in which your staff will thrive"

For example

- appreciating the breadth of academic work and the many facets of the university organisation
- understanding the unique needs and communication styles of academic staff
- being consistently respectful and professional
- applying organisational rules fairly
- demonstrating a balance in leading research and teaching.

a. What does the participant currently do well? ____________________________

b. Where could the participant improve? ____________________________

c. Please give a specific example, if possible ____________________________

18. Enable . . . "Enable your unit to always move forward"

For example

- making timely and confident decisions
- not leaving things to chance
- initiating change responsibly
- being organised
- making strategic use of available resources
- taking a 'can do' attitude.

a. What does the participant currently do well? ____________________________

b. Where could the participant improve? ____________________________

c. Please give a specific example, if possible ____________________________

19. Link . . . "Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline"

For example

- regularly consulting and sharing views and ideas
- tolerating disagreement without always needing a resolution
- building external networks for advice

a. What does the participant currently do well? ____________________________

b. Where could the participant improve? ____________________________

c. Please give a specific example, if possible ____________________________
The last part of this questionnaire looks at:

The teaching-research nexus and Interdisciplinary collaboration

Teaching-Research Nexus

20. To what degree do you see evidence that research informs the participant's **TEACHING**?

- 1 — Very strongly
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Not at all

21. To what degree do you see evidence of a focus on the Nexus in the participant's **RESEARCH**?

- 1 — Very strongly
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Not at all

22. If possible, please describe (briefly) one example of how the participant has integrated the Nexus into his/her work.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration

23. To what degree do you see evidence of the participant's involvement in **INTERDISCIPLINARY** collaboration?

- 1 — Very strongly
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Not at all

24. To what degree do you see evidence of the participant's involvement in collaboration in general?

- 1 — Very strongly
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 — Not at all

25. If possible, please describe (briefly) one example of interdisciplinary collaboration in the participant's work.
That concludes the PROPEL 360 Degree Feedback Questionnaire.

Results of this assessment will be collated and an individual report distributed to the participant at the PROPEL Leadership Skills Workshop in late September.

Thank you once again for your interest and your time in completing this questionnaire.
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How to use these results

This report summarises the results of the Participant Self-Assessment and 360 Degree Feedback questionnaires.

Your personal responses will give you a benchmark from which to measure your leadership development over the coming 12 months. They will also help you clarify in your own mind the areas you feel are your strengths and the areas you see as challenging.

Others’ perceptions, gained through the 360 degree feedback process, will help you take stock of the impact you are currently having and to identify the specific areas where you can maximise your leadership potential in the future. You may find your ratings and those from the 360 degree process vary significantly on occasions. These are the results which will tell you most about yourself.

This report is for your development, so use the results in any way you feel will assist you. You may choose to share your results with other PROPEL participants, co-ordinators and your leadership mentor if you wish. You may also choose to discuss results as part of your career development process within the Faculty.

Confidentiality of responses

The PROPEL Coordinators will keep your responses and your 360 degree feedback confidential at all times. This report will not be forwarded to any other party unless you request it. PROPEL will use some parts of the responses to assess changes in your leadership abilities over the 12-month Program. At the conclusion of the Program, results will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Program in achieving its aims. Any published reports resulting from the PROPEL Program will contain only aggregated and de-identified information.
### SECTION 1: Your leadership aspirations

I **definitely** see myself moving into an institutional leadership role.

Others’ views about you moving into an institutional leadership role:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I see this happening **in more than 5 years**.

When others see this happening:

**Supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Next 12 months</th>
<th>1-2 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>More than 5 years</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Peers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Next 12 months</th>
<th>1-2 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>More than 5 years</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Next 12 months</th>
<th>1-2 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>More than 5 years</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I feel I **possibly** have the skills and confidence to take on an institutional leadership position right now.

Others’ views about your skills and confidence to take on an institutional leadership position right now.

**Supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YOU currently see the following aspects of moving into an institutional leadership position as the most challenging for you:

• Managing politics and conflict;
• delivering favourable outcomes.

To help you overcome these challenges YOU have identified:

• Being asked to act in that role, while being mentored by (1) a person who has successfully delivered that role, (2) a person who has skilfully and successfully managed those challenges and (3) a person who can look "beyond the square" and facilitate my provision of "fresh" ideas.

Your SUPERVISORS currently see the following aspects of moving into an institutional leadership position as the most challenging for you:

• experience with dealing with people and issues around leadership

To help you overcome these challenges your SUPERVISORS have identified:

• time, experience and training

Your PEERS currently see the following aspects of moving into an institutional leadership position as the most challenging for you:

• I feel he needs to gain considerable managerial experience managing people on a day to day basis for a few years before I could recommend a hug level managerial position such as a head of school or above. The ability to deal with people, and to show empathy where needed, as well as approaching communication in a softer or more approachable manner, when the staff member being interfaced with is perhaps problematic, is a skill that can take some time to hone and foster. I feel John needs to have some time to adjust to this aspect in his communications. In other words I feel at times in his communications he may need to learn more patience and to temper his approach than seen to date at times.
• Challenges: dealing with the conflicting interests of multiple stakeholders, some of whom are rather forceful in expressing their opinions. Dealing with senior managers at the university level.

To help you overcome these challenges your PEERS have identified:

• Several years 2 to 3, of managerial experience dealing with staffing and managerial issues on a daily basis. Basically on the ground managerial experience.
• Credibility based on continued track record of competence and political wisdom. A leadership style which conveys an ability to listen actively to all stakeholders. A capacity to show flexibility in leadership style, depending on the issue and the context. Time spent in committee work with UOW senior managers would help.
Your REPORTS currently see the following aspects of moving into an institutional leadership position as the most challenging for you:

- I do not see that there are any challenging aspects that the participants may encounter other than it may be considered that he does not have enough experience at this stage.
- When I first started to work with John, I would have said ability to delegate tasks and responsibility. However since working with him longer, I have observed that once he trusts you he does delegate. He has high standards and a strong work ethic. You have to prove yourself before he will rely on you. The challenge may be that given the role, he may have to delegate earlier than his comfort level would dictate.

To help you overcome these challenges your REPORTS have identified:

- I believe that he continues to work in an environment conducive to producing leaders and he is committed to working towards achieving his leadership goals. The challenge that I see for the participant is convincing others that he is worthy of a leadership role and I believe that he will do whatever it takes to achieve this.
- A clear understanding of his responsibilities balanced with his manager's acceptance that delegation is necessary and some risk is attached but there can also be benefits. Ability to choose his own staff; or if not HR support in identifying strengths and weaknesses of individuals to enable a management framework to work within and clear communication of expectations between John and his staff.
SECTION 2: Dimensions of Academic Leadership - The Kennie Scale

1. CREDIBILITY
   Personal - Peer - Positional - Political

2. CURiosity
   Challenge - Creativity

3. COLLEGIality
   Team - Discipline - Academic Unit - Profession - Institution

4. CAPABILITIES
   Horizon Scanning - Sense-making
   Performing - Connecting - Celebrating

5. CHARACTER
   Integrity - Resilience - Distinctiveness

6. CONFIDENCE
   Inner - Outer
Your current ratings across the 6 dimensions of academic leadership:

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

Your notes . . .
**CREDIBILITY**

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>S'visors</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you possess adequate academic credentials and experience in your areas of academic enquiry?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do your immediate and wider peers ‘rate you’ as an intellectual force in your field?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you actively illustrate by your actions the importance of using your position to enable others to succeed?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you deploy, when required, the necessary influencing and political skills to progress your academic work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average rating for ‘Credibility’</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURIOSITY**

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>S'visors</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you capable of consistently setting yourself academic challenges?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you capable of consistently setting academic challenges for others?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you challenge your academic team (students, colleagues) to perform at the highest levels?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you consistently demonstrate innovative approaches to your academic work?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you demonstrate academic inquisitiveness and encourage this creative thinking in your academic group?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you make time to foster and facilitate creative thinking in your academic group?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are you sufficiently flexible and adaptable to new ideas?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average rating for ‘Curiosity’</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLEGIALLY

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>S’visors</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you offer support and mentorship to those in your immediate team?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you consistently contribute to the ongoing success of all of your team members?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you make regular contributions to the progression of your discipline through peer refereeing and reviewing, external examining etc?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you make a great contribution to the work of learned societies in your discipline?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you make contributions to the progress of your academic unit (Dept/School)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do your peers value your contributions to the academic unit?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you make a fair contribution to the administrative and other demands across the unit?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you make contributions to the development of your professional or regulatory body through examining, chairing relevant committees etc? (where relevant)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you have a reputation as a significant influence on aspects of your profession’s development? (where relevant)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you contribute to the development of the academic reputation of your institution through membership of relevant academic committees and groups?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you ‘put something back’ into the institution’s academic processes and practices (are you perceived to be a good ‘academic citizen’)?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Collegiality’ 2.1 3.4 3.3 3.7
CAPABILITIES

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>S'visors</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have access to adequate ‘intelligence’ about the issues where the greatest intellectual opportunities will exist?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you sufficiently up to date and current in your knowledge of academic thinking in your field?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you spend sufficient time personally and collectively scanning the intellectual horizons of other disciplines?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you adequately turn opportunities into tangible plans?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are you open to routinely revisiting your academic plan to respond to changing contexts?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you routinely help connect team members so as to maximize intellectual opportunities?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you consistently connect team members to external colleagues in order to develop academic networks?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you protect your team networks from the wider organisation?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you set your team the highest standards of academic contribution?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you hold team members adequately to account for delivery?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you intervene to deal with conflict in the team?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you adequately engage the team in changes to your activities?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you give sufficient recognition to peer celebration when academic achievements arise?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you routinely review progress with individuals and offer encouragement?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Capabilities’ 1.8 3.0 3.1 3.3
CHARACTER

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>S’visors</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you exhibit the highest levels of academic integrity (compliance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compliance with ethical standards etc)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you behave in your team in ways which avoid inappropriate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favouritism?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are your contributions to your academic field beyond reproach and</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenge from any hint of plagiarism?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you give full credit to your team for their academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you have the capacity to maintain momentum when you find</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourself in an academic cul-de-sac?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you maintain adequate resources of energy to help you</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress your academic endeavours?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you have a noticeable reputation in one or more areas of academic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enquiry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have you found your ‘academic voice’?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If you lead a team, does your team have a distinctive presence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond your personal contributions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating for ‘Character’</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONFIDENCE

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>S’visors</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have an appropriate sense of inner intellectual confidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which guides your academic leadership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is your inner confidence also guided by a set of moral and ethical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you project an appropriate sense of external confidence about your</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you adequately develop and encourage the confidence of your team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating for ‘Confidence’</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: Leadership attributes - The PROPEL Scale

The PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains consist of six groupings of skills and characteristics which have been identified as essential to good academic leadership. The domains were developed through interviewing and surveying a wide range of academic staff at UOW.

**Position**
Think and work strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within your university and the wider context

**Reflect**
Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes

**Open**
Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal level

**Provide**
Provide a supporting environment in which your staff will thrive

**Enable**
Enable your unit to always move forward

**Link**
Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline

The questionnaire you have completed listed a selection of skills from each domain. Many skills were similar to those listed in the Kennie Scale and therefore were not repeated. Your results below are indicative of your abilities in each PROPEL domain, however you should read these results in conjunction with those for the Kennie Scale (particularly ‘Credibility’ and ‘Capabilities’).

1  Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2  Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3  Largely - show regular evidence
4  Fully - a real strength

---

1. Self
POSITION

How well you believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1  Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2  Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3  Largely - show regular evidence
4  Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you take a ‘big picture’ view of your organisation?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How well do you assess and manage risk?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you really understand how the system works?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How proactive are you in driving initiatives by gaining alignment and commitment?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Position’ 1.8

What others see as your strengths in this area:

- Very good at administration, processes and coordination understanding the system and moving with new ideas
- Considers well the collaboration opportunities with other schools and faculties.
- John understands the need to develop postgraduate programs which meet market needs. He knows how to use the teaching and research award systems to develop his profile and his credibility.
- The participant is constantly looking at strategies and ways to improve the education environment of academics and that of students. He clearly understands what is required is able to communicate this effectively.

What others see you could improve in this area:

- people skills and understanding the bigger picture
- Needs more experience with regard the often ramifications of cross school or faculty ideas, especially with regard the wider and perhaps more political perspective.

Examples:

- The participant is still at the beginning of his career and just needs more experience in the various academic/admin areas and people leadership
- Sometimes keen to suggest collaboration which may in fact be detrimental to his own unit’s activity in mid to long term if not careful. This is partially due to not having the experience to help him understand the full ramifications of the decisions taken. Needs to become more aware of others potential agendas for involvement in collaborative projects and thus way up the benefits and risks before proceeding, but to remain in a positive and constructive spirit. More caution based on experience is needed.
REFLECT

How well you believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How successfully are you moving from a self-focused academic role to a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people-focused leadership role?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you committed to ongoing personal and professional development?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How well do you make sense of and learn from experience?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you fully understand your personal strengths and limitations?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can you admit to and learn from your mistakes?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you approach situations by thinking strategically, creatively and</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laterally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for 'Reflect' 2.8

What others see as your strengths in this area:

- commitment to students, discipline and the institution
- Is willing to learn from others, and actively approaches others for feedback.
- John has learned to position himself visibly by taking key positions and committee roles etc. These roles would require some personal adjustments to serve the larger UOW community.
- The participant shows strong leadership qualities and is committed to ensuring that the staff he supervises are well informed, kept up to date and he provides us with a positive experience which we in turn pass on to the students.
- In relation to "people focused leadership role": face to face communication; sensitivity to a team member's concerns and responses; and very supportive in assisting with new challenges and personal issues.

What others see you could improve in this area:

- thinking strategically and taking in the big picture
- Needs to realise that management is about experience as much as it is about training programs and approaches. This will come with time as for all of us.
- I do not see any areas where the participants needs to improve but having worked with him over a long period of time, I know that he himself sets goals and objectives and strives to achieve and in fact does not rest until he achieves these goals and objectives. His commitment is exemplary.
- In his email communication, although he has become more sensitive to how a written message may be interpreted. He is very brief at times to the point of appearing abrupt, however is a "different person" face to face or over the phone. In written communication he
is starting to use the "social niceties" such as "Dear XXX", "Hi"; and give more information. As this is the primary means of communication with some staff it is an important issue.

Examples:

• again this is just a case of more experience and time
• Early in our working relationship, John sent me an email indicating that there was a major perceived issue with some students. I rang him straight away as I was concerned. John was happy to clarify and reassured me that the problem was manageable and that he had supported me in the discussion with the students. We also discussed ways to avoid such an issue in the future. In subsequent emails he has been more careful in how he communicates information.

OPEN

How well you believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1 Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2 Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3 Largely - show regular evidence
4 Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you make sure you are accessible, visible and approachable?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How well can you listen without pre-judging?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you communicate with colleagues and staff clearly, openly and honestly?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are you consistent in your actions and decisions?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you act on feedback you receive about yourself?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have strategies in place to find out about staff needs?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Can you say ‘no’ to staff and colleagues without undermining working relationships?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent do you value diversity in your workplace?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Open’ 2.0

What others see as your strengths in this area:

• taking on board new ideas, consistency, acting on feedback
• Very accessible, although I am unsure all staff would approach him if he was in a managerial role.
• John is personable and approachable. He makes time for open discussion with his colleagues. He has been extremely accommodating in providing timely feedback to colleagues.
• The participant makes himself available at all times and most definitely listens to us without pre-judging. He is open to suggestions from the staff that he supervises and at the same time
is able to say "no" without comprising or undermining the relationships we have with him. He also praises initiatives of the staff he supervises.

- John is always professional and approachable. He is always available to discuss any issues either at the time or is very direct in stating his unavailability and agreeing a mutually available time. This is a bonus as you know where you stand with him and you have his full attention when you do meet. I have found his support and feedback invaluable as he has given me the opportunity to take on new tasks. He listens to my ideas and gives me feedback based on (and referring to) his experience. Within clear guidelines, he gives me the freedom to try new things and learn from my successes and mistakes. He is clear about what he needs and where the task fits in the bigger picture.

**What others see you could improve in this area:**

- understanding other peoples constraints
- Try to find ways to be accessible even with staff that perhaps tend to take up more 'combative' approaches when dealing with their managers.
- I have not seen the way John treats general staff so cannot comment on the say he may or may not be 'open' to them. But he is warm and approachable on a personal level.
- At the beginning of our working relationship I would have said he needs to delegate more and trust his staff to get on with it as I felt at times that he was doing my work and that was frustrating. However now he hands over tasks and even though he is there to help, lets me "fly on my own". So now we have a positive working relationship.

**Examples:**

- In the first session we worked together he taught me about a student process but then proceeded to deal with the bulk of the students' requests. At the time I was doing the same role with another subject co-ordinator who basically enabled me to get on with it. The difference was that I had worked with the other co-ordinator before so he knew my capabilities.
**PROVIDE**

How well you believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well do you appreciate the breadth of academic work and the multi-faceted nature of the university organisation?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you able to lead academic staff in ways which suit their unique needs and communication styles?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you consistently deal with staff in a respectful and professional manner?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you understand the organizational rules and apply them fairly and appropriately?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you demonstrate balanced leadership in teaching, research and community engagement?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Provide’ 2.6

What others see as your strengths in this area:

- applying organisational rules fairly consistently respectful and professional
- Good balance of interests and activity in both teaching and research, than one or the other.
- John has provided invaluable support and advice to colleagues. He has demonstrated fairness in the application of organisational rules in his administration of policies. He has provided a supportive environment in which first-year students can learn how to succeed in large first year subjects.
- The participant definitely is able to demonstrate the necessary balance in leading research and teaching. He understands the needs which are sometimes unique to academic staff and is at all times respectful and professional in his approach. He demonstrates fairness when rules are required to be adhered to.
- John is consistently respectful and professional. He applies organisational rules fairly and communicates clearly his decision.

What others see you could improve in this area:

- Understanding the many facets of university organisation will be a growing capability, given John’s committee work at the University level.
- I do not see any area where the participant could improve.
- John has already improved in "understanding the unique needs and communication styles of academic staff" as explained earlier.

Examples:

- Leading research teams will be another area of possible growth into the future.
ENABLE

How well you believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well do you make timely and confident decisions?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you make sure you don’t leave things to chance?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you able to initiate change responsibly and manage it sensitively?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How well organized are you (especially time management)?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are you able to make the most strategic use of available resources?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you always take a ‘can do’ attitude?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Enable’ 2.0

What others see as your strengths in this area:

- Very well organised and responsible and committed
- Very well organised, manages time well.
- John displays a ‘can do’ attitude. He is not cynical or jaded. He is optimistic about possibilities for his discipline and for the School. He is willing and able to speak up about matters which affect teaching and learning within the School.
- The participant is very particular about how things are to be done and when they need to be done by, He is extremely organised and seeks the same commitment from the staff that he supervises to be organised as well. He provides us with the necessary resources that are required to enhance the learning experience of our students. Near enough is not good enough for the participant. He expects commitment to tasks and ensures that he supervises these tasks to completion.
- Given the range of activities he undertakes I would say he is VERY organised. He usually gives us the information needed for our teaching activities in a timely manner.

What others see you could improve in this area:

- more open to new ideas
- Perhaps learn some additional time management techniques
- I do not see an area where there improvement is required.
- Handing over what is needed at the beginning of the session. In the past as a tutor, I have asked for all the information and been told that it will be sent as needed.
Examples:

- Rather than sending the tutorial activities each week, hand over a CD at the beginning with everything included. This enables the tutors to organise themselves and takes the weekly pressure off John to provide the information.

**LINK**

How well you believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you regularly consult and share views and ideas with others?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can you maintain a constructive climate in which disagreements can be tolerated without always being resolved?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you build external networks which you can turn to for advice?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Link’ 2.0

What others see as your strengths in this area:

- consults well and shares new ideas with colleagues
- John expresses his opinions and welcomes the opinions of others, without being disagreeable. He appears to enjoy good collegial relationships with his peers.
- The participant is committed to sharing views and ideas to cement relationships with the relevant parties at Faculty, School, Supervisor and student levels. He is aware of the need to build responsive and responsible networks that will strengthen the learning and teaching experience.

What others see you could improve in this area:

- Building larger networks beyond the faculty and university
- I am not sure to what degree John has developed an external network but this is an area where growth over time would add to his credibility as a leader.
- I do not see an area where the participant can improve.

Examples:
SECTION 4: Teaching-Research Nexus

In your discipline, you see the Nexus as . . .

A motherhood statement

You see incorporating the Nexus in your work as . . .

A waste of time

You believe the value of the Nexus for undergraduate teaching is . . .

Of no value

You believe focusing on the Nexus in your teaching will . . .

Add nothing to your understanding

You believe focusing on the Nexus in your work will . . .

Hold your career back

How do you and others see your focus on the Nexus?

Research currently informs your teaching . . .

Not at all

You currently focus on teaching implications when developing your research . . .

Not at all
Your example of how you have integrated the Nexus in your work:

Example provided (withheld here to maintain confidentiality)

Examples from others of how you have integrated the Nexus in your work:

Examples provided (withheld here to maintain confidentiality)
**SECTION 5: Collaboration and Interdisciplinarity**

**Disciplines which you currently see as complementing your research activities:**

Healthcare

**Disciplines which you currently see could benefit from including your discipline in their research activities:**

Social sciences and communication

**Your current level of involvement in collaboration and interdisciplinarity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you made any contacts in any of these disciplines (within or outside your university)?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you specifically discussed common research areas with any of your contacts?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you applied for, or are you developing applications for, any grants with researchers outside your own discipline?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you written, or are you currently writing, any joint publications with researchers outside your own discipline?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**You see interdisciplinary collaboration as . . .**

- A waste of time
- A good investment of time

**You believe interdisciplinary collaboration . . .**

- Limits publication chances
- Increases publication chances

**You believe interdisciplinary collaboration will . . .**

- Add nothing to your understanding
- Stimulate and challenge you

**You see building interdisciplinary collaboration as . . .**

- Difficult
- Easy
You see the results of long-term interdisciplinary collaboration as . . .

Frustrating  |  Rewarding

You believe interdisciplinary collaboration will . . .

Hold your career back  |  Enhance your career

How others see evidence of your involvement in . . .

INTERDISCIPLINARY collaboration:

Not at all  |  Very strongly

Collaboration in general:

Not at all  |  Very strongly

Examples from others of interdisciplinary collaboration in your work:

Examples provided (withheld here to maintain confidentiality)
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How to use this report

This report summarises the results of the Participant Self-Assessment and 360 Degree Feedback questionnaires, and includes pre-program, mid-point and end-of-program responses.

Your personal responses at the beginning of the Program gave you a benchmark from which to measure your leadership development over 12 months. They also helped you clarify the areas you felt were your strengths and the areas you saw as challenging.

Others’ perceptions, gained through the 360 degree feedback process at the beginning and end of the Program, help you take stock of the impact you are currently having and identify the specific areas where you can maximise your leadership potential in the future. You may find your ratings and those from the 360 degree process vary significantly on occasions. These are the results which will tell you most about yourself.

This report is for your development, so use the results in any way you feel will assist you. You may choose to share your results with other PROPEL participants, co-ordinators and your leadership mentor if you wish. You may also choose to discuss results as part of your career development process within the Faculty.

Confidentiality of responses

The PROPEL Coordinators will keep your responses and your 360 degree feedback confidential at all times. This report will not be forwarded to any other party unless you request it. PROPEL will use some parts of the responses to assess changes in your leadership abilities over the 12-month Program. After the conclusion of the Program, results will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Program in achieving its aims. Any published material resulting from the PROPEL Program will contain only aggregated and de-identified information.
## OVERVIEW: Your PROPEL leadership development goals and achievements

Based on your self-assessment, the 360 degree feedback you received and your experiences during the first part of the PROPEL Program, you identified the following development goals for yourself:

### GOAL 1  Regaining my confidence in my abilities

**PROGRESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After six months</td>
<td>I have some good skills that have been recognised by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After twelve months</td>
<td>I have tried to be more confident of my knowledge - with this more people have tried to cut me down to exert more dominance over me. I found this interesting as because I was standing up for my views, others felt they needed to exert more authority over me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL 2  Making decisions that are in line with my passion

**PROGRESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After six months</td>
<td>I have made big decisions that could change my career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After twelve months</td>
<td>Still going on the decision making process - working out my life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL 3  Becoming more independent

**PROGRESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After six months</td>
<td>I am pursuing goals independently of my traditional collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After twelve months</td>
<td>Yes, I am becoming more independent although upper management keep trying to bring me back down to continually seek the view of my old supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1: Your leadership aspirations

**Before** commencing the PROPEL Program you felt:

I **possibly** see myself moving into an institutional leadership role.

**At the end of** the PROPEL Program you felt:

I **possibly** see myself moving into an institutional leadership role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others’ views about you moving into an institutional leadership role:</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Sept 2010</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Sept 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reports only</th>
<th>Sept 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Before** commencing the PROPEL Program you felt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>September 2010</th>
<th>September 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I see this happening in an uncertain timeframe.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At the end of** the PROPEL Program you felt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>September 2010</th>
<th>September 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I see this happening in an uncertain timeframe.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**When others see this happening:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>September 2010</th>
<th>September 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supervisors**

**Peers and Reports**

**Supervisors**

**Peers only**

**Reports only**
Before commencing the PROPEL Program you felt:

I feel I **definitely don’t** have the skills and confidence to take on an institutional leadership position right now.

At the end of the PROPEL Program you felt:

I feel I **probably** have the skills and confidence to take on an institutional leadership position right now.

**Others’ views about your skills and confidence to take on an institutional leadership position right now:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Sept 2010</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Sept 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports only</th>
<th>Sept 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the beginning of the PROPEL Program you saw the following aspects of moving into an institutional leadership position as the most challenging for you:

- Getting a handle on how things currently operate, finding pathways of progress that will not meet with too much resistance, or being able to manage pathways and change;
- Dealing with personalities;
- Managing equity across areas outside my environment;
- Having the confidence in my abilities and my thoughts and not allowing others to change them without good reason;
- Being seen as independent to previous supervisors.
- Maintaining passion in the position
- Dealing with difficult personalities
- Maintaining/developing my self-confidence and positivity to any new role
- Being able to indicate to others the direction that I wish to move without negativity

After twelve months in the Program you added:

- Being able to get through the bureaucracy to actually get things done; being seen as an independent person; being forthright and able to "do"; dealing with difficult personalities

Before commencing the PROPEL Program you identified what you needed to help you overcome these challenges:

- Knowledge of systems and processes in the University environment;
- Being placed in governance roles that differ to those my previous supervisors;
- Working on confidence to instigate and manage change;
- Getting to know more high level operatives in the academic environment and feeling confident to discuss University issues (rather than out of work issues) with them;
- Being able to work through life choices and feeling confident that these will not impact my work situation;
- Having time to devote to big picture thinking and then potentially acting on this;
- Working on personality traits that ensure I can work with a variety of people and manage different personalities;
- The ability to not take negatives to heart but instead learn from them and move forward in a positive way.
- Making decisions while informed and without regret
- Identifying what I am passionate about and following this direction rather than the directions of others
- Being open and honest utilising MY time rather than reacting to the schedules of others
- Reminding myself that I have a strong skill set and I should exploit this rather than what I think others see in me

After twelve months in the Program you added:

- Moving forwards; being able to ask the tough questions and keep asking until I receive the responses I need; defining my place in the bigger picture and the ways that I am able to negotiate most effectively.
The following aspects of moving into an institutional leadership position were seen as the MOST CHALLENGING for you:

SUPERVISORS
- Feeling that he has the freedom to be himself and make his own decisions AND Being seen as an independent thinker and decision-maker - Personally, I think he has the ability to do both
- The relentless nature of the position John desires, trying to deal with the challenging "personalities" involved (i.e., gaining the respect of staff and being able to deal with performance management issues), and trying to juggle his own personal expectations of achieving in research, teaching, and academic governance. I believe that one of John's greatest "impediments" is his lack of personal belief - despite his very good achievements he is extremely hard on himself and this prevents him from having the confidence to tackle the challenges faced by a Head.
- I think he needs to develop more of a sense of independence and develop his own ideas/style of working and managing teams.

PEERS AND REPORTS
- I don't think John would have any issues within himself but I think that the University, culturally, has a misconception that "younger" people are not suitable for senior positions and that people who have had a longer career are entitled to such positions.
- John is a fairly young academic which may hinder his progress in some ways.
- Confidence, particularly when dealing with more senior staff members.
- If given a high teaching load.
- For example: Being able to manage the requirements of a large group of staff - these requirements include administrative/teaching/research/financial/collaborative etc. To be able to provide the leadership and mentoring this sort of position requires. Having the interpersonal skills to interact with what is always a varied group of individuals. Successful time management - as this is crucial to personal and professional wellbeing.
- Independent identity - Raising profile both amongst peers and superiors - When adopting such a leadership position, undermining of existing and future research output
- How to demonstrate he does not need to have his supervisor alongside him to achieve his goals as he has had the same supervisor for a long time.
- Being able to continue a number of research studies, while teaching in a very specific area (with only a small number of academics able to cover the area) and also running a unit. This would be a much larger than expected workload.
- The challenges would be mostly external, in that other people might not give John the 'respect' he would need, perhaps because of seniority issues. I think that John would be totally competent, but would other people consider he has been here long enough, is senior enough, to take on such a role? This is more about the culture of the Faculty. Also, I think John has a reputation and strength as an academic, not necessarily an administrator, and he might be seen as having enough high level administrative experience.
360 Degree Feedback – End-of-Program - Sept 2011

The following aspects of moving into an institutional leadership position were seen as the MOST CHALLENGING for you:

SUPERVISORS
- John has the skills but I would be worried that he would try to take on too many tasks at once (i.e. not be willing to give up his current interests and then try and juggle too much).
- The question asked about position such as HoS. I do not think he is focused on that era. I do, however, feel that he has the capacity and interest in roles associated with research leadership and is, I believe, on that trajectory, supported by our faculty.
- I think John needs to promote himself and his work more widely, so he is seen as a knowledgeable researcher who can lead others.
- Time constraints
- Lack of experience

PEERS
- Politics. Perceptions of more senior/established academics within the school and faculty.
- Time commitment
- Giving up research activity
- As for anyone, the number of roles and responsibilities and competition for budget.

REPORTS
- Setting aside enough time to spend with his family.
- John is well know by his colleagues at the university and shouldn’t have any problems
- Balancing various aspects of workload (this is true for everyone). John is very much an ideas person. One of the difficulties of a leadership position in the tertiary sector is maintaining enthusiasm in the face of structural difficulties- I would hate for John to lose his passion!
- I also think he needs a bit more confidence in himself, to not be fearful of what other people think and say what he really feels. I think he is still a little tentative in that regard.
- The ability to manage a large and diverse group of staff.
- To be sufficiently ‘thick-skinned’ so as not to be intimidated.
- To realise that you cannot please everyone all of the time.
- John is still a young academic which could threaten more senior staff members.
The following were identified to help you OVERCOME THESE CHALLENGES:

**SUPERVISORS**

- Being seen to be in a position where this is possible/required and being seen to be making the decisions
- Personal coaching so that he gains the ability to recognise his own achievements and therefore develop greater confidence in his own ability to lead.
- Training in various strategies to deal with human resource issues so he can effectively deal with "difficult" staff.
- Hopefully, participation in this program. Also, the opportunity to take on leadership roles outside of his unit/faculty.

**PEERS AND REPORTS**

- There needs to be support to navigate the challenges that the University culture presents and potential perceptions that could cause conflict or difficulty for John to rise to such a position.
- John could readily take on any challenge
- Experience.
- Being given financial support to buy out his teaching.
- These attributes are acquired through experience. Taking on such a leadership position requires exposure to, and involvement in, many roles and responsibilities over time which will result in an understanding of the needs of all stakeholders and best practice to ensure the smooth running of the whole.
- Increased leadership and independence on research grants and undergraduate teaching. Funding of a research assistant/s
- Availability of academic staff to regularly assist with teaching and the support of a research assistant.
- Externally, there would need to be support from higher up in the Faculty, and this would give John the credibility he needs. His own natural confidence and the skills and knowledge he does have would be internally sufficient, he is a calm and consultative person with good knowledge of university systems and internal politics.
360 Degree Feedback – End-of-Program - Sept 2011

The following were identified to help you OVERCOME THESE CHALLENGES:

SUPERVISORS
- Being confident to focus on fewer tasks and letting other things go so he can focus.
- He would need the support of higher level managers to wherever possible protect him from such preconceptions and to assist his to deal with them.
- I think John needs to network with people who can then tell others about his capabilities.
- opportunities to gain experience

PEERS
- I think most of the challenges for John would be environmental. I believe he already has the skills to overcome these challenges but this will require his to demonstrate these skills in a position of authority in order to alter perceptions.
- Collaborate independently with more researchers where possible- already undertaking this task.
- Determining priorities
- Funding to facilitate ongoing research output
- Delegation
- Great administration support

REPORTS
- Provide administrative support.
- John will be more than fine in his leadership role
- More exposure to preliminary leadership roles to build confidence.
- More experience in leadership roles.
- General management skills.
SECTION 2: Dimensions of Academic Leadership - The Kennie Scale

**CONFIDENCE**  
Inner - Outer

**CHARACTER**  
Integrity - Resilience - Distinctiveness

**CAPABILITIES**  
Horizon Scanning - Sense-making  
Performing - Connecting - Celebrating

**COLLEGIALITY**  
Team - Discipline - Academic Unit - Profession - Institution

**CURIOSITY**  
Challenge - Creativity

**CREDIBILITY**  
Personal - Peer - Positional - Political
Your PRE-PROGRAM ratings across the 6 dimensions of academic leadership:

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

Your END-OF-PROGRAM ratings across the 6 dimensions of academic leadership:

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength
## CREDIBILITY

How well you and others believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you possess adequate academic credentials and experience in your areas of academic enquiry?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do your immediate and wider peers ‘rate you’ as an intellectual force in your field?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you actively illustrate by your actions the importance of using your position to enable others to succeed?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you deploy, when required, the necessary influencing and political skills to progress your academic work?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating for ‘Credibility’</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average change over 12 months</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength
## CURIOSITY

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you capable of consistently setting yourself academic challenges?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you capable of consistently setting academic challenges for others?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you challenge your academic team (students, colleagues) to perform at the highest levels?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you consistently demonstrate innovative approaches to your academic work?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you demonstrate academic inquisitiveness and encourage this creative thinking in your academic group?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you make time to foster and facilitate creative thinking in your academic group?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are you sufficiently flexible and adaptable to new ideas?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating for ‘Curiosity’</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average change over 12 months</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COLLEGIALITY**

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you offer support and mentorship to those in your immediate team?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you consistently contribute to the ongoing success of all of your team members?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you make regular contributions to the progression of your discipline through peer refereeing and reviewing, external examining etc?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you make a great contribution to the work of learned societies in your discipline?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you make contributions to the progress of your academic unit (Dept/School)?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do your peers value your contributions to the academic unit?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you make a fair contribution to the administrative and other demands across the unit?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you make contributions to the development of your professional or regulatory body through examining, chairing relevant committees etc? (where relevant)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you have a reputation as a significant influence on aspects of your profession’s development? (where relevant)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you contribute to the development of the academic reputation of your institution through membership of relevant academic committees and groups?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you ‘put something back’ into the institution’s academic processes and practices (are you perceived to be a good ‘academic citizen’)?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average rating for ‘Collegiality’**

2.1

**Average change over 12 months**

+19% +29% +3% +3%
### CAPABILITIES

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have access to adequate ‘intelligence’ about the issues where</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the greatest intellectual opportunities will exist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you sufficiently up to date and current in your knowledge of</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic thinking in your field?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you spend sufficient time personally and collectively scanning</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the intellectual horizons of other disciplines?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you adequately turn opportunities into tangible plans?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are you open to routinely revisiting your academic plan to respond to</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changing contexts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you routinely help connect team members so as to maximize</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellectual opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you consistently connect team members to external colleagues in</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order to develop academic networks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you protect your team networks from the wider organisation?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you set your team the highest standards of academic</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you hold team members adequately to account for delivery?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you intervene to deal with conflict in the team?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you adequately engage the team in changes to your activities?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you give sufficient recognition to peer celebration when</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic achievements arise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you routinely review progress with individuals and offer</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouragement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating for ‘Capabilities’</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average change over 12 months</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>+7%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHARACTER

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions  
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses  
3. Largely - show regular evidence  
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you exhibit the highest levels of academic integrity (compliance with ethical standards etc)?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you behave in your team in ways which avoid inappropriate favouritism?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are your contributions to your academic field beyond reproach and challenge from any hint of plagiarism?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you give full credit to your team for their academic contributions?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you have the capacity to maintain momentum when you find yourself in an academic cul-de-sac?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you maintain adequate resources of energy to help you progress your academic endeavours?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you have a noticeable reputation in one or more areas of academic enquiry?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have you found your ‘academic voice’?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If you lead a team, does your team have a distinctive presence beyond your personal contributions?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating for ‘Character’</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average change over 12 months</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>+13%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONFIDENCE

How well you and others believe you currently meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have an appropriate sense of inner intellectual confidence which guides your academic leadership?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is your inner confidence also guided by a set of moral and ethical values?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you project an appropriate sense of external confidence about your academic work?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you adequately develop and encourage the confidence of your team members?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Confidence’ | 3.3 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.3 |

Average change over 12 months | **-24%** | | **+7%** | | **+10%** | | **+6%** |
SECTION 3: Leadership attributes - The PROPEL Scale

The PROPEL Leadership Attribute Domains consist of six groupings of skills and characteristics which have been identified as essential to good academic leadership. The domains were developed through interviewing and surveying a wide range of academic staff at UOW.

**Position**
Think and work strategically to position yourself, your staff and your unit within your university and the wider context

**Reflect**
Reflect on yourself as a leader and be prepared to make changes

**Open**
Open out to your staff on both the professional and personal level

**Provide**
Provide a supporting environment in which your staff will thrive

**Enable**
Enable your unit to always move forward

**Link**
Create links and connections with other staff, faculties and institutions which will strengthen your unit and your discipline

The questionnaires you have completed listed a selection of skills from each domain. Many skills were similar to those listed in the Kennie Scale and therefore were not repeated. Your results below are indicative of your abilities in each PROPEL domain, however you should read these results in conjunction with those for the Kennie Scale (particularly ‘Credibility’ and ‘Capabilities’).

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

![Graph showing leadership attributes](image-url)
Considering any or all of the PROPEL leadership attributes, your 360 degree feedback respondents identified the following CHANGES IN YOUR ABILITIES AND CONFIDENCE since they first provided feedback 12 months ago. (NOTE: Where respondents had not provided feedback for you at the start of the Program they were asked to identify any current strengths or areas for improvement.)

SUPERVISORS

- John has recently accepted a leadership position within a different unit. This will better position his in terms of leadership opportunities within the University.
- I think he is more confident in taking on new challenges and going beyond his comfort zone. He is also broadening his experience of academic activities.
- I do not directly supervise John so there is little for me to reflect on personally. Perhaps the fact I don’t reiterates my earlier point about the imperative for John to influence the views of opinion leaders higher up the system. Having said that, John has been asked to take on a greater role in his department and I believe this will provide a huge opportunity for his to ‘be seen’. He needs to grab that opportunity. In particular, he needs to be seen for his unique contribution and leadership.

PEERS

- John has spent some time contemplating his position within the university in the past 12 months and his strategies for achieving this.
- I am not sure these are changes: He has always been open and willing to discuss academic issues Willing to provide support when called upon across a range of issues Is flexible and willing to take on change if required
- I have noticed improved confidence in a number of domains; but particularly related to position and link. John has undertaken a new work opportunity; while still providing a supportive environment for others.

REPORTS

- Even with a heavy workload he remains dedicated to his research, students and colleagues by making himself available to them. He has a smile for everyone.
- I can’t say i work closely enough with John on a day to day basis, to comment on these comprehensively, but I have seen him take ownership of a project that has opened him up to different ways of thinking about academic life and work. He has taken a lot of advice on board in that project and proven himself flexible and open minded. He is always very self-reflective, and the project he’s been undertaking would have given him a great deal of knowledge from which to contribute to the direction of the faculty.
- John has been able to provide a more supportive environment to staff and students within his discipline. John networking skills are of a very high calibre and he is able to create important links and connections with personnel in other institutions and the wider community.
POSITION

How well you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1  Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions  3  Largely - show regular evidence
2  Adequately - but with occasional lapses   4  Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you take a 'big picture' view of your organisation?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How well do you assess and manage risk?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you really understand how the system works?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How proactive are you in driving initiatives by gaining alignment and</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Position’ 1.0 1.8

Average change over 12 months +80%
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What others saw as your strengths in this area:

• John is a good researcher who works within a good team. I see him as a team player who brings his personal and professional attributes to the team and gives them happily and willingly
• John can see the big-picture in terms of where research in our field is going, and he understands the system well. He can be extremely passionate about driving initiatives.
• Active participant in business planning and setting of strategic directions.
• Driving initiatives, leading direction for research team, innovating teaching practices, identifying future research opportunities and national gaps, developing industry alliances
• John is very good at taking the big-picture view and driving initiatives
• John driving change and ensuring systems run efficiently
• Write grant submissions
• Active member on committees
• Shows initiative in promoting the department within the university. Is prepared to accept roles and responsibilities within the department.
• Good communicator, able to take tasks to completion
• Taking in the big picture, assessing and managing risk.
• Very well organised; great ability to prioritise and work to deadlines, and very good at collaborating.
• Well aware of emerging strategic initiatives across the university. Is very consultative. Encourages people to have confidence. Remains objective.

What others saw you could improve in this area:

• I think he needs to be ‘given a go’ to show he can be a leader of teams, then he needs to clearly take on the job and do it well. I think he (and others) need to see that he can be successful not only by himself but also through others
• John can sometimes let his frustration with inadequacies in the system "eat at him" more than necessary. He needs to have more confidence in his ability to lead, and not get distracted by inadequacies in the system.
• Taking (or being seen to take) a more independent role in the development of his own career/developing his own team.
• I believe he can, at times become too focussed on processes and lose sight of the "big picture".
• Promotion of department within wider community
• Increase professional independence and identity
• Driving initiatives, gaining alignment and commitment
• Some communications about tight timeframes.
• Would like to see John have a more active presence across the whole faculty not just school based.

Examples:

• His recent involvement in a project highlighted John's ability to drive a major research initiative and he used his understanding of the big picture to pull together a focussed application. His frustration at the system during this process really "got him down".
• Instead of backing his judgement always feels the need to be consultative and go through his supervisor, in case 'toes' are trodden on, hence driving initiatives can go by the wayside instead of committing to go forward by gaining alignment and commitment.
REFLECT

How well you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions  
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses  
3. Largely - show regular evidence  
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Average change over 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How successfully are you moving from a self-focused academic role to a people-focused leadership role?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you committed to ongoing personal and professional development?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How well do you make sense of and learn from experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you fully understand your personal strengths and limitations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can you admit to and learn from your mistakes?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you approach situations by thinking strategically, creatively and laterally?</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Reflect’ 3.0 2.5

PRE-PROGRAM 360 DEGREE RESPONSES – Sept 2010

What others saw as your strengths in this area:

- John brings a wealth of experience prior to working at the University, adds it to his experience here and thus ensures an excellent job is done
- John’s strength is that he can think strategically, creatively and laterally. He is also very willing to learn from others, as long as he respects them. He is committed to his own development.
- Considering the needs of others; people-focused.
- Thinks strategically, good strong leader, able to build and motivate teams, can rely on his to get things delivered. Able to incorporate and build upon feedback.
- Thinking strategically, creatively and laterally - committing to his own development
- I believe John performs well in most of the areas mentioned above.
- Is a supervisor or co-supervisor to a number of research students.
- Thinking strategically
- Engages well with other staff, is honest and prepared to change
- Thinks creatively and laterally, committing to their own development.
- Good at reviewing previous teaching and coordination roles. Good strategic thinker and able to look at the big picture and the smaller details.
- I think John is very good at thinking strategically and seeing the big picture, especially as far as the faculty goes. John is very dynamic and energetic and is keen to get in there and do things, rather than just talk about them.
What others saw you could improve in this area:

- Being a little more 'out there' so that people can see that he has that expertise. John needs to be better at 'blowing his own trumpet' so as to be less easy to 'miss' ('ignore' would be too strong a word). As a leader, he needs to take on leadership roles and show that he enjoys them and can do them. He needs to do this, not wait to be asked. When the opportunity comes he needs to grab it and make sure he gets outcomes that are of benefit to the organisation/others BUT that can be seen to be attributable to his input.
- John needs time to make sure that his own internal competitiveness doesn’t cloud his judgement of others. Although he is committed to his own development, he seems somewhat lost at the moment in terms of which direction he really wants to go.
- Being more willing (able?) to take an independent position and develop/stand by his own views, rather than acquiescing to those of senior staff.
- I think he excels in this area. Maybe a bit of patience with how the university system operates.
- He does at times however, underestimate his strengths.
- Moving to a more people-focused leadership role
- To learn to go to a more people focused leadership role, learning to think more strategically within the system and to admit and learn from mistakes.
- The communication of how the smaller components fit within the 'big picture'.
- Would like to see John have a bigger presence across the faculty as well as in his school.

Examples:

- John has expressed "confusion" about where he should head. He constantly questions whether he has achieved much, when in fact he has been very successful.
- Meets with his research students on a regular basis to ensure they are coping.
**OPEN**

How well you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses
3. Largely - show regular evidence
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you make sure you are accessible, visible and approachable?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How well can you listen without pre-judging?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you communicate with colleagues and staff clearly, openly and honestly?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are you consistent in your actions and decisions?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you act on feedback you receive about yourself?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have strategies in place to find out about staff needs?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Can you say ‘no’ to staff and colleagues without undermining working relationships?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent do you value diversity in your workplace?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for ‘Open’ 3.1 2.8

Average change over 12 months -10%
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What others saw as your strengths in this area:

- I see John as someone who will help others to be successful. I think he is a team player who shows he values others.
- In cases where John respects a staff member, he interacts extremely well and is highly accessible and approachable.
- A good communicator and willing to learn and develop.
- John communicates well and responds well to feedback.
- Strong evidence of teaching excellence.
- Being accessible, visible and approachable
- Good listener, able to take on different points of view
- John is very willing to share his experiences with others and is consistent and equitable in his approach.
- John is extremely accessible and approachable. I think this is his biggest strength. He is easy to talk to, and comes from a space of wanting to improve things rather than making excuses. He is a very good clear communicator, doesn’t play politics, and is open to ideas regardless of who and where they come from. He respects other staff, regardless of their 'level' and doesn’t wield authority just for the sake of it.
What others saw you could improve in this area:

- I think he could usefully search out more people who could be helped and thus build his reputation as a mentor and leader of others. I think John is a confident person when you get to know him, but he doesn't necessarily come over that way immediately.
- Some staff have expressed concern that John can project an image of being a "solo" player (ie preferring to work alone). If John is feeling "uncomfortable" about an issue, he can avoid directly confronting the situation, which can impede communication.
- Being more confident about saying no taking on additional tasks that distract him from his key focus.
- I think he excels in this area. He takes feedback much more positively than most people do.
- Having the confidence to say no to senior staff
- Listening without pre-judging
- Saying no to excessive administrative tasks
- Being able to say 'no' without undermining relationships so becomes more consistent in their actions and decisions. Taking time to act on feedback.
- Doing well overall.
- Again, I think John needs to do more of this at a faculty level. I think he is quite strongly associated with his school in particular, which is good, but his skills are needed elsewhere.

Examples:

- At times John has expressed frustration to me with not knowing certain information, and yet he can be reluctant just to ask.
- Was surveyed by his undergraduate students.
- From an outsider it appears as if John takes on some roles because he feels he should rather than aligning those roles to his goals. He would be advised to work out a strategy to delegate or consult rather than commit to a role because it is easier to do oneself and know it is done.
**PROVIDE**

How well you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions  
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses  
3. Largely - show regular evidence  
4. Fully - a real strength  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well do you appreciate the breadth of academic work and the multi-faceted nature of the university organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you able to lead academic staff in ways which suit their unique needs and communication styles?</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you consistently deal with staff in a respectful and professional manner?</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you understand the organizational rules and apply them fairly and appropriately?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you demonstrate balanced leadership in teaching, research and community engagement?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average rating for 'Provide' | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Average change over 12 months | 0%  |     |
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What others saw as your strengths in this area:

- I don't see this currently in John but that is more about the depth to which I know his day to day work, rather than 'fact'. I see him as professional, supportive etc. I'm not sure that he has a role where he would be expected to do some of these things (I think the same for several sections, I want to help John become a leader of teams via this programme). To my knowledge he doesn't have 'staff to provide a supportive environment for...'
- John understands and appreciating the breadth of academic work and the many facets of the university organisation. As far as I am aware he has always applied organisational rules fairly.
- John is a very strong communicator and is ALWAYS professional. He applies organisational rules fairly and with integrity. He is a leader in both teaching and research, but also in administration.
- being consistently respectful and professional
- John is always respectful and professional.
- Makes himself available to both undergraduate and postgraduate students.
- Provide meaningful feedback
- He is supportive of other colleagues, acts in a professional manner
- Demonstrating a balance in leading research and teaching, with being consistently respectful and professional in both areas.
- John is fair in his approach. He currently balances research and teaching very well and is involved in collaboration with researchers and students in numerous units.
- John is always professional, courteous, compassionate and respectful, even when people irritate his he is patient and calm.
- He is supportive of people within the faculty at all levels.
What others saw you could improve in this area:

- He needs to be given a go
- John could benefit by training to assist in his understanding of the unique needs and communication styles of academic staff.
- I find John excellent to work with and I enjoy working on teams with him. He always provides a supportive team-focused approach.
- appreciating the breadth of academic work and the many facets of the university organisation
- understanding the unique needs and communication styles of academic staff
- Recognise limitations of others
- I think the participant is working well in this area, for the level of leadership currently required.
- Taking organisational rules and applying them fairly, including to oneself, where possible.
- A little more understanding regarding differing work styles and influences on outputs by some.
- I would like to see him be more active in advocacy for all HDR students, I think he has a lot to offer young researchers.

Examples:

- Again... sometimes John's own lack of belief in his own ability impede his ability to communicate with some staff, particularly those he feels he is "competing with"
**ENABLE**

How well you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions  
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses  
3. Largely - show regular evidence  
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well do you make timely and confident decisions?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you make sure you don’t leave things to chance?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you able to initiate change responsibly and manage it sensitively?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How well organized are you (especially time management)?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are you able to make the most strategic use of available resources?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you always take a ‘can do’ attitude?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating for ‘Enable’</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average change over 12 months</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What others saw as your strengths in this area:

- I see John as very organised. He plans well and makes sure things are done on time, as far as he can
- John can see very clearly strategic use of available resources and at times, has a great "can do" attitude.
- John makes confident and well informed decisions that he is able to back-up with a strong rationale. He is highly organised and effective. He has an exemplary attitude and is realistic but striving in his attitude and commitment to work outcomes.
- Being organised - his ‘can do’ attitude
- Initiating change
- Responsibly
- Making strategic use of available resources
- Taking a ‘can do’ attitude.
- John does have a can do attitude and gets on with the job with minimum fuss. He appears organised and timely in his actions.
- Taking a 'can do' attitude, makes confident decisions based on knowledge rather than chance.
- Very well organised; efficient; very capable and instils confidence.
- John is very well aware of the needs of his research group and his school. He is a very good strong advocate, is well organised, professional and willing to do what needs to be done.

What others saw you could improve in this area:

- I think he needs to grab opportunities to shine as and when they present themselves
- Although John often has many things he is trying to juggle. Training with strategic time management would be good. Again, developing his self-belief would also help him to make more confident decision.
- making timely and confident decisions
- Not take on too much
• Increased focus on strategic enablers with consideration of the bigger picture.
• Organisation, delegation to make more time, this last minute is more often than not due to workload commitments so may not be an easy one to achieve, so one could say he needs to make more strategic use of available resources within the team.
• More experience would be my only suggestion. Very strong in this area already.
• The only thing here is using his skills, what he currently does, to bring his unit and school more fully into faculty wide linkages etc.

Examples:

• John will frequently leave things like the preparation of the slides for a talk until the early hours of the morning he has to present.
**LINK**

How well you believe you meet (or would meet) these demands on you as an academic leader.

1. Inadequately - fail to meet this on many occasions  
2. Adequately - but with occasional lapses  
3. Largely - show regular evidence  
4. Fully - a real strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you regularly consult and share views and ideas with others?</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can you maintain a constructive climate in which disagreements can be tolerated without always being resolved?</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you build external networks which you can turn to for advice?</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average rating for ‘Link’ | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Average change over 12 months | -13% |
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What others saw as your strengths in this area:

- John has built highly successful external networks for his research work.
- Building links with other units and being committed to work on cross-disciplinary projects.
- John has a history of multi-disciplinary interactions that have strengthened his research outcomes. He builds strong networks both internally to UOW and externally and is a comfortable and confident networker.
- regularly consulting and sharing views and ideas
- Research collaborations with other research centres outside his School and overseas institutions.
- Networking
- This is an area of strength for John.
- Sharing views and ideas, especially in academic area of expertise.
- John has built networks in many areas. He shares ideas and regularly consults and presents at conferences.

What others saw you could improve in this area:

- If John does do these things then he needs to make sure this is clear to people with influence around him; then we need to help celebrate it.
- At times John will keep ideas to himself, making those around him uncertain of his motives.
- Building stronger external networks - which may enable him to develop his own research directions and a stronger 'position' as an independent researcher/leader.
- I can only think of a minor comment that he could dedicate more time to building external alliances for future (not current) research direction via industry partners but this requires time, which academics don't have a lot of. But building those relationships needs to happen now for his future research program and so is a worthy investment of time. John would have no problems identifying and contacting these partners and building the subsequent relationship.
- Building external networks for advice
• Tolerating disagreement without always needing a resolution
• Accept advice
• Currently trying to build external networks for advice but still needs to be built upon. Tolerating disagreement without resolution.
• At the moment, John is mostly involved with his school, and I think he needs to find a way to be more active across the faculty as a whole.

Examples:
• Evidenced by the high number of publications accepted in Journals.