

ABSTRACT

Title of dissertation: A CASE ANALYSIS OF A MODEL PROGRAM FOR THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT OF WOMEN FACULTY AND STAFF SEEKING TO ADVANCE THEIR CAREERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Lee Scherer Hawthorne Calizo, Doctor of Philosophy, 2011

Dissertation directed by: Susan R. Komives
Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

The purpose of this case study was to explore a model of leadership development for women faculty and staff in higher education. This study is significant because it explored the only identified campus-based program open to both faculty and staff. The campus-based Women's Institute for Leadership Development (WILD) program at the University of Cincinnati evolved over a few years and became a regionally-based program subsequently called the Higher Education Collaborative (HEC). These two programs at the University of Cincinnati served as the foci of this case study research.

Using methods consistent with case study research, I interviewed six past participants of the programs (three from each), plus the program coordinator, and several other campus administrators. Document reviews were conducted on marketing materials, progress reports, websites, budgets, status of women reports, and other documents found

in university archives. A focus group was conducted with the primary informants of the study as a way to check identified themes with the participants.

Findings suggest that elements of the leadership development programs did have influence on the participants in terms of their leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations and career paths. A comparison of the WILD and HEC programs suggest that the regionally-based HEC provided a solid opportunity for skill development and training, while the campus-based WILD program excelled at providing opportunities for participants to develop meaningful relationships and gain insights into the operations of the University. Participants in the HEC program engaged in the experience to learn about ways to advance in their careers, unlike the women in WILD who participated in order to be better in their current positions. WILD alumnae had changed positions, taking on more responsibilities and in some cases higher ranking titles since participating in the program. It was too soon to tell the career path implications for the HEC participants.

Other universities wishing to create a pipeline for women to advance into leadership can learn from the University of Cincinnati. Elements of both the WILD and HEC programs serve as valuable models for creating effective leadership development opportunities for women. Making sure women understand the purpose of an all-women experience is an important component that was missing from the UC programs.

A CASE ANALYSIS OF A MODEL PROGRAM FOR THE
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT OF
WOMEN FACULTY AND STAFF SEEKING TO ADVANCE
THEIR CAREERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Lee Scherer Hawthorne Calizo

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2011

Advisory Committee:

Professor Susan R. Komives, Chair
Dr. Linda Clement
Professor Sharon Fries-Britt
Professor KerryAnn O'Meara
Professor Stephen J. Quayle

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have made it to this final stage of my doctoral studies with the love and support of many very special people. This is my small way of saying thank you. There is much about the dissertation process that is completed in solitude, but even in my alone time, I have appreciated your presence in my life. You have given of your time and energy to assist with work projects, school assignments, and life obligations. You have cheered me on. You have laughed with me and cried with me. You have been patient with my delays or absence. Capturing the depth of my gratitude in words is not possible, but I feel so fortunate to know and love those of you who have been by my side through this journey.

To my dissertation committee, your input and expertise helped shape this study and my experience as a researcher. I so appreciate your wisdom and care throughout this process. Susan, you truly are one of the most amazing women I know – a brilliant instructor, leader, and advisor.

Many great women have come before me - opening doors and inspiring me to pursue my goals. Thank you to the strong and courageous women who have been role models for me. And to the women's group at UMBC who allowed me to see some of your self-created leadership experience. Patty, Diane, Kathy, Pat, Janet, and Lynn, thank you for sharing your experience with me, for giving me a foundation for this study, and for serving as role models to all the women on campus. You inspire many of us.

To the women at UC who served as informants for this study - I appreciate your willingness to give of your time to share your insights with me. UC is lucky to have such amazing, bright, and dedicated women on its campus.

Many friends, classmates and coworkers also supported me along the way. Leah, you are a masterful editor and a dear friend. I cannot begin to thank you enough for all the support you have shown me. Mollie, Kirsten, Susan, and Sal, each of you have played an important role in my journey. Whether as comps buddy, a dissertation writing buddy, a sounding board, an empathic ear, or a partner in brainstorming, you have helped shape this dissertation and me as a person and professional. Jen and David, I am so lucky to work with such hardworking, thoughtful, bright people, and Jen, you know me so well. The treats, the notes of support, and the constant words of encouragement truly made a difference. There were many times when I just was not sure I could keep going. You helped me find perspective and focus.

And to my family, thank you for your love and support. Whether editing drafts, bragging to friends about my impending Ph. D., sending me articles to read, or scouting out future job possibilities, you have been a steady force of encouragement. And Joe, you have been amazing throughout this process, but especially in this home stretch. Grocery shopping, making meals, cleaning the house, reading drafts, and planning fun outings, you created an environment in which I could disappear to the library for hours and then pop back into our life. I am forever indebted to you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Setting the Context.....	1
Problem Statement.....	5
Overview of Methodology.....	6
Identifying a Case	7
Informants	8
Data Collection and Analysis.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	9
CHAPTER 2: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Historical Background	11
National Data on Women in Academic Leadership Positions.....	16
Women’s Development	18
Women and Leadership	21
Barriers to Women’s Advancement.....	23
Structural Barriers.....	24
Social Norms and Expectations (aka Stereotypes, Prejudice and Discrimination)...	26
Lack of “Traditional” Mentoring.....	27
Lower Sense of Self-Efficacy	28
Barriers for Women of Color	30
Strategies for Overcoming the Barriers	31
Career Aspirations	34
Opportunities that Show Promise	36
Mentoring.....	37
Internships.....	41
Leadership Training Programs.....	42
Conclusion	45
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS	47
Research Questions.....	47
Research Design	49
Qualitative Methods and Theoretical Perspective	49
Case Study	51
The Sample	53
Case Selection Criteria.....	53
Case Selection.....	55
Access to the Site and Participants	57
Participant Selection	58
Data Collection	61
Document review.....	61
Participant interviews.....	62

Primary participants.....	63
Secondary informants.....	64
Data Analysis.....	66
Trustworthiness.....	68
CHAPTER 4: THE CASE OF TWO DIFFERENT LEADERSHIP MODELS	71
Institutional Overview	72
Context and Climate for Women on Campus.....	72
Data from the Late 1990s.....	73
UC Women’s Center.....	75
Women’s Leadership Conference.....	76
Introduction of the Women’s Leadership Program	77
Women’s Initiatives Network.....	79
Presidential Leadership.....	80
Summary	81
Women’s Institute for Leadership Development (WILD) Program.....	81
Administration of Program and Budget.....	82
Marketing.....	83
Participants of the WILD Program	84
Workshop Series	85
Internship	86
Higher Education Collaborative for Women’s Leadership Development (HEC)	88
Administration and Budget.....	89
Marketing of the HEC.....	91
HEC Participants.....	92
HEC Workshop Series	93
Impact of the WLP/WILD/HEC Programs.....	94
Summary.....	98
Introduction of Study Participants	99
ShipleY	99
McDaniel.....	101
Poole	102
Hunt.....	104
Mason.....	106
Berry	107
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS	109
Outcomes Associated with WILD and HEC	110
Knowledge Acquired	112
Learning more about campus and higher education leadership – WILD.	113
Leadership skills were enhanced through the HEC.	116
Summary.....	119
Relationship Building and Networking	121
Establishing relationships and building a network through WILD.	121
Deeper connections desired by HEC participants.....	125

Summary.....	128
Leadership Self-Efficacy.....	129
Leadership self-efficacy and WILD.....	130
Possible influences on self-efficacy beliefs – HEC.....	134
Summary.....	136
Career Aspirations	136
Doors opened through WILD.....	137
Looking for next steps after participating in HEC.....	138
Summary.....	142
Career Paths	143
Responsibilities increased, women moved up as a result of WILD.....	144
Too soon to tell if career paths have changed – HEC.....	145
Summary.....	147
Other Notable Findings.....	147
Value of program being open to faculty and staff.....	148
Confidence.....	151
Women only.....	154
Cohort-based model.....	159
Research Questions – Summary and Conclusions.....	160
 CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS.....	 163
Major Findings Related to Leadership Self-efficacy, Career Aspirations, and Career Path	163
Major Findings Related to the Experience	168
Major Findings Related to Obtaining Leadership Positions.....	171
Learning	171
Relationships.....	173
Limitations	175
Future Research	177
Implications for Theory	179
Implications for Practice.....	180
Implications for Individual Campuses	180
Implications for Higher Education.....	184
Conclusions.....	185
 APPENDIX A: SOLICITATION LETTER TO EXPERT NOMINATORS.....	 187
 APPENDIX B: LETTER TO PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS (PAST PARTICIPANTS OF THE PROGRAM)	 188
 APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT FORM	 190
 APPENDIX D: LETTER TO PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS (SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS/PAST SUPERVISORS)	 193

APPENDIX E: DOCUMENT REVIEW FORM.....	194
APPENDIX F: QUESTIONS GUIDING MEETINGS WITH PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR(S).....	195
APPENDIX G: QUESTIONS GUIDING MEETINGS WITH PAST PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS	196
APPENDIX H: QUESTIONS GUIDING MEETINGS WITH SUPERVISORS OF PAST PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.....	198
APPENDIX I: CODES	199
REFERENCES	218

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 <i>Interview Schedule</i>	63
Table 2 <i>Number of Men and Women in Academic and Administrative Leadership Positions 1998-1999</i>	74
Table 3 <i>Criteria for Applying to Program in 2000</i>	84
Table 4 <i>A Comparison of the WILD and the HEC Programs</i>	94
Table 5 <i>Number of Men and Women in Academic and Administrative Leadership Positions 2005-2006</i>	97
Table 6 <i>Number of Men and Women in Academic and Administrative Leadership Positions 2009-2010</i>	98
Table 7 <i>Comparative Features of the WILD and HEC Programs</i>	111
Table 8 <i>Program Elements and Their Influence on Outcomes</i>	112

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Setting the Context

For more than 20 years, concepts like “chilly climate,” “glass ceiling,” “the silencing of women’s voices,” “double-bind” and “gender gap” have permeated our research, writing, and conversations about women learning and leading (Catalyst, 2007; Hall & Sandler, 1982; Sandler & Hall, 1986; Scanlon, 1997). Despite women’s attempts to call attention to their experiences of differential treatment early in the women’s movement, these phrases surfaced only in the 1980s when businesspeople and educators began paying attention to the different experiences women and men encounter as they negotiate the education system and the workplace (Hall & Sandler, 1982; Sandler & Hall, 1986). These concepts are still widely known and understood, suggesting that we have not yet figured out how truly to create educational and work environments that are supportive of women’s ways of learning and leading (Eliasson, Berggren, & Bondestam, 2000; Hall & Sandler; McCormick, Tanguma, & Lopez-Forment, 2003; O’Meara, 2002; Pascarella, Whitt, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Yeager, 1997; Scanlon).

In addition to the common phrases that suggest isolation and barriers to success, statistics in higher education show evidence that women are not advancing in their careers at the same rate as their male counterparts (American Association of University Women [AAUW], 2003; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2004, 2008, 2009). Advancing in this context refers to the process by which individual women move from their positions to higher-level positions, thus “advancing” up the hierarchy of leadership. For years, it was often cited that women were not holding leadership positions because they did not have the necessary degrees or qualifications. However, women have

been earning bachelor's degrees in higher numbers than men since 1989, a higher number of master's degrees since the early 1980s, and slightly more doctoral degrees since 2006 (NCES, 2009). Degree attainment no longer explains why women are not advancing at the rate of men.

While the numbers of women in academic leadership positions (deanships, provost positions, vice presidencies, and presidencies) and in tenure-track faculty positions are increasing, women are still disproportionately underrepresented in administrative affairs, student affairs, and academic affairs leadership positions in American higher educational institutions (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; NCES, 2004, 2008, 2009; Taylor, 1989; Warner & DeFleur, 1993). This is particularly true at the presidential level. The 2007-2008 *Chronicle Almanac* reported that in 2006, 77% of college and university presidents were men while 23% were women. This represents a 6.5% increase in women presidents since 1995 (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2007)—an optimistic move toward gender equity. However, it is important to note that women presidents are most often leaders of associate and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions rather than doctoral degree-granting institutions, where men continue to dominate the presidencies (American Council on Education [ACE], 2007).

Although concrete data do not break down the types of administrative leadership positions, they suggest that women have started to outnumber men in university executive, administrative, and managerial positions (NCES, 2009). In 2003, nearly 2,000 more women than men held executive, administrative, and managerial positions at all degree-granting institutions. These numbers are encouraging, but a more complex review of the types of campuses and actual leadership positions would be helpful in determining

if there really is more gender equity in academic leadership. Unfortunately, women still far outnumber men in nonprofessional staff positions such as administrative assistants, food services staff, and housekeeping personnel, and are twice as likely as men to hold these positions (NCES, 2009). Conversely, men still hold significantly more tenure-track faculty positions than women (NCES, 2009), and they earn more money than women faculty (DeWitt, 2011). Women are better represented in leadership positions within the division of student affairs holding titles of director, dean and vice president (Jones & Komives, 2003).

Despite the recent increase in women in leadership positions on college campuses, scholars have explored the reasons women are not advancing at the same rate as men, naming a broad scope of obstacles from structural and societal barriers to low self-confidence and personal choices (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Baumgartner & Schneider, 2010; Carli & Eagly, 2007; Fobbs, 1988; Hoyt, 2005; Kellerman & Rhode, 2007; LeBlanc, 1993; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005; Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002; Rhode, 2003). Scholars also have conducted research on ways to help women overcome such obstacles and have identified several ways to support women seeking to advance into administrative leadership roles, including mentoring relationships, women-only leadership training programs, and internship opportunities (Bower, 1993; Brown, 2005; Chovwen, 2004; Eliasson et al., 2000; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005; Rhode, 2003; Roan & Rooney, 2006; Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003).

As women continue to face difficulty climbing the leadership ladder within higher education, I wanted to explore a useful model for leadership development for campuses wishing to create a pipeline for women to move into senior leadership. My research

explored the benefits and challenges of a leadership development program for women faculty and administrative staff at the University of Cincinnati. More specifically, I sought to learn first-hand the experiences of the women who participated in the leadership development program at the University of Cincinnati, and to tell their stories about how and if participation in the program shaped their leadership self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), career aspirations, and career paths. I wanted to learn more about the similarities and differences for female faculty and staff seeking to advance, and if participation in the programs responded to the campus desire to create an environment for women on campus to more easily move into leadership positions. I thought that if the program did indeed meet these goals, the program could serve as a model for other campuses wishing to advance more women into senior leadership positions.

I was particularly interested in the University of Cincinnati program because it was the only program I was able to identify in the United States that was campus-based and open to both faculty and staff. Additionally, as a staff member interested in moving up the student affairs ranks, I also had a selfish motivation for wanting to study this program. (It is important to note that the original program under investigation in this research evolved over the years and became a regionally organized program. I did not know this until my first visit to the campus. I decided to maintain the single case study framework but adapt my study to allow for some comparison of the two programs.)

This introductory chapter presents the problem statement guiding the study. I also briefly describe the methodology guiding the research and the significance of this study for women seeking to advance in their careers in higher education and to the field of

higher education overall. The subsequent chapters share greater detail about the methods employed, the findings, and the implications of this research.

Problem Statement

Women seeking to advance in administrative leadership positions in higher educational institutions often find themselves stifled by the “glass ceiling,” unaware of the processes for how to advance, and frustrated by the obstacles that seem to halt their progress up the ladder. Navigating this ladder can be an isolating and lonely experience (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Flynn, 1993; LeBlanc, 1993; Rapoport et al., 2002; Rhode, 2003; Scanlon, 1997; Warner & DeFleur, 1993). While leadership development opportunities have been created to support women seeking to advance, many such opportunities are one-time courses or workshops designed to disseminate tips and tools for effective leadership, such as the Alice Manicur Symposium sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the Donna M. Bourassa Mid-Level Management Institute sponsored by College Student Educators International (ACPA), which is open to men and women. The National Science Foundation (NSF) ADVANCE Program seeks to enhance campus climates for women and to facilitate the advancement of women faculty in science, technology, engineering and mathematics into senior leadership.

There are a few models of leadership development that are designed to be on-going opportunities for groups of women to explore leadership and advancement as a cohort. Association-based examples include the American Council on Education (ACE) Office of Women in Higher Education National Identification Program for the Advancement of Women in Higher Education, state-based ACE programs, and the

Higher Education Resource Services (HERS) institutes, where women from different institutions across the country come together to explore leadership. These programs provide valuable opportunities for the women who participate, yet there is great need for individual campuses to create and host leadership development opportunities for women administrators as a way to encourage and support women's advancement on their home campuses. In addition, even though peer mentorship is common practice in student affairs and higher education, there is limited research on the impact of a cohort-based model or peer mentorship as a form of leadership development for administrators (Bandura, Millard, Peluso, & Ortman, 2000; Ender & Kay, 2001; Hunter, 2004; Kram, 1985b, 1988; Mavrinnac, 2005; McDade et al., 2008).

The purposes of this case study were: (1) to explore the leadership development experiences of professional women who participated in the cohort-based women's leadership development program at the University of Cincinnati; and (2) to understand how the program shaped leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations, and career paths of the participants. (Leadership self-efficacy refers to one's belief in herself to accomplish specific leadership tasks or responsibilities [Bandura, 1997]).

Overview of Methodology

This section contains an overview of the methodology used in this study. A more comprehensive explanation is provided in Chapter 3. This study was based upon the premise that knowledge is socially constructed, whereby the social, historical, and cultural contexts are crucial components of meaning making (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). The constructivist approach suggests that one's reality is based in particular experiences and how she makes sense of those experiences. This is an epistemological perspective,

sometimes referred to as interpretive, that suggests individuals construct their perceptions of the world and there is no one “right” way to make meaning (Crotty, 1998; Glesne, 2006). This approach helped me understand the experiences of the women who participated in the cohort-based women’s leadership development program. The women shared their stories with me through interviews, inextricably linking my findings to their and my interpretations of their experiences. Together, we constructed knowledge about the women’s leadership program.

Given my interest in gaining in-depth information and insight into a campus-based, cohort model of a leadership development program for female faculty and staff, I needed to identify one campus program to use as a case study. The case study method involves “the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (Stake, 1995, p. xi). Beyond investigating the structure and format of the program itself, I was interested in the experiences of the women who participated in the program and how their participation shaped their paths. Specifically, I wanted to better understand the cohort model and the role it played in the leadership development experience.

Identifying a Case

I established the following criteria to identify a program appropriate for my case study:

1. The institution must have offered the program for at least three years.
2. The program must be open to faculty and staff.
3. The program must be designed to keep a cohort together for at least a year of activities and exercises.

4. The program must be campus-based.
5. The program must have resulted in the advancement of some women to higher levels of administrative leadership within higher education.

I solicited nominations for campus-based cohort models of leadership development for women from “experts” in the field of higher education. From the nearly 60 individuals and 10 associations or list serves that served as “experts,” I identified fewer than 20 potential programs that were suitable matches for my established criteria. I chose the University of Cincinnati as my case study—a simple choice in that it was the only one of the recommended programs that met all of my criteria.

Informants

Once I identified the case, I sought and received approval for the study through the Institutional Review Board at the University of Maryland. The program administrator at the University of Cincinnati approved my request to study the program, and invited program alumnae to participate. Six of the 11 women initially who responded participated as primary informants. In addition, I met with “secondary informants” including the program administrator, one participant’s supervisor and two senior-level administrators. Finally, I reviewed written material about the program including marketing pieces, application packets, evaluations, newspaper articles, and annual reports.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collected for this study came from three sources: primary informants, secondary informants, and document reviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted

with primary and secondary informants. As is common with case study research and interviewing, I recorded and transcribed all interviews.

In reading the transcripts from the first round of interviews, I looked for themes and differences in the women's stories, which helped inform the second round of interviews. The second interviews and a focus group served as an opportunity to "member-check" the themes I had identified through the first round interviews (Creswell, 2003; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Through the first round of interviews, I grew to understand that the original Women's Institute for Leadership Development (WILD) program at the University of Cincinnati had evolved into a women's leadership program that took a different shape and had different goals. The women's leadership development program at UC, inclusive of both the WILD and the newer Higher Education Collaborative (HEC) programs, was explored to better understand the efforts the University is making to create a more supportive path to leadership for women.

Significance of the Study

This study provides individual campuses and higher education professionals with an analysis of two practical models of women's leadership development programs that could be used as a foundation for creating similar programs at other institutions. While there is ample literature with suggestions for ways to support women's leadership development, having a base of experiences and opportunities is easier and more realistic than having to build a program from scratch. This case study serves as that starting place, informed by lessons and advice from program participants and program administrators.

Additionally, this case study provides valuable information to women currently in or aspiring to leadership positions. Women in higher education careers—and perhaps even other careers—will likely benefit from a deeper understanding of the way a formal leadership development program can shape career aspirations, leadership self-efficacy, and career paths.

Most of the literature on mentoring refers to a mentor-protégé relationship where there is a power differential between the two parties (Bower, 1993; Eliasson et al., 2000; Kram, 1988). The model explored in this research is a cohort-based relationship where women across power lines work together to support and challenge each other. Although neither program explicitly focuses on peer mentorship nor uses that terminology, it was evident that the relationship building with the other participants that occurred, particularly in the WILD program, proved invaluable. Through this study I contribute to the existing literature on mentoring by offering insights about the benefits and drawbacks of such a model.

CHAPTER 2: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Statistics show that women are not advancing to top administrative positions in higher education and other professions at the same rate as men (American Association of University Women [AAUW], 2003; Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Jaschik, 2008; McCormick et al., 2003; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2008, 2009; Scanlon, 1997; Sharpe, 2000) despite the fact that for at least the last decade, women and men have been earning terminal degrees at similar rates (NCES, 2004, 2008, 2009; Richman, Morahan, Cohen, & McDade, 2001). Factors contributing to this discrepancy are revealed through listening to women's stories and reviewing prior literature.

In this chapter, a historical context is provided for women in the workplace, including higher educational settings, and in leadership positions. Following the historical background, the literature on women's development is highlighted, specifically exploring the socialization of women and women's ways of learning and leading. The literature relevant to women and leadership is then reviewed with attention to some of the barriers or obstacles that keep many women from advancing to the most senior level positions in higher education, as well as in other fields. Finally, I present some of the literature related to experiences that promote women's leadership development and advancement including various forms of mentoring and internships.

Historical Background

The colonial view of woman was simply that she was intellectually inferior – incapable, merely by reason of being a woman, of great thoughts. Her faculties were not worth training. Her place was in the home, where man assigned her a number of useful functions. (Woody, 1929, p. 137)

Thankfully, beliefs have advanced since colonial times. Formal education for girls and women did not begin until the mid-19th century (Women's College Coalition [WCC], n.d.). At that time, it was widely accepted that a woman's place was in the home, taking care of it and raising children. In this role, society expected women to impart civic value and knowledge on to their children. In this sentiment, people began to realize that women needed better education in order to "properly" raise children (Farnham, 1994). As more schools opened, more teachers were needed. Women were regarded as better teachers than men, they were cheaper to hire, and they were willing to take on "lower status" positions. All of these factors contributed to the need to educate more women, and different ideas on women's education started to bloom.

Some schools (republican education) sought to prepare female students for their future roles as wives and mothers. Other educators (academic education) sought to teach girls and women about serving as community leaders and social benefactors. Still others (seminary education) taught women to become teachers, which was the only socially acceptable vocation for women at the time (WCC, n.d.). Many colleges for women were founded during this time, including the Seven Sister institutions: Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke, Radcliff, Smith, Wellesley, and Vassar (WCC, n.d.). These women's colleges offered new opportunities for female students, though the scope of education available to women remained more limited than that available to men. Women's colleges seemed to thrive until the 1960s and 1970s, when many closed and others opened their doors to co-education, largely due to political and fiscal pressure (WCC, n.d.). While many held fast to the benefits of single-gender education for women, they could not sustain themselves in the changing political and financial environment.

Of course, the civil rights movement, the women's movement, and feminist ideas all had an impact on the political culture that in turn shaped the experiences of women in higher education. Women challenged previously held notions about their "place in the home" and traditional female roles (Berkeley, 1999; Freeman, 1975, 1995). Many highly educated women, who had up to this point faced personal discrimination, publicly redefined themselves and the ways they wanted to live their lives. They were no longer satisfied with the status quo and living out the roles society had deemed appropriate. It was a period of extraordinary social change and a time of much hope for equality.

In the 1980s and 1990s, as women began to realize that while they were gaining access to new work environments, new roles, and new positions outside the home, they were also banging against a "glass ceiling" that kept them from advancing above a certain point on the corporate ladder (Kaufman, 1995). Many women, including those who reached leadership positions, experienced "chilly climates" where they did not feel welcomed or included, and they began to grow tired of these newfound inequities (Freeman, 1995; Hall & Sandler, 1982; Sandler & Hall, 1986). Faludi (1991) noted in her national best seller *Backlash* that "women were starting to tell pollsters that they feared their social status was once again beginning to slip" (p. 18). Despite the frustration working women were feeling, they were practicing leadership and exhibiting leadership characteristics—but simply not advancing into named leadership positions in any great numbers. For those women who achieved top jobs, they likely were not feeling supported in those roles (Hall & Sandler, 1982; Sandler & Hall, 1986).

A similar feminist stir was taking place in academia. Women were redefining themselves in the home and in the workplace, and women were changing the ways they

“define[d] reality, conceive[d] of knowledge, and exercise[d] leadership” (Astin & Leland, 1991, p. xi). *Women of Influence, Women of Vision* described Astin and Leland’s landmark study of three generations of women who led social change in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s with a focus on the educational sector. They interviewed 77 women and wrote about their leadership experiences. Three major themes emerged that described the leadership initiatives in which the women were engaged: “(1) concerns about female identity and consciousness; (2) access and opportunity in institutions, organizations, and the workplace; and (3) the inclusion of women in intellectual inquiry, publication, and curricular reform” (p. 19).

Many stories are shared in Astin and Leland’s (1991) book, and they provide insight into the motivations, experiences, and results of women’s leadership efforts. However, three additional themes emerged as significant for each of the three generations of women included in the study. First, almost all of the women viewed leadership as a group process whereby they felt they had better ideas, more power, and greater opportunity for social change as a collective group than they did as individuals. Second, women shared a passion for social justice—and desired to change those things that were unjust. Some felt this commitment as a result of their own experiences of discrimination; others learned to value justice from the experiences and stories of other women. Finally, the women shared a commitment to good leadership. They used their resources wisely, and they did not quit in the face of challenge. They created new ways to lead.

Astin and Leland (1991) added significantly to the literature on women and leadership—they focused on the process of leadership as opposed to the more typical research on the role and style of the leader. Additionally, the women in Astin and

Leland's study commented on the need for teaching and modeling to occur between generations, so momentum is not lost. The authors discovered that women found the role of relationships and collaboration significant—"leadership cannot prosper fully as a solitary phenomenon...[most women] needed opportunities for collegiality that promote the sharing of wisdom and insight" (p.161). Astin and Leland's book, particularly the voices of the women it included, demonstrated how women activists and leaders created change and experienced collaborative leadership for decades.

During the 2000 National Teleconference for Women in Higher Education, more than 5,000 participants engaged in conversations about improving campuses for women (Rios & Longnion, 2000). The conference's report suggested "less of our effort...will be from the outside, demanding access. More of it will be from the inside, demanding equity" (p. 4). This was a clear statement about the challenges facing women, not only in higher education, but also in business, law, politics, and sport (Freeman, Bourque, & Shelton, 2001; Rios & Longnion, 2000). Women from all types of professions have experienced greater access to work, but until women feel valued, understood, and truly welcome in such environments, much more needs to be done.

We know that more women today are advancing into senior leadership positions in higher education, including university presidents, (American Council on Education [ACE], 2007; Madsen, 2008), and there is increasing interest and research on career aspirations and paths in the academic arena (Baruch & Hall, 2004). Despite these advances, there is little research on women leaders in academia. Madsen is one of the few authors whose work focuses on this kind of experience. Her book delved into the experiences of 10 women who ultimately became college or university presidents. She

shares the stories of these women—how they developed the skills and knowledge to become campus leaders. The women shared information about their childhood experiences, personalities, employment histories, goals, and other people who influenced their climb to the top. Not surprisingly, eight of the ten women began their professional careers in education, and six of them obtained doctorate degrees. Four followed nonacademic paths while six advanced through academic ranks. Interesting, only one followed the more traditional “male” career path—faculty member, chair, dean, academic vice president or provost, ending in the presidency.

Madsen (2008) suggested that the women college presidents included in her study had drives and passions for lifelong learning and personal development. Complementing other studies about women’s leadership (Astin & Leland, 1991; Carli & Eagly, 2007; Eagly 2007) and learning styles (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Carli & Eagly; Gilligan, 1982), Madsen’s study also showed that women value networks and relationships as important components of their success. Her book offers future women leaders ideas and models on how to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to make a difference in their communities and stresses the importance of passion and personal development.

National Data on Women in Academic Leadership Positions

In 2007, ACE produced its sixth report as part of its American College President Study. The study described the backgrounds, career paths and experiences of college and university presidents; the report presented comparative data documenting changes between 1986 and 2006. Notably, during the 20-year span, the number of female college presidents in the United States more than doubled, from 10% to 23%. In the 1990s, the

progress began to slow. As stated earlier, the number of female presidents has increased, but there is still great disparity in the actual number of female versus male presidents and in the types of institutions where males and females serve in this leadership capacity.

Women more often preside at women's colleges and community colleges.

Acknowledging the challenges many women face balancing family and career, the ACE (2007) study found that 63% of female presidents were married, compared to 89% of male presidents, and 68% of female presidents had children, compared to 91% of male presidents. As one might expect, female presidents were more likely than their male counterparts to have altered their careers to care for their families. The ACE report also suggested that female presidents were more likely to have earned doctoral degrees than male presidents.

NCES records trends on faculty and staff who work in higher education; according to its data (2008; 2009), there continue to be more male faculty than female faculty at 4-year institutions. However, the reverse is true for 2-year colleges, where female outnumber male faculty. These same data also suggest that women have held more executive, administrative and managerial positions than men since the early 2000s. At first blush, this is optimistic but turns less so when considering the fact that there are more than double the women in nonprofessional staff positions than men and there have been more women than men working in higher education (both faculty and staff) for years. Additionally, when women are in leadership positions, they tend to be concentrated in certain types of institutions (2-year colleges) and in certain divisions or departments (student affairs, education) (NCES, 2009; Jones & Komives, 2003).

Women's Development

When considering women's experiences of seeking and attaining leadership positions, it is helpful to turn to the literature on women's development to understand better the ways women make meaning of the world around them. Understanding women's social influences as well as their developmental processes helps provide context for why some women aspire to leadership positions while others do not. It also helps us understand how women lead.

Toward a New Psychology of Women (Miller, 1976) was one of the first studies to explore the psychological implications of gender socialization. In this groundbreaking book, Miller called for a new language within the field of psychology that would describe and connect to the ways women define their sense of self, suggesting that what existed previously was not inclusive of the female experience. Miller linked women's identities with the care-giving role and with concepts connected to affiliation and relationship.

Later Josselson (1990), a psychologist, committed much time and energy exploring identity development in women as well as the differences among women. Her theory of identity development for women was built on the concepts of "separation" and "individuation" in relation to one's parents. She suggested that women are on a continuum of separation-individuation. At one extreme, a woman may have not separated and therefore struggles with claiming an identity separate from her parents. On the other extreme, a woman may have separated too early and therefore does not have enough structure to form a workable identity. Depending on what occurs in the course one's lifetime, there are tugs and pulls that continue to shape one's identity. Josselson pointed out that women "tend to grow within rather than out of relationships" (p. 189)

Gilligan (1982) provided some interesting insights about women through her work on moral development. She challenged Kohlberg's theory of moral development (as cited in Gilligan), and through research created a theory that highlights women's ethic of responsibility and care in contrast to men's ethic of rights and impartiality. Gilligan further explained the differences in how men and women structure relationships based on their different views of morality and self. She presented two images to better understand the different ways of thinking—the hierarchy, which is most closely associated with men, and the web, which is most closely associated with women. Imagine superimposing one image on top of the other. The most desirable location on one is a less than desirable location on the other (Gilligan, 1982). For example, in the hierarchy, one is “safer” working at the top than at the bottom. Similarly, being on the edge of the web is typically perceived to be less safe than being in or near the center.

Thus the images of hierarchy and web inform different modes of assertion and response: the wish to be alone at the top and the consequent fear that others will get too close; the wish to be at the center of connection and the consequent fear of being too far out on the edge. These disparate fears of being stranded and being caught give rise to different portrayals of achievement and affiliation, leading to different modes of action and different ways of assessing the consequences of choice. (Gilligan, 1982, p. 62)

Gilligan used this metaphor to explain the way women relate to others in contrast to men, however, this metaphor has also been used to describe male leadership and female leadership (Helgesen, 1995). It is hard to ignore how these different “ways of relating” play out in stereotypical leadership styles for women and men.

Intrigued by the work of Gilligan (1982) and others (Perry, 1981), Belenky et al. (1986) collaborated on a research project that looked at the experiences of a select group of women in higher education. One of the authors reflected on her learning:

Women don't just learn in classrooms; they learn in relationships, by juggling life demands, by dealing with crises in families and communities...I remember feeling as exhilarated by the collaborative discovery—the group 'ah-ha'—as I was by naming what we wanted to do: Education for Women's Development. (p. xi)

Collectively, the authors interviewed 135 women in the education system to better understand women's ways of knowing. Their work resulted in a framework for different ways women view reality and make conclusions about truth. Their book highlighted the obstacles women encounter as they make meaning for themselves. Key findings in this study, which have been supported by others (Josselson, 1990; Miller, 1991; Surrey, 1991), included that women's ways of knowing are connected to their self-concepts and that women develop senses of identity that are in relation to others and are not simply about individuation. This foundational work provided insights into women's ways of knowing and being that help us to understand better women's experiences as participants in society and as beings seeking to live in and lead our communities (Belenky et al., 1986).

Identity development theories help us to understand how one develops a sense of self in regard to one particular dimension of our being, yet people have multiple identities that are always at play (Jones & McEwen, 2000). The research cited above provides some highlights of women's identity development, however, those theories do not take into

consideration the “intersectionality” of human identities (Crenshaw, 1995). They do not speak to the experiences of being African American and a woman, or being a woman from the middle class, or being physically disabled. Jones and McEwen developed a model of intersectionality that depicts and explains how different dimensions of identity interact with each other. This model provides an important lens for viewing the woman’s experience—it is limiting to explore the experiences of women without considering other dimensions of their identities.

Women and Leadership

Leadership theories and practices have changed dramatically from the “industrial model,” where individualism, change, competition, and power were characteristic of effective leadership, to the more relational-based “post-industrial” or “postheroic” model, where effective leadership is characterized by relationships, consensus, and democratic processes (Badaracco, 2002; Beer, 1999; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007; Rost, 1991). In the contemporary models, there is less emphasis on the one or the few leaders at the top of the hierarchy, and more emphasis on collaborative leadership throughout an organization (Allen & Cherrey, 2000; Badaracco; Beer; Pearce & Conger, 2003). Many assert that this shift in leadership style and practice to a more inclusive and relationally based process better reflects women’s leadership styles in that it is more consistent with their values and natural ways of being (Coughlin, Wingard, & Hollihan, 2005; Eagly, 2005; Eagly & Carli, 2003, 2007; Helgesen, 1990, 1995; Rhode, 2003).

Postindustrial or postheroic leadership is defined as a shared social process where there is an emphasis on collective achievement and teamwork (Fletcher, 2004; Pearce & Conger, 2003). The concept of leadership as a process suggests more focus on the

“dynamic, multidirectional, collective-activity—an emergent process more than an achieved state” (Fletcher, 2004, p. 649). Fletcher defined postheroic leadership in terms of outcomes, including mutual learning, greater collective understanding, and positive action. She ultimately suggested that the changes in definitions of and understanding of leadership reflect a paradigm shift about what it means to be a positional leader.

Fletcher (2004) however, pointed out several paradoxes in the new model, suggesting that complex power and gender dynamics in the workplace challenge postheroic leadership. She argued that the characteristics associated with postheroic leadership are generally socially ascribed to women in our culture, yet she questioned that if that statement was true, why are there not more women in top leadership positions? Fletcher also presented a convincing argument about the socially acceptable behaviors in the workplace that are more deeply connected to masculine traits and definitions of success. She explained that notions of shared power are likely to be associated with powerlessness rather than a more fluid and accepting view of power:

It is the hidden under-explored nature of these gender/power dynamics that may account for many of the paradoxes people experience in trying to implement postheroic leadership and may account for how long it is taking for this model to achieve widespread adoption at the level of everyday practice. (p. 653)

An analysis of 283 definitions of leadership by women participants in an Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine Program resulted in a thematic framework for understanding how leadership is discussed, perceived, and enacted in a higher education setting (McDade et al., 2008). The themes that emerged in the study were leadership as activities, leadership as relationships with followers, leadership as

envisioning and strategy, leadership as traits, leadership as communication, leadership as influence, and leadership as transformation. The authors concluded that if women and men view and define leadership differently, those definitions may contribute to the barriers to advancement that women experience.

Barriers to Women's Advancement

More women are holding leadership positions today, and the style of leading attributed to women's relational and inclusive style of being (Helgesen, 1995) has found its way into leadership theories and practice (Carli, 2001). The environments, however, in which this advancement is happening are still limited. For example, women are less likely to hold leadership positions in science, technology, and mathematics related fields or to serve as leaders of four-year doctoral degree-granting research institutions than their male counterparts (ACE, 2007; DeWitt, 2011). There is a hierarchy of professions and disciplines where men tend to dominate in areas considered more prestigious, and many women face challenges moving into leadership positions or breaking through the glass ceiling in such venues (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Baumgartner & Schneider, 2010; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Kellerman & Rhode, 2007; Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000; Mitchell, 1993; O'Meara, 2002; Rhode, 2003; Wirth, 2001).

The literature exploring barriers to women's advancement has been consistent in identifying several key factors contributing to this experience. Essays included in the book *Cracking the Wall: Women in Higher Education Administration* (Mitchell, 1993) were authored by women in a variety of professional positions in higher education and represented myriad approaches to the topic including historical, sociological, political, psychological and personal. Written at a time when many colleges were giving

significant attention to broadening the racial diversity of their student bodies, faculty ranks, and staffs, Mitchell and the other authors challenged the higher education community to recognize the need to continue to focus on ensuring that women were not left out of the strategic thinking and planning. One contributing author suggested that the barriers to women's advancement in higher education can be categorized into three groups: "hurdles within the academy," "hurdles within society," and "hurdles within ourselves" (Flynn, 1993). She cited specific obstacles as the "old boy's network," the traditional structure of institutions of higher education, women's typical roles in society and the home, and social pressures for women to behave a certain way.

Mitchell's (1993) book highlighted many of the challenges women have faced in climbing the leadership ladder in academia, and other studies uncovered similar barriers in professions outside of higher education. Such obstacles include structural barriers like policies and laws around maternity leave and the tenure process (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Flynn, 1993; LeBlanc, 1993; Mason & Goulden, 2002; Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005; O'Meara, 2002; Rhode, 2003; Wirth, 2001); social norms and socialization (Baumgartner & Schneider, 2010; Bower, 1993; Carli & Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli; Flynn; Hoyt, 2005; Kellerman & Rhode, 2007; Kolb, 1999; LeBlanc; Rhode; Sharpe, 2000); lack of mentoring (Bower; Eliasson et al., 2000; LeBlanc; O'Brien & Janssen; Rhode; Scanlon, 1997); and issues relating to self-esteem and/or self-efficacy (Hoyt; LeBlanc; McCormick et al., 2003; Murray, 2003).

Structural Barriers

Structural barriers to women's advancement in higher education are often created by policies, systems, and structures. Policies related to family leave and the tenure and

promotion process for faculty (LeBlanc, 1993; Mason & Goulden, 2002; O'Meara, Terosky & Neumann, 2008; Touchton, Musil, & Campbell, 2008; Williams, 2004) are often cited as structural barriers with significant impact on women. In order to overcome some of the structural barriers, not only do policies and laws need to be reviewed and revised, but social norms and expectations regarding sex roles must also be challenged (LeBlanc, 1993).

Data show noteworthy evidence that men and women university presidents differ with regard to (ACE, 2007). Far more male presidents are married (89 percent) compared to 63 percent of women presidents. Similarly, 91 percent of male presidents have children compared to 68 percent of women presidents. Not surprisingly, these same data showed that women presidents were more likely than men to have altered their careers to care for their families (ACE). Other research showed that when men and women with doctoral degrees decided to have children within the first five years after degree completion, women were less likely to work as tenured faculty (56%) than men (77%), and a significant number (59%) of those women who were married with children considered leaving academia (Mason & Goulden, 2002).

Williams (2004) referred to some of the challenges creating these dynamics as the “maternal wall” or biases faced by women in the workplace who have children. Noting the clear discrepancies, there has been a call for rethinking and changing policies (ACE, 2007; Mason & Goulden, 2002). ACE suggested the creation of more flexible work schedules, allowing pauses in the tenure process, and the provision of child care as possible ways to better support professional and personal balance for all employees, but particularly for women. Others have suggested that policy changes are a good and helpful

step but caution that if the campus culture as such does not support the use of leave policies, changes will not be as effective as intended (Williams, Alon, & Bornstein, 2006).

As mentioned above policies allowing more time or a pause in the tenure clock for women on maternity leave would be a step in improving the tenure process for women, but another factor often creating challenge for women is the types of research and activities that are more heavily valued in academia. O'Meara (2002) found that that service scholarship continues to be undervalued in the tenure and promotion process. Given that women faculty and faculty of color are more likely to engage in service as scholarship, the tenure policies and practices continue to favor men (O'Meara, 2002).

Social Norms and Expectations (aka Stereotypes, Prejudice and Discrimination)

Women face challenges as they seek leadership positions because society has reinforced strict expectations about what women can and should do with their time and energy (Carli & Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hoyt, 2010). Women leaders often find that they are judged whether they conform to feminine norms or masculine norms, creating a “double-bind” (Catalyst, 2007). These social expectations often create boundaries, sometimes obvious and sometimes hidden, that keep women from pursuing and/or obtaining leadership positions.

The 2007 Catalyst study sponsored by IBM surveyed 1231 senior managers in the U.S. and Europe. In addition, follow-up interviews were conducted with 13 U.S. women leaders to expand on some of the themes identified in the quantitative study. This research showed that gender stereotypes are prevalent and create hurdles for women leaders, several of which are caused by the “double-bind” women leaders often

encounter. The study identified three frequently encountered predicaments - all related to gender stereotypes. The first predicament is that women are judged as less competent leaders when they engage in behaviors consistent with feminine stereotypes but are viewed as unfeminine when they exhibit behaviors considered to be masculine. The second predicament is that women leaders often have to prove themselves over and over again and often have to reach a higher bar than men. The third predicament is that “women leaders are perceived as competent or liked, but rarely both” (Predicament 3, para. 1). The researchers concluded that gender stereotypes are a misrepresentation of the truth and that they have the potential to undermine women’s contributions and possibilities for future advancement. These findings were consistent with previous research, including studies conducted by Eagly and Carli (2007) and Hoyt and Blascovich (2007).

Lack of “Traditional” Mentoring

Mentoring has been cited as a long-term practice that typically involves a more senior-ranking professional providing guidance and support for a less-seasoned professional during a significant career change. Some suggest that mentoring is equally effective when the pairings are mixed gender or race as when they are same gender or race (Carnell, MacDonald & Askew, 2006). Given that the number of senior-ranking women is comparatively small to men, women who have mentors are more likely to have male mentors. Research suggests, however, that women often find it difficult to find mentors (Rhode, 2003).

In her exploration of mentoring in higher education, Bower (1993) focused on her personal observations and experiences, as well as her reactions to other studies that

identified issues with which women contend that contribute to the legacy of challenges that impede the advancement of women. Bower began with the premise that having a mentor often can be linked to promotion and pay, increased productivity, greater knowledge, and general success of a protégé. She explained that women have been disadvantaged in terms of access to this traditional form of mentoring for a variety of reasons including the absence of women role models, the refusal of some women to serve as mentors because they feel threatened by other emerging women leaders, the potential misinterpreted motives of men serving as mentors to women, or because men simply do not see the merits of women's skills and abilities to serve as leaders. Bower recommended that formal mentoring programs be established to encourage and support women seeking to advance.

Lower Sense of Self-Efficacy

The concept of self-efficacy is more specific than self-esteem in that it goes beyond a general sense of confidence. Self-efficacy refers to the belief that one's abilities can lead to specific or desired results in a certain situation (Bandura, 1993). In other words, an individual with self-efficacy has a sense of agency or ability to create change in a particular arena. The literature on self-efficacy suggests that a person's self-concept can play a significant role in influencing the skills she believes she has and in influencing what one perceives she can do with those skills (Chemers, 2001).

Multiple studies have explored the role of self-efficacy in women's attainment of leadership positions (Hoyt, 2005; Kolb, 1999; McCormick et al., 2003). McCormick et al. sought to understand gender differences related to self-efficacy and participation in leadership activities. The females in the study reported significantly lower leadership

self-efficacy than their male counterparts, and leadership self-efficacy was correlated to the frequency with which participants attempted to take on leadership roles. This finding supported previous research that suggested the more efficacious one is in his or her leadership abilities, the more likely he or she will engage in such activity (Bandura, 1997). While gender of the participants did not explain the differences in leadership self-efficacy, participant's sex role identities were connected to leadership self-efficacy:

The more masculine-type behaviors a person had incorporated into their self-concept, the greater was the number of leadership-related developmental activities engaged in. And the more leadership-related developmental experiences a person had encountered, the greater was his or her leadership self-efficacy. (McCormick et al., 2003, p. 12)

This study demonstrated the important connection between leadership self-efficacy and positional leadership roles (Komives, Longersbeam, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006), leadership training, and community involvement (Bandura, 1997).

A case study of the Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) Program for Women showed how participants' self-efficacy increased as a result of the experiences they had in the program (Sloma-Williams, McDade, Richman, & Morahan, 2009). The ELAM Program was established in 1995 at Drexel University to "address the gap in women's leadership in the field in academic medicine and dentistry" (p. 54). The intent was to develop a program for senior women faculty in which participants would develop leadership skills that would enhance their current positions and/or help them as they took on higher ranking positions. Three main findings emerged from this study: 1.) developing and growing leadership self-efficacy is a gradual process; 2.) developing and

growing leadership self-efficacy is a collaborative process involving the support of others, 3.) and it is an independent process involving self-reflection; and women who are developing into leaders thrive with support from both formal and informal networks.

Hoyt (2005) explored the role of leadership self-efficacy and women's identification with leadership when exposed to stereotypes about men being better leaders. Her research included 85 women and suggested that women with high leadership self-efficacy also had heightened identification with leadership, even after being exposed to the stereotype suggesting otherwise. Women with lower leadership self-efficacy did not necessarily experience a lessened sense of identification with leadership when exposed to stereotypes about men making better leaders, which may be due to a lack of connection with the concept of leadership to start. The study concluded that leadership trainings should incorporate elements to enhance leadership self-efficacy for women.

Barriers for Women of Color

Women from underrepresented populations encounter barriers due to historical, cultural, and social factors (Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, Bonus-Hammarth, & Stassen, 1991). Some of the barriers women of color face are similar to those mentioned above including: structural barriers related to the recruitment and hiring of faculty; navigating the tenure process; the lack of clear pathways from faculty to administrative leadership; lack of opportunities for mentorship; unfriendly policies and practices for women with families; and inhospitable environments (Moses, 2009). Faculty of color also experience subtle and not so subtle forms of racism and sexism that contribute to the unwelcoming feeling many get within the academy (Moses, 2009). As Kellerman (2003) stated, "that which holds for white women does not necessarily hold for women of other racial and

ethnic groups” (p. 58). Therefore, attention to the experiences of women of color is imperative.

In a study conducted by Turner and Kappes (2009), women of color who were participants in the ACE Fellows program were surveyed to learn about their experiences. The ACE Fellows program provides opportunities for individual participants to “immerse themselves in the culture, policies and decision-making processes of another institution” (Turner & Kappes, 2009, p.155). The study suggested that, like majority women, women from marginalized groups struggle with the program requirements in terms of the time and financial commitments. Many women, both white and women of color, cited the challenge of not being able to physically be separated from their families for the amount of time required. Women of color also appeared more hesitant to ask their home institutions for the financial commitment required to participate in the program, which Canul (2003) suggested may be related to cultural values. The researchers pointed out that despite the obstacles to advancement, African American participants were more optimistic about the leadership future for women of color than were Hispanic participants. Participant feedback suggested that the ACE leadership development programs should have components specifically focused on issues that pertain to the experiences of women of color in higher education, and that workshop speakers and leaders should represent a variety of backgrounds including women from underrepresented groups.

Strategies for Overcoming the Barriers

Meyerson and Fletcher (2000) conducted a longitudinal study in the 1990s and discovered that the barriers to women’s advancement have become more hidden over

time because they are ingrained in the structures of society and organizations. They suggested that while many barriers to advancement and leadership have been identified, further exploration is needed to understand some approaches to break through discrimination. Three approaches organizations typically use to change the experience for women involve assimilation, (in which women are encouraged to change the way they do things to assimilate into the more masculine characteristics of the work); accommodation, (in which the organization may adopt a few changes or enhancements to make the success of women more likely); and lastly, celebration, (in which organizations emphasize the differences that women bring to the work environment and channel women into jobs or positions where their skills can best be utilized).

These three approaches to gender equality have been used for over 30 years, but each basically implies that women do not really fit in with the work environment (Meyerson and Fletcher, 2000). They proposed a fourth approach to eradicate gender inequity in the workplace, and it involves first believing “that gender inequity is rooted in our cultural patterns and therefore in our organizational systems” (p. 131). Once the belief is held by male and female employees alike, employees must work together to determine what in their everyday practices are undermining effectiveness. They must then make small, incremental changes to chip away at the roots of the discrimination and eventually create equity. The article emphasized that small steps lead to significant change which eventually benefits both women and men in the workplace (Meyerson & Fletcher; Rapoport et al., 2002).

Eagly and Carli (2007) suggested that women need to prove their competence as leaders (agency) and be communal in their approach. Second, they suggested building

social capital because of the value of networks. These authors appear to believe the way to empower women is to navigate through the challenges to advancement and equip them with tools to do so successfully.

Meyerson and Ely (2003) suggested the barriers must be broken down and under-represented people should be moved into leadership positions in order to gain equality and justice. When there are limited voices in leadership, the knowledge is also limited, and under-represented people have insights and knowledge that could be “vital to the effective functioning of the organization” (p. 137). Meyerson and Ely concluded that real change in an organization requires new perspectives where voices are heard and acted upon with acceptance rather than fear and hesitation of differences.

Research on the tenure and promotion process for faculty shows women and faculty of color are often at a disadvantage when it comes to advancing through the faculty ranks (O’Meara, 2002; O’Meara, Kaufman, & Kuntz, 2003). Even though some institutions are changing the language in their values statements and policies to have broader definitions of scholarship, those who are conducting the reviews for faculty tenure are more traditional in their beliefs and values about the type of scholarship that should be recognized and rewarded. So, while some schools are attracting faculty with diverse interests and ideas about scholarship, the people who advance are typically still those who produce the more traditional scholarship. It remains true, faculty who are heavily engaged in teaching and service scholarship are less likely to advance than faculty who are conducting research and producing scholarly papers. As previously stated, female faculty are more likely than men to hold teaching positions at universities (NCES, 2004, 2008, 2009).

While leadership theories have expanded to be more inclusive of women's leadership styles, there are still many barriers that keep women from advancing into leadership positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Kellerman & Rhode, 2007; McCormick et al., 2003; Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000; Mitchell, 1993; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005; O'Meara, 2002; Rhode, 2003; Sharpe, 2000). As proposed by the literature, there are ways organizations and institutions can look at practices and policies to examine how internal processes keep skilled and qualified women from advancing (Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000). Similarly, women seeking to overcome the obstacles and achieve advancement may look for opportunities to expand their skills, knowledge, efficacy, and access to higher positions (Baumgartner & Schneider, 2010).

Career Aspirations

Young men and women have similar career aspirations until they get into their thirties. At that point, women's ambitions for advancement begin to drop off (Kellerman & Rhode, 2007). To date, much research suggests that women have lower career aspirations than men, which potentially explains why more women are not in key leadership positions (Correll, 2004; Gibson & Lawrence, 2010; Keaveny & Inderrieden, 2000; Major, 1994). Some believe that women have lower career aspirations because of their perceptions about what certain leadership positions require (Correll, 2004). Others suggest it is related to women's career referents—the people who individuals see as being similarly situated or having similar careers (Gibson & Lawrence, 2010). Another cites the need or desire to accommodate personal and family concerns (Wirth, 2001). Regardless of the cause, it is clear that many believe women simply set their career goals too low (Locke & Lathan, 1990).

Correll (2004) explored the impact of one's beliefs about ability on the career aspirations and paths of men and women:

Men use a more lenient standard to infer ability and assess their task competence higher than women when exposed to a belief about male superiority, but no gender differences in self-assessments or ability standards were found when gender was defined as irrelevant to the task. (p.108)

Correll's study showed that men and women have different perceptions about their competence levels for career-relevant tasks. These different perceptions are based on societal expectations and cultural norms, and often affect individuals' career aspirations. Related to this idea, women in academia may not intentionally look for leadership positions. Instead, they work hard and perform their duties, and are given more responsibility because they have performed well (Madsen, 2008).

Other research suggests women have lower career aspirations than men because of their "career referents" (Gibson & Lawrence, 2010). Women often choose other women as career referents, and men often have men as career referents (Sumner & Brown, 1996). Women's career referents are typically in lower-level positions, collect lower pay, and receive fewer promotions than men's career referents (Blau & DeVaro, 2007; Heckert et al., 2002), leading some to conclude that if women set their career goals on what they see their career aspirants achieving, they may not be setting high enough goals. Gibson and Lawrence found that even when women identify career referents who are at the same level as men's career aspirants (and therefore higher than typical for women), they still exhibit significantly lower aspirations. Further research is needed to explore this phenomenon.

Gibson and Lawrence (2010) concluded that simply increasing the number of women in leadership positions alone will not solve the problem of women's career aspirations being too low. Instead, they suggested, campus leaders must also determine the cultural patterns, the hiring and selection processes, and the promotion practices that are contributing to the lower expectations and aspirations. They stated that campus leaders should start with the assumption that "women tend to shoot for positions lower than they ought to, given their potential" (p. 1172); therefore, leaders need be proactive about ensuring that women are not undervalued and underemployed.

Hewlett (2007) found that part of what influences women's career aspirations relates to their values. In a survey of 2,445 women and 643 men in the U.S. aged 28 to 55, a series of factors played significant roles in the career goals of women. For example, most of the female study participants wanted to associate with people they respect, to "be themselves" at work, to collaborate with others, be a part of a team, and to "give back" to their communities through their work. These factors were more important than compensation or even advancement. As Hewlett concluded, these priorities for women are dramatically different from the traditional male model of hierarchy and importance. This creates tension between that which is considered the "typical" career path and the paths that many women want to create for themselves (Hewlett, 2007).

Opportunities that Show Promise

Despite the challenges women may encounter on the climb to leadership, there are experiences and models that show promise for supporting women in their efforts to advance. Such supportive experiences include: mentoring programs (Brown, 2005; Chovwen, 2004; Eliasson et al., 2000; Hubbard, 1998; Kadar, 2006; Kram, 1985a, 1988;

Meyerson & Ely, 2003; Richman et al., 2001; Scanlon, 1997); internship programs (O'Brien & Janssen, 2005); and women-only training programs (Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003).

Mentoring

Although mentoring can mean different things, depending on the context, the traditional view of mentoring involves a more senior-ranking professional teaching or training a protégé who has less experience or expertise (Kram, 1985a). Many have suggested that mentoring helps open doors and present possibilities for protégés that encourage and support advancement; however, as cited previously, many women have difficulty finding such mentoring relationships (Bower, 1993; Chovwen, 2004; Eliasson et al., 2000; LeBlanc, 1993; Rhode, 2003; Scanlon, 1997). In an overview of the literature on mentoring, Scanlon found few studies about mentoring in academia prior to the late 1990s, but it was possible to determine that the existence of a mentor could indeed help women in higher education achieve their goals. She added that the challenges for women in higher education were likely similar to those in the business sector—the limited number of women in leadership positions translated to the small number of women who can serve as mentors in this traditional sense of mentorship.

A Swedish study conducted in 2000 looked at a structured, 18-month mentoring program for 14 mid-level university women (Eliasson et al., 2000) to learn whether this kind of program in the academic setting would help more women achieve higher positions within Swedish higher education, thus narrowing the gender gap. Each of the women was paired with a more senior-level academician for lectures, social occasions, and mentoring conversations. Through questionnaires, observations, and interviews, the

researchers learned that the protégés felt that academic women had to perform at higher levels than their male counterparts for the same recognition, and women felt their opinions were not recognized or valued within the university system. The protégés found great benefit from getting to know women from other departments and comparing experiences, and, more specifically, learned that the obstacles to advancement were largely external and were also due to a lack of information on how to advance. Most of the mentors in the program were male. They rejected the idea that men had advantages over women, although they supported the idea that informal channels for career advancement were helpful. The conclusions of this study suggested that while women have a difficult time finding female mentors, it remains helpful to meet with an experienced professional, regardless of gender, to discuss career paths and options. Additionally, having time to meet with colleagues from across the campus also provided meaningful opportunities to talk about issues of concern.

Chowwen (2004) examined the impact of mentoring on women's perceived professional growth. The 243 women in the study included lawyers, engineers, architects, insurance brokers, and medical professionals from Ibadan and Lagos who ranged in age from 30 to 60 years. Results from a survey, interviews, and focus groups suggested that only 21% of the women had mentors, and of those who did, 66% had male mentors. Eighty percent of the women who had mentors said their mentors positively influenced their careers and were good sources of information and encouragement. While "growth" was not defined in the study, nor did the study outline how it measured growth, Chowwen concluded that those in mentoring relationships realized more professional growth than

those without mentors. Chovwen suggested that organizations should encourage and structure opportunities for mentoring relationships.

In a study of female college presidents, Brown (2005) explored mentoring as a way to advance women in higher education. Ninety-one female presidents of independent colleges were surveyed to learn more about the role of mentoring in the participants' career advancement as well as in support of their colleagues further down the career ladder. Just more than half lacked mentors prior to becoming college presidents, and nearly 72% of those women said their mentors, mostly men, sought them out. Nearly 21% of the presidents who said they had mentors also said that they had been encouraged by those mentors to seek their presidential appointments. Nearly 73% of the women who had participated in mentoring relationships reported stronger professional skills, better networking abilities, higher self-esteem, and increased desires to pursue a presidency. More than 64% of the participants had served as mentors for others, suggesting that they valued mentorship and felt the need to mentor other professionals. Brown concluded that the women recognized the important role mentorship played in their advancement to their college president positions.

While the mentoring relationships are most often conceptualized as “mentor-protégé,” Shapiro, Haseltine, & Rowe (1978) introduced the concept of “peer pals.” Kram (1988) also challenged the more traditional definition of mentoring in her book, *Mentoring at Work*. In a chapter on “mentoring alternatives,” she discussed the idea of peer mentoring as a different form of mentoring. Peer mentoring offers professionals non-hierarchical relationships that promote better communication, mutual support, and collaboration. The more typical mentor-protégé relationship functions like sponsorship,

perhaps neglecting coaching, exposure, visibility, and protection. Peer relationships, on the other hand, offers career strategizing, information sharing, and feedback. This type of mentoring builds in a shared responsibility for learning and growth, and often endures longer than traditional mentoring relationships (Kram, 1988).

Despite efforts to broaden the definition of mentoring to include non-hierarchical relationships, the more traditional view of mentoring has dominated the higher education research on mentoring since early 2000. In an exploration of peer mentoring as an alternative to the more traditional approach to mentoring, Kadar (2006) looked at six mentoring pairs of female faculty. The women were pre- and post-tenure faculty ranging in age from 37 to 68 years, and their peer mentoring relationships had been in existence for 3 to 35 years. Through individual and paired interviews, document review, and observation, Kadar found that the women participants defined their peer mentoring experiences as having strong, interpersonal bonds that reflected deep respect and trust. The peers found each other to be highly intellectual, and because they became friends, they found increased motivation to engage in research, teaching and other faculty work. The participants enjoyed the collaborative work and found that the peer mentoring relationships facilitated their career advancement.

There are limitations to peer mentoring, such as peers not being able to give each other access to opportunities at higher levels, but Kadar (2006) found that peer mentoring yielded similar benefits to those of mentor-protégé relationships. Each type of mentoring has its own set of unique challenges while sharing some of the benefits. Kadar suggested that peer mentoring may be a viable mentoring option for women faculty who do not have access to the more traditional mentor-protégé relationships, and that the “shared

bond of gender appears to play a role in the success of their peer-mentoring relationships” (p. 25). Connecting the stories of the women in her study to previous research on the role of relationships for women (Belenky et al., 1986), Kadar highlighted how the female participants in her study connected the personal and the professional, and as the women benefited from their peer mentoring, their institutions, students, and colleagues likely benefited as well.

Internships

In a case study of 12 women faculty who participated in a self-designed administrative internship program at Eastern Kentucky University, researchers sought to understand if participation in the program provided the necessary experiences for women and minorities to apply, attain, and succeed in administrative positions within higher education (O’Brien & Janssen, 2005). They also explored how participation in the program altered the way women and minorities functioned within the university setting. Staff at Eastern Kentucky designed the internship program to promote administrative experiences for women and minority faculty. According to the study, participation increased the women’s confidence in their knowledge of the university and in themselves in terms of skills, attitudes, and abilities to make administrative-type decisions. Participation also provided greater opportunities for networking across campus. Participants, however, did not report strong mentorship experiences in the internship program.

Faculty participants in the Eastern Kentucky study (O’Brien & Janssen, 2005) struggled to balance project work with their teaching responsibilities, despite having been granted reduced teaching loads in order to participate in the internship program. They

also noted that other colleagues—department chairs and deans—seemed jealous or suspicious of their experiences. Within 2 to 5 years after their internships, 8 of the 12 participants served in administrative leadership positions despite the fact that within their institution, there were not many options for the participants, and they were not encouraged to apply to those positions when they became open.

Researchers concluded that academic institutions continue to marginalize women and that the “glass ceiling” is still firmly in place. They suggested ways that institutions could develop internship programs to better support women due to the many benefits these programs provide, such as better networking skills. Creating internship experiences for women, however, does not change the organizational culture or structure that supports the problem (O’Brien & Janssen, 2005).

Leadership Training Programs

The Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) Program began in 1995 to help women in academia advance into leadership positions in medical and dental schools and other health centers (Richman et al., 2001). Through this advancement, ELAM could influence changes in curricula, working climates, and policy that would ultimately improve health care for women. ELAM is a year-long program consisting of mid-level female faculty who hold associate or full professor positions. It can accommodate 40 women and consists of 2 week-long residential programs, an annual meeting, and many intersession assignments on the participants’ home campuses. The program curriculum has three major focuses: (a) a business focus honing in on fiscal planning and budgeting, resource management, organizational structure, and change management; (b) an emerging issues focus that explores academic and corporate

leadership, information technology, successful alliances, and organizational planning and assessment; and (c) a personal and professional development focus, which explores career development, conflict management, team building, mentoring, and interpersonal network building.

A longitudinal assessment of the ELAM program resulted in substantial evidence that it is having a significant positive impact on the professional development of the participants. For example, upon entering the program, 38% of the first class of participants held administrative leadership positions. About five years later, 80% of them had administrative leadership positions, such as chair, vice chair, assistant dean, and associate dean. Participants said that ELAM provided them with better understandings of leadership and management strategies, more confidence and knowledge in addressing and resolving conflict, broader reaching networks of colleagues, increased awareness of educational and medical issues, and wider knowledge of career possibilities. The ELAM program upholds the tenets of Ely and Meyerson's (2000) four tenets of approaching gender and organizational change: (a) to focus on training women to give them skills for advancement that they may lack, (b) to celebrate and value the leadership skills women bring to the workplace, (c) to develop policies and procedures to ensure equal access, and (d) to identify and change the systems and structures that have deeply ingrained cultural gender schemas that disadvantage women (Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000; Rapoport et al., 2002).

Vinnicombe and Singh (2003) reviewed the literature on women and management training to understand the role of women-only training in the development of women leaders. Their research focused on women in master of business administration (MBA)

programs, and suggested that women-only trainings were a way to acknowledge that men and women learn and develop differently. Despite radical feminist opposition, Vinnicombe and Singh concluded that single-sex training should be offered in business preparation programs in addition to other leadership courses and developmental opportunities offered to both men and women. They emphasized this need in light of the fact that women often find it difficult to find mentors, have different values at work than men, do not always understand the importance of politics, and often lack confidence in themselves. The authors believed that special courses and training for women in MBA programs would help provide women equal chances of success in leadership in business.

Women working in higher education who seek to climb the administrative leadership ladder often develop and hone their leadership skills through participation in workshops and institutes. While individual campuses may offer one-time workshops or day-long conferences related to leadership development, intensive immersion leadership development experiences are more typically hosted by external sources such as city-based or state organizations like “The Leadership: A Program of Greater Baltimore” or Leadership Ohio and national associations including Higher Education Resource Services (HERS) and American Council on Education (ACE).

City and statewide leadership programs typically are for participants from a broad range of disciplines, including business, not-for-profit organizations, government, and education, while HERS and ACE programs are for people working in education. Participation in some of these experiences can be costly and may require travel to named destinations for extended periods of time. Participants are exposed to leadership development opportunities and then travel back to their home campuses to utilize what

they learned. While participants report high levels of satisfaction with these experiences and there are clearly positive outcomes related to these programs (HERS, n.d.), engaging their home campuses afterward may feel isolating and frustrating.

Conclusion

It is clear and encouraging that women have made strides in entering and advancing in the workplace, but studies and stories of working women demonstrate the realities of their working environments and the obstacles that continue to block their advancement (Astin & Leland, 1991; Baumgartner & Schneider, 2010; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Kellerman & Rhode, 2007; LeBlanc, 1993; Madsen, 2008; Meyerson & Ely, 2003; Mitchell, 1993). For many women, the workplace does not welcome or include their voices. Others hit the “glass ceiling” and are unable to move their careers forward. And yet others have internalized messages about what they should or should not do, where they should excel, or what others might think about their work—and these messages keep them from pursuing new challenges and opportunities (Correll, 2004; Kaufman, 1995; McCormick et al., 2003; Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000; Scanlon, 1997).

The inclusive, relationship-oriented career approach many women exhibit has proven to be a valuable and effective form of leadership. Women’s participation in mentoring programs and other forms of leadership development have presented them with new possibilities to find their comfort levels with their own leadership styles (Kram, 1988; O’Brien & Janssen, 2005; Richman et al., 2001). Finally, women have been working in cohorts for a long time, and research shows that this type of collaborative process can help women develop effective leadership skills (Astin & Leland, 1991; Freeman, 1995).

The literature on the benefits of mentoring for women is optimistic and encouraging, and suggests that participation in mentoring relationships can provide women with valuable leadership skills development, increased self-efficacy, and preparation for advancement (Brown, 2005; Chovwen, 2004; Eliasson et al., 2000). Studies that have explored the peer mentoring or group leadership development experiences suggest significant learning and growth for female participants. This understanding, combined with the concepts presented earlier in this chapter about women working in groups, suggests there is great potential for women to learn, develop, and grow through small-group mentoring experiences. This study is built on the knowledge of the benefits of mentoring, the barriers to women's advancement, and the positive role of working in groups for women.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

In this chapter, I present the rationale for using qualitative methods and case study methodology to explore the research questions under investigation. The research questions are stated and the research design and methods are described, giving attention to the process by which I identified the site and the participants for this study. I discuss how I collected and analyzed study data and the steps I took to enhance the trustworthiness of the data and my findings.

Research Questions

I had multi-dimensional goals for this research. At the outset of this study, I was perplexed that there are more women than ever working in higher education, but women continue to be disproportionately represented in the highest positions of leadership (NCES, 2009). I became familiar with the literature documenting the obstacles women face when seeking to advance into leadership positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Fobbs, 1998; Kellerman & Rhode, 2007; LeBlanc, 1993; Rhode, 2003), but I believed there were ways women could work together to support each other and to create opportunities to overcome the barriers. I was intrigued by the concept of cohort-based programs for women—this is a model that women have long used for support and empowerment (John-Steiner, 2000). Since cohort-based programs have proven beneficial to women in a variety of contexts, I wanted to know more about how this same model works within the context of leadership development and advancement in higher education.

There is a body of literature on leadership development experiences, including mentoring programs and internship opportunities that women have found to be helpful and supportive with regard to professional advancement (Brown, 2005; Chovwen, 2004;

Daresh & Playko, 1993; Eliasson et al., 2000; Hubbard, 1998; Kram, 1985b, 1988; Mavrinas, 2005; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005; Roan & Rooney, 2006; Scanlon, 1997; Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003). However, the mentoring relationships highlighted in such studies tended to be more traditional in terms of the mentor and protégé being in different places within the hierarchy (Kram, 1985a). Thus, I wanted to learn more about how a cohort-based program of leadership development might create opportunities for mentorship through peer-to-peer relationships.

Through this research, I wanted to explore the following research questions related to women faculty and staff who participated in a cohort-based model of leadership development:

1. How do alumnae of the women's leadership development programs describe the experience?
2. How does participation in the cohort-based programs for leadership development shape leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations, and career paths of women participants?
3. How did participation in the programs for leadership development provide experiences and opportunities that prepared participants to seek and obtain leadership positions?

By better understanding the opportunities and challenges of a cohort-based leadership development program for faculty and staff, I hoped to identify ways to prepare and support women for advancement in higher education careers so they may be more visible and equally represented in senior leadership positions. My goals were to understand the structure and format of the program and to learn about participants'

experiences in the program and as alumnae of the program. I expected to learn if and how participation in the leadership program altered how women function within the university.

Research Design

I shaped the research design for this study using an internship experience I had as part of my doctoral studies. In that project, I documented the activities and experiences of six women leaders at my home campus who had created their own leadership development cohort, felt they had benefited greatly from the experience, and wanted to document and share their learning with others. I interviewed each participant separately, and observed them as a group. The women found the peer mentoring relationship to be extremely valuable personally and professionally. Furthermore, they found the all-women setting comfortable and believed their individual and collective work improved because of the relationships they developed through their cohort experience. That study inspired me to conduct this larger, more in-depth study. I came to this research with a personal desire to identify elements of a leadership development program for women that could be considered a starting point for creating similar programs on other campuses, which, in the long run, would help more women advance to leadership positions.

Qualitative Methods and Theoretical Perspective

I grounded this inquiry in the qualitative approach to research. According to Creswell (1998), there are eight compelling reasons to conduct qualitative research, five of which related to this study: (a) the nature of the research questions warranted qualitative inquiry, meaning the research questions ask what or how versus why; (b) the topic needed further exploration, suggesting that existing theories do not explain the

phenomenon under investigation; (c) there was a need for a detailed look at the topic, as it was not typical or familiar; (d) I, as the researcher, wanted to write in a literary style, engaging in storytelling and writing narrative; and (e) I sought to highlight my role as an active learner—telling the stories through the words and perspectives of the participants rather than as an ‘expert’ who passes judgment on participants.

Through this research, I wanted to use individual women’s stories to understand the phenomenon of the cohort experience as a model for supporting women’s advancement. I sought to understand how the participants made sense of their experiences in the program, and I approached this study with the belief that people make meaning through their experiences. In other words, one’s knowledge about something is socially constructed. Social constructivism is based on the fact that individuals’ frameworks for understanding and meaning-making are based in their personal experiences (Guba & Lincoln, 2001). As such, I grounded my research in constructivist epistemology, and I saw my role as researcher primarily to explore leadership development programs through the eyes of the participants.

Furthermore, Bandura’s (1995) work on self-efficacy served as the theoretical perspective for this research. This theoretical perspective is woven through the study analyses presented in Chapter 5, and is examined in light of the research questions in Chapter 6. I sought to tell the women’s stories about how and if participation in the program shaped their leadership self-efficacy. Self-efficacy refers to individuals’ beliefs about their capacities to manage particular situations. Leadership self-efficacy, then, refers to individuals’ beliefs in their capacities to be successful leaders.

Case Study

Through this research, I developed an understanding of how the University of Cincinnati (UC) programs shaped the lives of the female participants. I was interested in the role of the cohort structure of the UC program, which, according to Yin (2003) is what makes this case study research. He said case study is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon with-in its real-life context” (p. 13). My interest lay in the “insight, discovery, and interpretation” of the leadership program and the women’s experiences, as opposed to testing a hypothesis about how the participants may have benefited from the program (Merriam, 2001, pp. 28-29).

In selecting a particular leadership development program, and because I wanted to use the direct experiences of some of the participants, a case study design seemed most suitable. “A case study is an exploration of a ‘bounded system’ or case...over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich in context” (Creswell, 1998, p. 61). From the outset, I anticipated that I would gain a deep understanding of the experiences of alumnae of the UC Women’s Institute for Leadership Development (WILD) program. During my study, I learned that the name of the program had changed over the years—it became the Higher Education Collaborative for Women’s Leadership Development (HEC)—and the structure and goals of the program had morphed into something new. The “cohort” experience for the two programs seemed significantly different, as did the impact on the participants’ leadership development.

Despite the changes in the UC leadership program, I maintained a single case study design, but I analyzed and compared the experiences of the alumnae of the WILD

and the HEC programs. The UC women's leadership development program served as one bounded case, and within that case I explored the two different program models. As part of my research, it was important to describe the context and environment for the case study (Creswell, 1998), including the campus, history of women in leadership on the campus, and the background for the creation of the leadership program in detail, as presented in Chapter 4. The UC programs interested me because I thought they may serve as models for other campuses trying to create their own programs. The UC programs were designed for both faculty and staff, making them even better potential models for other institutions.

Merriam (2001) presented three features common in case study research: particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic. I used each of these features in this case study. It was particularistic because it focused specifically on the WILD and HEC programs. The case was descriptive in that it resulted in "rich, 'thick,' description of the phenomenon under study" (Merriam, 2001, p. 29) as I gathered an insider's perspective on the role of the women's leadership development program on participants' self-efficacy, career aspirations, and career paths. Finally, I broadened my knowledge and understanding of the experiences of the alumnae of the leadership development programs (Merriam, 2001), which made it heuristic. As mentioned previously, I wanted to understand how the cohort-model shapes the experiences of the women in the leadership development program. This intent fit in Merriam's definition of an "interpretive" case study, as there were not many models of this type of leadership development program and there was a lack of theory explaining this phenomenon.

This study closely aligns with Stake's (1995) definition of an instrumental case study. He said that a case study is "instrumental" to gain insight into a particular research question or to gain a general understanding about a topic. In this case study, I sought to understand the participants' experiences in the women's leadership development program with particular focus on the role of the cohort model and whether the program had an impact on leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations, and career paths. Therefore, it was instrumental to study this case to learn more about the impact of this particular women's leadership development experience.

The Sample

Case Selection Criteria

I used several criteria in selecting a women's leadership development program for the focus of this study:

1. The institution must have offered the program for at least three years.
2. The program must be open to faculty and staff.
3. The program must be designed to keep a cohort together for at least a year of activities and exercises.
4. The program must be campus-based.
5. The program must have resulted in some women advancing to higher levels of administrative leadership within higher education.

It was essential that a program had been in existence for at least three years because I was most interested in learning how participation in the program shaped the experiences of the female participants. I wanted to interview women after they had participated in the program so they could reflect on the experiences and share if they

thought that their career aspirations, paths, and leadership self-efficacy had been influenced by the program. The program needed to have been around for a few years in order to garner participants who had been out of the program long enough to reflect on the experience.

It was necessary that a program be open to both faculty and staff because many senior-level positions in higher education are deemed academic positions and are often held by people who have climbed the academic ranks starting as faculty members, but there are also senior-level positions in administrative affairs and student affairs that are not typically filled by people who have come through the faculty ranks. Also, the literature suggested that many women benefit from relationships and information, so a program that was open to both faculty and staff seemed to be a structure that would broaden the network for the participants and expand their campus knowledge. I was intrigued to learn more about how women climb the leadership ladder in higher education through both the academic ranks and the non-faculty ranks.

It was important for a program to be a year in length because it would allow cohort participants to develop some relationship with each other. Anything shorter than a semester may not have been long enough for such relationships to have developed. As mentioned previously, learning about the cohort model was of particular interest. Also, I wanted the program to be campus-based because it would mean the program would be accessible to more women from one campus, thus allowing cohorts to form on a single campus. My particular interest was in how to change campus culture and leadership, and I felt a campus-based program may have more potential to make an impact in this way. As noted by the participants in the campus-based ELAM program cited earlier, continued

support from their home institution after the formal program positively influenced their leadership development (Sloma-Williams, McDade, Richman, & Morahan, 2009).

It was key that at least some of the past participants had advanced into higher levels of administrative leadership within higher education, either on the home campus or other institutions. A women's leadership development program would be deemed a success if the women participants found it helpful and supportive of their experiences and aspirations, and if those who desired to advance to higher levels of leadership found that they were informed, prepared and welcomed to senior leadership positions. I did not define success as producing a certain number of participants who had advanced to higher levels of leadership because I suspected some women would have chosen to participate in a leadership development program for self-improvement without desires to move up the leadership ladder.

Based on preliminary exploration of programs that fit my criteria, I expected to find only a handful of programs from which to choose. Acknowledging the limited possibilities for my study, I knew I may need to be flexible with my selection criteria and was prepared to re-evaluate the above criteria as needed.

Case Selection

One of the first steps in this research study was to identify a leadership development program for women that met the criteria I established. My preliminary on-line search turned up very few campus-based programs designed as leadership development opportunities for females in both faculty and staff positions. This led me to solicit nominations from "experts" in the field. I tapped experts from divisions or

councils of national higher education associations designed to research and support women and women's issues.

I e-mailed some 60 individuals and 10 list serves that had either authored previous research on women in leadership, run leadership development programs for women, or focused their work on women's issues. Examples of associations contacted included: the Office of Women at the American Council on Education (ACE), the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), the National Science Foundation (NSF) ADVANCE Program, the Higher Education Resource Services (HERS), and The Center for Creative Leadership. I also solicited key scholars of women in higher education, including Sharon McDade, Page S. Morahan, Rosalyn C. Richman, D. Walter Cohen, Shirley O'Brien, Karen Janssen, Barbara Kellerman, Deborah L. Rhode, and the scholars on my dissertation committee. The solicitation e-mail is included in Appendix A. Several of the experts I contacted forwarded my request on to others who are knowledgeable of such programs.

Fewer than 20 programs were nominated, most of which did not meet the established criteria. Another 25 referrals were made to organizations, individuals, institutions, or associations that potentially were sources of information that may have been helpful to me and this research. From the programs that were ultimately nominated for consideration, I either reviewed information on-line or made phone calls to the host campuses to determine which programs best fit my research interests and questions. I identified five programs that most closely met the established criteria. Four of the five focused on faculty, and three of those were specific to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics faculty.

The WILD program at UC surfaced as the only program open to both faculty and staff in which participants experienced a series of workshops over an academic year. The program was also designed for a group of women to go through a series of workshops together, creating the cohort experience, and the program had been in existence for more than three years. Finally, I found evidence in the marketing materials for the program that some alumnae of the program had advanced into higher level positions on campus. I selected the UC program—both WILD and HEC—as my research focus, despite the fact that over time, the program had changed from a campus-based program to a regionally-based program.

Access to the Site and Participants

The Institutional Review Board at the University of Maryland approved the study in March 2009. At that point, I contacted one of the members of the steering committee for WILD at UC, sending an introductory e-mail that explained my background, my interest in WILD and the objectives of my research. She reviewed the proposal for my research, discussed the proposal with her colleagues, and agreed to assist me in gaining access to past program participants and data about the program. She also agreed to serve as the point of contact in the initial invitation to WILD alumnae asking them to participate in the study. During my first campus visit, I learned that the director of the UC Women's Center was formally the campus administrator for WILD. The steering committee member and the director of the Women's Center helped me access the campus and past program participants. Their support was critical in my efforts to the information I needed for my research.

Participant Selection

I began with intensity sampling (Mertens, 2005), whereby I sought to interview as many past participants of the WILD program as I could. Intensity sampling is the process by which a researcher seeks to identify individuals “in which the phenomenon of interest is strongly represented” (Mertens, 2005, p. 318). My contact at UC e-mailed all alumnae of the programs (even though the program name and structure had changed, everyone still associated the program as WILD) and invited each to participate in the study. The number of women she emailed was just under 100. Eleven women agreed to participate in the study. I e-mailed them the consent form and a series of introductory and demographic questions (see Appendices B and C). Eight women responded to the initial questions and returned their consent forms, two women did not respond, and one said she could no longer participate. Six of the eight viable participants became the primary participants of the study. The other two women opted not to participate due to timing and other personal obligations.

At the point of this initial call for participants, I was aware that the program had evolved to become a collaborative effort in the region, but I did not know enough about the specifics of the program to realize that the topics covered and the structures of the WILD and the HEC programs were different enough that I would need study participants from both WILD and the HEC.

I interviewed each of the six women on two different occasions, and I met with them as a group on my last visit. During the first visit to campus for the round one interviews, I discovered that the WILD program and the HEC programs were structurally different. I decided soon after the visit that I would continue with a single case study

design, but I would incorporate a comparison of the two different models. I was fortunate to learn that half of the women who had agreed to participate in my study were WILD alumnae and half were HEC alumnae. Five of the women were classified as staff. Three of the five had moved into academic staff positions from faculty roles, and two held staff positions in academic dean's offices but had never been faculty. The sixth participant was holding a teaching and research faculty position at the time of the study.

During the first interview, I asked the participants if there were other women who had gone through the programs that may have had differing or divergent experiences. This was in an effort to move past saturation, the point at which I realized I was no longer gathering new information (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Maximum variation sampling is a process by which one gathers data from those who had common as well as distinct experiences in the program and as a result of the program (Mertens, 2005). I wanted to be sure I was hearing as many different perspectives as possible and was gathering information-rich data. Only one of the participants identified that she was likely one of the participants to offer divergent opinions about her experiences in the program. The study participants provided me with names of other women they felt could help inform the study either because they were on the steering committee or they helped create the program.

In addition to interviewing some of the women who participated in the program—primary informants—other individuals served as secondary informants, including one participant's supervisor (see Appendix D for a copy of the invitation letter). I intended to interview participants' supervisors, but several of them had either retired or failed to respond to my requests. Speaking with the participant's supervisor helped me to learn

about the role he played in supporting his staff member's participation in the program. However, it did not provide enough critical information to warrant follow-up interviews with other supervisors.

The one supervisor with whom I spoke knew the basics about the program and generally felt positively about what the program offered his staff member. However, he was not necessarily engaged in the program or the learning his staff member gained from her participation. Based on my interviews with the primary informants, most supervisors were supportive of participation in the program but were not engaged in the learning. Most of the participants said their supervisors played minimal roles in supporting their participation. The supervisors supported the women's applications to participate, but once they began the program, supervisors tended not to really engage in the learning process with the WILD participants.

Other secondary informants included the director of the Women's Center, who was the current campus administrator for the WILD program; the provost, who provided some initial funding for the program; and a senior vice provost who helped develop the original program and was recommended by several participants. I spent time with the provost and senior vice provost because I wanted to understand how the women's leadership program may have shaped campus culture, and I wanted to know if top university leaders knew of and supported the program. Additionally, I wanted to know if there were visible changes or differences in the makeup of the senior leadership on campus as a result of the program.

Data Collection

I collected data from document reviews, interviews of participants, an interview with one participant's supervisor, interviews with the program coordinator, and interviews with other campus leaders. Collecting data from a variety of sources was important because it allowed for triangulation or confirmation of the data (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003). Two additional principles relevant in case study research emphasized by Yin guided the collection of data. First, the data from the interviews and document reviews were stored separately from my researcher's notes and reports so as to provide evidence directly from the data for conclusions drawn about the case. In other words, keeping my narrative report separate from the interview and document review data kept me from confusing my notes and conclusions with what was actually said by the informants or found in the document reviews. Second, to increase the trustworthiness of the case study, I created a chain of evidence whereby an external reader of the case study could easily ascertain how I moved from the original questions to the conclusions. I used NVivo software to house the interview transcripts for each case; the NVivo records for this case study show evidence of working within these recommended protocols.

Document review.

Prior to conducting interviews, I reviewed print materials about the program. According to Merriam (1998) and Yin (2003), documents provide additional opportunities to learn about the topic under investigation. Many documents about the WILD program were stored in the UC archives, which I accessed on my first campus visit. I reviewed marketing materials, program budget reports, websites, participant materials, progress reports, business plans, and evaluation and assessment documents.

Learning about the structure and format of the program from written documents helped prepare me for the interviews and provided context about the experiences and stories I would hear from the participants themselves. I was also able to access quotations from other program alumnae that were used in the marketing materials. Some of these quotations are included in the presentation of the case and in the findings of this study. Additionally, the document reviews provided some recording of the history of the program and presented data relevant to the number of women who had participated in the program, remained at UC since participation, and advanced since participation in the program.

I used document review forms to keep track of my documents, their content, their significance, and related key learning (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The document review form can be found in Appendix E.

Participant interviews.

I used semi-structured interviews with a number of different constituents as the primary source of data for this study. I approached each interview with a list of questions, but remained flexible in the exact wording and order, which allowed me to respond to ideas and concepts the participants introduced that I may not have anticipated (Merriam, 2001). The interview schedule can be found in Table 1.

Table 1
Interview Schedule

Interviewees	Number of Interviews	When I Interviewed
Past participants	Two	First and second campus visit
Supervisor of past participant	One	Second campus visit
President/Provost	One	Second campus visit
Program administrator	Multiple times	Pre-visit phone calls and second visit to campus

Note: Interview protocols for each group are in Appendices F, G, and H.

It is important to note that these questions served as a guide, and I did not limit myself to only these questions. I developed the questions based on my research interest, my knowledge of the literature, and my experiences. O'Brien and Janssen's (2005) study of a women's internship program and McDade et al.'s (2008) new framework for defining leadership served as resources in creating the interview questions. Question formation was a process whereby I added or omitted questions depending on the responses and the conversation (Glesne, 2006). In many cases, questions were presented to participants in varying order, depending on what flowed from their responses to previous questions.

Primary participants.

During my first visit to campus in December 2009, I met with each of the study participants for about an hour and a half (see Appendix G for interview protocol). In each interview, I quickly established relationships with the participants so that they could build trust in me as a researcher (Glesne, 2006). I also wanted to learn the reasons the women decided to participate in the leadership program. I gathered preliminary data about participants' long-term career goals and aspirations prior to the program, and I sought to

understand some of the experiences that led them to the program. I asked questions that would help me better understand the participants' perspectives on the kinds of experiences the program offered that contributed to their knowledge and skills of leadership. I also asked about the role of the cohort group in the experience. During this first interview, I asked the participants if they would be comfortable if I interviewed their supervisors to gain a sense of their understanding of the program and their perspectives on if and how the program affected participants.

The second interview, conducted in March 2010, afforded me deeper conversations with the participants about the specifics of the program and the opportunity to explore if and how participation in the program shaped their career paths. I asked questions about the levels of support they felt on campus during their participation and after they had completed the program. I also tried to understand the implications of their participation in the leadership development program with a cohort of other women. I learned about the participants' leadership role models and their comfort with leading others. Finally, this second interview provided an opportunity to learn about the paths the participants had chosen as a result of their experiences in the program.

Secondary informants.

On my second visit to campus I interviewed one of the participant's supervisors, the provost, the senior vice provost, and the director of the Women's Center (also the administrator of the WILD/HEC programs). These secondary informants provided me with valuable insights into the development and creation of the programs, the impact of the programs on individual participants and the campus community, and some of the challenges associated with administering the programs. Interviews with these secondary

informants gave me a sense of their levels of involvement and UC's commitment to staff members' professional development, and an understanding of how one supervisor noticed differences in the work of his employee as a result of participation in the program (see Appendices F and H for interview protocols). Data from these interviews enhanced my understanding of the context of the University at the time the program was developed and informed the findings of this study.

I was interested in meeting with the provost and senior vice provost because both of whom were involved in the program's inception. The provost's office financially supported the program for the first few years, and the senior vice provost helped identify the need for the program and contributed time and energy to developing the WILD program curriculum. Not only did I want to hear their perspectives on the value of the program and the impact on campus leadership, I also sought to understand the university's commitment to the program and to women's leadership development. In order for leadership development programs to be successful in helping to advance the careers of women or other minorities, top leaders must demonstrate a commitment to equal access to leadership positions and the programs that help achieve that objective (Kellerman & Rhode, 2007).

At the outset of my research, I anticipated that I may be able to observe the current cohort of women in the program, which would have allowed me to see participants interacting in their physical space and engaging in activity (Merriam, 1998). After I learned of the program's evolution from WILD to HEC and that the current cohort met once a month at different host campuses, I decided such observations would not add to my research.

Data Analysis

During data collection and analysis, I kept personal notes about each interview, general observations from walking around campus, as well as other insights or questions (Glesne, 2006; Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006). Providing a space for my preliminary reflections allowed me to separate what I was actually hearing and seeing from my thoughts and reactions to those experiences. I also had a place to capture my thoughts as they came to me rather than taking the risk that I might forget them. My researcher notes contained myriad thoughts and observations, including non-verbal signals from study participants and inconsistencies in what different participants told me.

Given the changes in the women's leadership development program under investigation, I compared the WILD and the HEC experiences during analysis. Upon completion of each round of interviews, I transcribed the recordings and read them several times to get a general sense of the data before beginning a formal coding process (Creswell, 2003). During analysis, I grouped and reviewed WILD data separate from the HEC data, which allowed me to gain an in-depth picture of one program before trying to draw useful comparisons.

Initially, I used open coding, noting general ideas and concepts in the margins of each transcript. I did this on two different occasions—after the first round of interviews, and then again after the second round. The types of codes that surfaced during this process included word and phrases like: “felt isolated,” looking for leadership training,” “role models,” and “did not see self as leader.” Upon completion of data collection, I followed Strauss and Corbin's (1990; 1998) step-by-step process for coding and analyzing data—analyzing transcripts line-by-line. Step-by-step coding is a process by

which the researcher notes key words or phrases in each line of the transcript. According to Miles and Huberman (1994) “codes are tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study” (p. 56). This process helped me identify categories or concepts beyond what I may have expected based on the literature or on my experiences from the data collection process (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

I created an NVivo database to house the transcripts and store the identified categories and codes. From this initial coding process, I identified about 750 codes, and then began to group similar codes (concepts and ideas) into tree nodes (see Appendix I). This process ultimately allowed me to see the major themes that emerged from the data and supported participant quotations. Similarly, the process allowed me to easily identify the categories and codes that may have been divergent or that did not easily fit into groups with other codes.

In qualitative research, data are analyzed continuously—during and after they are collected (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 1995). Miles and Huberman’s recommendations for delineating the analysis process into three different activities served as the guide for analyzing the data in this research: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. Data reduction is a process by which the data are narrowed down and simplified, and this happens through coding, drawing themes, clustering the data, and writing memos (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In this study, this was the process described above in which categories and themes were identified and then grouped. Data display refers to the manner in which the data are organized and presented in a more compact way than in transcriptions or field notes. Data displays can

take a variety of forms, including “matrices, graphs, charts, and networks” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 11). This technique helped me organize the key findings of the study. Finally, conclusion drawing and verification take place throughout the data collection process and help shape the data collection. In this process, the researcher continually thinks about and notes patterns and possible explanations, while keeping an open mind to data that may reshape such propositions. As more data are collected, the researcher verifies or challenges some of the previously drawn conclusions. These three components are interconnected and create a continuous, interactive process of data analysis, which I used to construct a more clear understanding of the WILD and HEC programs.

Trustworthiness.

Trustworthiness refers to the quality of the study and accuracy of the data (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Creswell described eight ways to verify the trustworthiness of a study: extended engagement in the field, triangulation of the data, peer review and debriefing, negative case analysis, clarification of researcher bias, member checking, rich, thick description, and external audit. I used several of these techniques in this study in an effort to establish credibility, reliability, transferability, and dependability (Merriam, 1998).

First, there were multiple sources of data in this study. The six primary informants provided personal stories and memories of their experiences in the women’s leadership development program. The second source of data was document reviews—I read progress reports, marketing materials, and budget plans related to the program. These documents provided helpful reflections and summaries of the programs successes and challenges. I pulled participant quotes from the reports and evaluations that supplemented

the feedback the study participants provided me. Secondary informants were the final data sources. Interacting with these sources gave me multiple perspectives and viewpoints on different aspects of the program and helped me solidify the findings.

Second, I consulted a peer reviewer or debriefer in the data analysis phase of this study. After I coded and grouped all transcripts into major themes, a peer debriefer reviewed the grouping of codes to ensure that similar ideas were grouped together and that the major themes I identified actually came from the data. Together with the debriefer, I developed two data displays (Miles & Huberman, 1994) to use in organizing the study results. The peer debriefer in this study had an assessment background; she had a doctorate degree and had served as the director of assessment for a campus division of student affairs.

Third, as a female college administrator interested in attaining senior leadership status, I had a personal interest in this research topic, which meant I had to recognize and identify my own biases going into this study. I asked questions about my own meaning-making process to try to minimize my shaping of the data. I began the research study expecting to understand and connect personally with some of the stories the women participants shared with me, particularly since my internship experience so closely related to this study. I am passionate about women's issues, and I believe that women must work together in naturally inclusive ways to open more doors and secure more seats at the upper level leadership table. Additionally, while this research was focused on the experiences of female faculty and staff, my depth of knowledge of the processes faculty members encounter when advancing through the academic ranks was much more limited than my knowledge of staff rising through the leadership ladder in student affairs or

administrative affairs. My understanding of the faculty experience broadened significantly through this study, as I learned of challenges and motivations directly from some faculty and became more familiar with existing literature on faculty advancements.

Fourth, participants in the study had the opportunity to provide member checks of the themes and concepts I identified as significant. At the conclusion of my second visit to campus and round two interviews, I conducted a focus group with all six study participants. In this meeting, I proposed the major themes I had identified and gave participants the opportunity to comment on, expand, or clarify my preliminary findings. This process allowed me to clarify the significant themes and identify a couple of themes for which there may have been divergent opinions. Generally, the participants agreed with the themes I identified. There was one theme for which one participant felt she had a differing experience. She shared her perspective, and I made appropriate adjustments.

Fifth, I presented the findings through rich descriptions directly from the participants. I did this to provide readers with as much context as possible, so they can draw their own conclusions. Chapter 5 contains a number of lengthy quotations because I thought it important to use the participants' words wherever possible to tell their stories.

CHAPTER 4: THE CASE OF TWO DIFFERENT LEADERSHIP MODELS

This chapter presents a description of the host institution and the environment of the campus at the time the program was developed, and the participants are also introduced. The program organizers were faced with both opportunities and obstacles; over time, the Women's Institute for Leadership Development (WILD) program took on a different format and became known as the Higher Education Collaborative (HEC). The structure and goals of the original and the reformatted programs are reviewed in this chapter, which sets the stage for Chapter 5, in which the two programs are presented with regard to the impact of the programs, the resulting outcomes, and the reflections on the program from the study participants who were program alumnae.

In 1999, leaders at the University of Cincinnati (UC) developed a campus-based leadership development program for women faculty and staff in an effort to maximize resources and to create a pipeline for women on campus to advance into leadership positions. This case study explored the effect of that "homegrown" leadership program and presents a deeper understanding of the complexities, challenges, opportunities, and successes associated with hosting a women's leadership development program on an individual campus.

This study sought to answer:

1. How do past participants of the women's leadership development program describe the experience?
2. How does participation in the cohort-based program for leadership development shape leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations, and career paths of women participants?

3. How did participation in the program for leadership development provide experiences and opportunities that prepared participants to seek and obtain leadership positions?

Institutional Overview

UC is a research-intensive university that is 1 of 14 four-year public institutions of higher education in Ohio. The main campus and the medical campus are located in “uptown” Cincinnati. UC employs more than 9,700 faculty and staff and employs 6,700 undergraduate and graduate students. It is the largest employer in the city and has an economic impact of more than \$3 billion (UC, n.d.). Some 31,000 undergraduate and 10,000 graduate students attend UC where they can pursue more than 300 different programs of study. UC offers all degrees, and its students hail from all 50 states and more than 110 countries (UC, n.d.).

The University mission statement proclaims “through scholarship, service, partnerships and leadership we create opportunity, develop educated and engaged citizens, enhance the economy, and enrich our university, city, state and global community” (UC, n.d.). UC’s mission also espouses a commitment to excellence and diversity among students, faculty, and staff. Finally, the University was recently named an “Up and Coming” university by the *U.S. News and World Report* (UC, n.d.).

Context and Climate for Women on Campus

Efforts to support women students, faculty and staff at UC have existed for more than 30 years. Much of the support has come from the UC Women’s Center in terms of programs and initiatives to enhance the experiences of women on campus. Human resources data gathered in the late 1990s showed that women and men were not

advancing at the same rate. The senior leadership listened to the concerns about advancement for women, and in response, the UC president and other senior leaders demonstrated their commitment to women faculty and staff at the University by financially supporting a new initiative to develop women leaders. The following pages highlight some of the programs, services, and campus realities at UC that set the stage for the creation and subsequent changes to the WILD program.

Data from the Late 1990s

In the 1990s, the numbers of women in leadership and higher ranking faculty positions at UC were no different than the numbers from across the country; women held many positions, but they did not attain the highest ranking positions at the same rate as men. Data compiled from UC's Department of Human Resources reported that from 1998 to 1999, only 4 of the more than 20 top UC leadership positions (president, provosts, vice provosts, and deans) were held by women (see Table 2).

Table 2
Number of Men and Women in Academic and Administrative Leadership Positions 1998-1999

Position	Number of Men	Percentage	Number of Women	Percentage
Pres, Provost, Vice Provost, Dean	20+	80.0%	4	20.0%
Executive Admin Staff	292	55.4%	235	44.6%
Faculty	1325	68.3%	1939	31.7%
Professor	561	81.0%	132	19.0%
Assoc. Professor	426	68.1%	200	31.9%
Assistant Professor	288	57.6%	212	42.4%
Instructor	13	44.8%	16	55.2%
Adjunct Professor	15	38.5%	24	61.5%
Librarian	22	42.3%	30	57.7%
Holds Tenure	860	73.6%	309	26.4%
Eligible for Tenure	111	56.6%	85	43.4%

Note: Table adapted from Rinto, et al., 2006

The only data available about staff in leadership positions at UC indicated that of the administrative leadership positions titled vice president, dean, director, assistant, associate, and manager, 44.6% were held by women during the 1998-1999 academic year. In that same year, women represented 31.7% of all faculty positions. Of faculty members with the rank of professor, 19% were women, compared to 81% who were men. Of associate professors, 31.9% were women. And finally, of the assistant professors, 42.4% were women. Not surprisingly, women held more instructor and adjunct titles than men; 55% percent of instructor positions were held by women, and 61.5% of adjunct faculty positions were held by women. Only 26.4% of the faculty who held tenure status during the 1998-1999 academic year were women, compared to 73.6% who were men (Rinto, Berryman-Fink, Faaborg, Graviss, & Mortimer, 2006).

These data suggest that women really were misrepresented in leadership at UC in the late 1990s. As was the case at other institutions across the country at the time, women faculty were concentrated in the Instructor and Adjunct Professor and outnumbered in the tenured Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor ranks. The number of women in the highest positions in administrative leadership on campus was also significantly low.

UC Women's Center

The UC Women's Center has provided programming and resources to support women since 1978 and has the distinction of being among the oldest continuously operating university women's centers in the United States (UC Women's Center, n.d.). Initially, the center served as a referral service connecting students and staff with off-campus resources and events, and its primary focus was to serve women students. In the early 1990s, the center expanded to offer support and advocacy for gay students, and in the mid-2000s the scope expanded again to include serving women faculty and staff more actively.

Today, one of the center's goals is to "identify and help eliminate institutional barriers that impede/inhibit the full participation of women and LGBTQ persons in the university" (UC Women's Center, n.d.). At its core, the Women's Center at UC inspires students to develop and hone their skills in working for and creating political and social change. To this end, the center is host to monthly brown bag lunches that showcase various forms of activism on campus or in the community. The center also serves women faculty and staff through programs and services, and the director of the center serves as

chair of the Women's Initiatives Network (WIN) and as chair of the WILD/HEC Selection Committee.

Women's Leadership Conference

The UC Women's Leadership Conference was a staple offering on campus between 1996 and 2007. The annual, day-long conference was comprised of workshops and plenary sessions with the purpose of increasing the knowledge, skills, and leadership potential of women faculty and staff. The goal was to prepare participants for leadership positions within higher education and ideally at UC (SM, personal communication, April 4, 2011). Therefore, the program had the potential to benefit the individual participants as well as the University. Workshops covered a variety of topics such as work/life balance, mentoring, negotiation, and conflict resolution. The conference drew a wide cross-section of women faculty and staff from the campus representing different colleges, disciplines, administrative departments, and backgrounds. While all women working at UC were invited to attend, most of the participants were staff in entry-level or mid-level positions.

During the fall semester of 1998, five women panelists prepared for a session that was to be part of the February 1999 conference (PR, personal communication, March 23, 2010). The panel addressed the small number of women in central academic administrative positions and the "chilly" climate for the women who did hold top-level positions (Berryman-Fink, Bardes, Nelson, Sheets, Taylor, & Trent, 1999). The panelists supported their statements about the low number of women in academic leadership positions with data showing there were no female vice presidents at the time that only 3 of the 15 deans were women, 10 of the 37 Associate Deans were women, and finally only 1 of the 9 members of the board of trustees was female. They suggested that the lack of

gender diversity at the top level created an unwelcoming climate for women. They also said that when few or no women are in top-level positions, it is difficult to raise and address issues pertinent to women.

Data showed that although some external searches yielded qualified women candidates for positions at UC, they often declined to accept the offers. Additionally, they noted that there were few mentoring and networking opportunities for UC women. Through the panel discussion, possible causes and effects of the problems were identified, and they offered some solutions for how to get more women into leadership positions on campus. The ideas discussed included inviting women to serve on search committees to ensure gender representation in applicant pools, developing an internship program for women in central administrative offices, and creating a women's leadership workshop series (Berryman-Fink et al., 1999).

Introduction of the Women's Leadership Program

The day-long Women's Leadership Conference held in 1999 and the stark reality of the disproportionately low number of women in leadership positions propelled the creation of the Women's Leadership Program (WLP). The program began in the 1999-2000 academic year, and in Fall 2000, it became known as the Women's Institute for Leadership Development (WILD) (PR, personal communication, March 23, 2010).

A group of 11 women, including several women from the panel at the February 1999 conference, formed a volunteer group that pursued the idea of trying to create opportunities to develop more women leaders and build a pipeline for women in leadership at UC. They developed a proposal for a year-long leadership experience in which participants would attend workshops and then have opportunities to develop and

participate in internship experiences. The women working on the proposal were in influential positions and had the ear of the president, some of the provosts/vice provosts, and several vice presidents. In fact, one of the key players in proposing and garnering support for the WILD program was a vice provost at the time. She had well-established relationships with the senior leadership team and was instrumental in the implementation of the program. The proposal for the leadership program, coupled with a call to ensure that all search pools include women, was submitted to the senior campus leaders. There was resounding support for the proposal. In fact, the president, some of the provosts, and several vice presidents funded the program from the start.

For the first three years, the program ran under the leadership and guidance of a volunteer steering committee that included the women who initiated the proposal for the program. In 2002, a part-time director was hired to administer the program. In her first year, the director ran a reunion-type program for past participants of WILD and spent time evaluating the costs and benefits of the program. Due to outside interest in the program, financial challenges with maintaining the program, and some concern about not having enough participants from UC, the director and the steering committee decided that the program would take on a different form in the 2003-2004 academic year when women from area universities were invited to attend. This newly structured program became known as the Higher Education Collaborative of Greater Cincinnati (HEC), and while not solely for UC women, it continued to serve as a leadership development experience for them. In a couple of the years (not consecutive) following the development of the HEC, both the UC-based WILD program and the HEC program ran

simultaneously. More information about each of the two programs is presented later in this chapter.

Women's Initiatives Network

Serving faculty and staff has been a focus of the UC Women's Center since its inception, but the scope and scale of its efforts increased significantly with the creation of the Women's Initiatives Network (WIN) in 2001. The goal of WIN is "advancing gender equity at UC by supporting the professional development and advancement of UC women and improving work/life balance for all at UC" (UC WIN, n.d.). At the recommendation of the director of the Women's Center and the senior vice provost, the president of the University appoints a diverse group of women from faculty and administration to serve on this umbrella committee, which is chaired by the director of the Women's Center. The group of about 12 is diverse in terms of race, age, position, and discipline, and members represent faculty and staff from student affairs, institutional advancement, and academic affairs. Most often, the women appointed to serve on WIN are senior-level and therefore hold some clout, which allows them to affect change in the campus culture and climate around diversity and equity issues with little risk of jeopardizing their positions (SM, personal communication, April 6, 2011).

WIN serves as a resource for leadership development opportunities, as well as a clearinghouse for information about the status of women in higher education in Ohio, the Midwest, and the U.S. WIN provides oversight and guidance for various efforts at UC to support women faculty and staff serving on the UC Diversity Council and promoting and/or developing policies and practices that support women. Additionally, the WIN website hosts a complement of leadership development programs and resources including

information about HERS, the ACE National and Regional Leadership Forums, and the Ohio Academic Leadership Academy. Also on the website is a listing of various women's organizations on campus including Academic, Administrative, and Professional Women (AAPW); American Association of University Professors Committee; and Sister Circle, a professional and personal support group for faculty and staff who are women of color. Finally, the WIN website hosts a number of reports about the status of women and gender equity at UC, in Cincinnati, and in Ohio. Several of these reports were authored by WIN, and a national report published by the American Association of University Presidents also resides on the site (Women's Initiatives Network, n.d.).

Presidential Leadership

The University of Cincinnati welcomed her first female president in 2003, Dr. Nancy Zimpher, who served in this capacity until 2009. Members of WIN and the WILD Steering Committee solicited their networks at the time of the presidential search to produce names of viable women candidates. Both groups fully supported Dr. Zimpher and felt strongly she should be considered for the position. While they did not take credit for her hire, they claimed some influence in the fact that she was considered (SM, personal communication, March 23, 2010). Ohio State University, a competitor to the University of Cincinnati, had a female president at the time, which certainly added pressure to the selection committee to ensure that viable female candidates were included in the pool (SM, personal communication, April 4, 2011).

During Dr. Zimpher's tenure as president, the University developed a strategic vision in which UC was to become a model institution for the 21st century (Rinto et al., 2006). Part of the vision was "to advance opportunities and success for our women

students, faculty and staff’ (Inside Panel). Zimpher appointed a Diversity Task Force that was charged with offering recommendations about how to create equity and inclusiveness across all facets of diversity. Zimpher noted in the 2006 report that UC had made some progress in terms of women in tenure-track faculty positions, academic leadership positions, and senior staff positions, as well as in some policies and practices that addressed gender equity, but that the work was far from complete.

Summary

Interest in and momentum for working on women’s experiences at the University of Cincinnati grew significantly in the early 2000s. With the creation of the Women’s Leadership Program, the hiring of the first female president of the University, and the collection and reporting of data on women, the University’s commitment to understanding women’s experiences and assisting in the advancement of women was evident. The campus climate was ripe, and the women helping to coordinate the efforts felt supported and heard.

Women’s Institute for Leadership Development (WILD) Program

The WILD program began as a pilot called the Women’s Leadership Program (WLP). It was run as a pilot project for UC faculty and staff during the first year. Due to its success, the program continued for the next seven years, and became known as WILD in the second year. Staff members who applied were from all areas of campus, including administrative affairs, student affairs, and institutional advancement. Faculty applicants represented a wide spectrum of disciplines. The goal of the program was to “advance women leaders in central academic as well as top level administrative positions [and to]

position women to attain a variety of higher level positions at most public and private colleges and universities” (UC, 2000b).

Administration of Program and Budget

The WILD program was initially sponsored by several university groups including the Association for Women Faculty, Association of Administrative Women (now known as the Association for Administrative and Professional Women), and the Commission on the Status of UC Women (which is now defunct). The coordination of the program was taken on by a group of 11 volunteers who comprised the steering committee and included most of the women who served on the 1999 panel for the Women’s Leadership Conference. These women were fairly high-ranking administrators at the time, and they had the ear of the president and senior vice provosts. These relationships served the program well as the WILD program was supported and funded by top university administrators including the president, the senior vice president and provost for baccalaureate and graduate education, the senior vice president and provost for health affairs, the vice president for student affairs and human resources, and the vice president for finance.

As the program gained recognition both internally and externally, the need for a program director became apparent. Late in the summer of 2002, a part-time director was hired to provide oversight and continuity for the program, and to begin thinking about future expansion of the program. This staffing enhancement, despite budget implications for the program, replaced the more transient assistance formerly provided by graduate assistants. The part-time director had served on the program steering committee and was already part of the UC community, which allowed for an easy transition. Hiring this staff

person created the need for a more formal reporting structure for the program; thus, the director reported to the senior vice president and provost for baccalaureate and graduate education.

Funding for the program primarily came through the president, the two provosts, and the vice presidents for finance and student affairs. These offices committed money for the first four years of the program, totaling \$165,000. Expenses to run the program for the first four years ran just under \$100,000, including the salary for the part-time director. The program ran on less than \$20,000 per year, and the cost per participant for the workshop series was approximately \$600. The internship experience cost approximately \$2,500 per person. After the fourth year of the program, the steering committee knew it would have to look to other sources for revenue.

Marketing

Brochures advertising WILD and email communications about the program were distributed across campus inviting women faculty and staff members to apply. One of the marketing pieces included a message from the UC president: “As an institution we are committed to strengthening women’s leadership in higher education. This pilot program will afford us opportunities to work toward this goal, while providing women the skills necessary to advance in their careers” (UC, 2000b).

In the same brochure, the president of the Association for Women Faculty explained, “It is critically important that faculty women take advantage of this innovative program in order to learn more about and take part in higher education” (UC, 2000b). There is no doubt that a leadership program endorsed by the University president carried some social capital. As the program became more established, alumnae of the program

also played roles in marketing the program because they talked with colleagues about the program and encouraged them to apply. In some cases, supervisors would suggest to staff that they consider applying, although this appeared to be an exception rather than the rule.

Participants of the WILD Program

The WILD program was marketed to both faculty and staff who had been at the University for a minimum of three years. As Table 3 indicates, in order to be eligible for the program, an academic applicant, or faculty member, had to 1.) be at the level of associate professor with tenure or higher; 2.) have previous administrative experience; 3.) have shown evidence of disciplinary, scholarly or creative activity; and 4.) have a terminal degree in her discipline. An administrative applicant, or staff member, had to 1.) be of director title or higher; 2.) have shown evidence of administrative achievement with consistently increasing or expanding responsibilities; and 3.) have a minimum of a master's degree. As long as an individual met the criteria, any woman was invited to apply.

Table 3
Criteria for Applying to Program in 2000

	Academic/Faculty	Administrative/Staff
Years at Institution	3	3
Rank/Title	Associate Professor with tenure or higher	Director or higher
Administrative Experience Responsibilities	Some previous experience Disciplinary, scholarly or creative activity	Demonstrated achievement Increasing responsibilities
Degree	Terminal degree	Master's degree or higher

Members of a selection committee reviewed the applications to determine who would participate in the program each year. The committee sought diversity among participants in terms of social identities, functional areas of responsibility, and academic disciplines. In the first three years of the program, 68 women were accepted, 64 women “graduated” or completed the program, and the average class size was about 20 (UC, 2002). There were no data explaining why four of the women did not complete the program, so it is unclear whether they decided not to participate at all, or if they started the program but left at some point. (Three of the four women who did not complete the program are still working at UC.) Of the graduates, 56 percent were faculty members or academic leaders and 44 percent were administrative staff. They represented 11 different colleges and 16 non-college units within UC. Of those classified as staff, they represented a variety of departments including academic departments such as engineering, medicine and arts and sciences and student or administrative affairs departments such as health, disability services, veteran services, bookstore, and construction services. Twenty-five percent of the 64 participants entered the internship component of the program serving under vice-presidents, deans, associate vice presidents and vice provosts. More about the internship experience is presented later in this chapter.

Workshop Series

WILD participants attended various workshops during the fall semester, typically two sessions per month. The format of the workshops included a presentation by a speaker or a panel of speakers and a networking dinner. On many occasions, participants engaged in hands on/experiential learning activities. The presenters for each workshop came from a broad cross-section of the University, which provided participants with

access to the president and most of the vice presidents, provosts, deans and other senior officials. The purpose of the presentations was for participants to gain broad exposure to the academic environment and the administrative structure of the University. Participants learned about the senior-level decision-making process in higher education and at UC specifically. They were provided with “insider” information about the culture and functioning of UC, and were exposed to a network of people from whom they could learn and with whom they could make professional connections.

The topics covered in the fall workshop series covered a wide variety of higher education administration issues including finances, state support and politics, assessment, vision, goals, leadership styles, and technology. UC-specific issues were also discussed, such as the university history, decision-making, university culture, agendas of the provosts, and budget management. In other words, there was significant attention to developing participants’ knowledge competencies. Additionally, personal and professional development topics were addressed, including management and leadership styles, career paths, and personality type indicators. Collectively, the content of the program was designed to expose participants to leadership enhancing knowledge and skills, as well as to build leadership efficacy in participants.

Internship

After completing the series of workshops, WILD participants had opportunities to apply for internships in order to practice their leadership skills, learn more about university and college administration, and gain exposure to different functions within higher education. The women who applied for internships were responsible for developing their own goals for their internship experiences, identifying and establishing

relationships with mentors, and negotiating the expectations of the deliverable report or product. The application process was to ensure that the interns had clearly stated objectives, committed mentors, and support from their primary departments. The WILD steering committee members helped make connections and recommendations for women who needed assistance, and they also officially approved internship placements.

Participants of the WILD program developed internship experiences through which they could glean the type of learning and experience they felt would most benefit them. The interns established the criteria for their internships in coordination with the host offices and their mentors. Therefore, not only did the internships benefit the participants, but significant contributions were made to the departments and offices hosting the interns as well as the University itself. For example, interns completed projects in areas including “college incentive programs, strategic and budget planning, distance learning, entrepreneurship, HR training programs, strategic enrollment initiatives and accreditation” (UC, 2006). The scale and scope of the internships were really up to the discretion of the WILD participants and the host internship sites. One participant completed her internship project over a ten-week quarter, spending one day a week in the internship, whereas another participant spent two days a week at her internship site for an entire year.

One WILD participant who completed an internship commented on the benefit of being exposed to an area of campus with which she typically did not interact: “[I] found the exposure to this side of the University’s communication network quite interesting – if anything, it made me realize how important it is for faculty and administrators to sit at the same table and share ideas” (UC, 2002). However, there were some challenges with the

internship experience. Most significantly, it was especially difficult for staff members to juggle the demands of their day-to-day responsibilities with internship experiences that took them away from their jobs for some period of time. One intern commented, “it can be difficult to turn ‘on’ and ‘off’ depending on what hat you’re wearing on a given day” (UC, 2000a).

The program budgeted funds of approximately \$2,500 per intern to assist with course buy-outs for faculty members or administrative support for staff interns who were balancing their full-time jobs with the internships. This money did not cover all of the expenses departments incurred, but it was a gesture of “good will” to thank the departments that supported interns. Some years there were four or five interns, and in other years there were only one or two. While some money was allocated in the budget for a few years following the start of the HEC program, only a couple of women participated in internships after the 2002-2003 academic year. Eventually, this component of the program was discontinued due to the financial implications and some of the challenges in balancing participants’ workloads.

Higher Education Collaborative for Women’s Leadership Development (HEC)

By the fourth year, the WILD program was gaining external attention. The program was showcased at the Ohio Network of Women Leaders, a chapter of the National Network of Women Leaders and an affiliate of ACE. Additionally, an article about the program was published in *Liberal Education* in the winter of 2003. At the same time that other area colleges and universities were learning about the program, the WILD steering committee was considering partnerships with other institutions in the region to both broaden the network of women participants and to help fund the program. This

change in course was the recommendation of Cynthia Secor, the director of HERS and an international figure in training women in higher education, (UC, 2001). In some ways, the program coordinators felt as though they were “tapping” out the pool of qualified candidates on the UC campus, and partnering with area colleges and universities would continue to funnel women into the program. Collaborative partner institutions would pay a fee for each participant to help defray the cost for the administration of the program. The cost of participating in this women’s leadership experience was significantly less than attending one of the nationally coordinated leadership development programs, so it was viewed as a “win” for the participants, the participating institutions, and UC. Additionally, there was increased opportunity for a significant return on the investment in that there was increased potential for the participants to advance within the higher education system in the region.

The Higher Education Collaborative for Women’s Leadership Development (HEC) began in the 2003-2004 academic year. This collaboration involved five institutions within an hour and half of UC, including Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, the College of Mount St. Joseph, Miami University, Northern Kentucky University, and Xavier University. The goal of HEC is to “establish a strong network of women in the Greater Cincinnati higher education community” (UC, 2005).

Administration and Budget

UC served as the coordinating campus for the HEC program for the first five years. As such, the director coordinated meetings, managed the budget, and provided general leadership and management for the program. A steering committee made up of representatives from the participating institutions oversaw the content, programming and

scheduling of the program. In the 2008-2009 academic year, another university assumed responsibility for coordination of the program. This transfer took place when the part-time director of the WILD program retired and UC re-evaluated the program.

Regardless of who formally administers the program, each campus is responsible for managing the selection process to identify participants from the institution.

Additionally, each campus is responsible for hosting one of the meetings during the year. The HEC steering committee identifies the topics and then the host institution confirms the meeting location, books the speaker, and makes arrangements for the meal. At UC, the selection committee is comprised of about five women, including the director of the WIN (who is also the director of the Women's Center) and four alumnae of either the WILD or HEC programs. Selection committee members do not have set years for service, and they are selected by the WIN director, who oversees WILD.

The collaborative institutions contribute about \$650 per participant to the funding of the program for an approximate annual total of \$20,000 per campus. While the HEC program was without permanent funding for the first two years, the fees collected from the regional institutions allowed it to function. In 2006, the UC president awarded the steering committee one-time funds to continue running the internal WILD program and the external HEC program. These funds came with the stipulation that the committee would submit a five-year business plan outlining how it could become a self-supporting program at the end of the five years. The plan was submitted and approved, and at the time of this research, that plan was being implemented.

Marketing of the HEC

Each campus markets the HEC program to its employees. Most applicants at UC heard about the program through email correspondence. It is important to note that while the name formally changed to the Higher Education Collaborative for Women's Leadership Development of Greater Cincinnati, most at UC still refer to it as "WILD". This has created some confusion in terms of accurately reporting which programs occurred in which years. Campus websites serve as marketing tools for getting information to potential applicants, and print brochures are used as well. Marketing efforts continue to use quotations and testimonials from former participants as ways to inspire more women to apply. A few of the testimonials cited on the UC website include:

- "The program helped me view the operations of the university from a broader, strategic level, rather than at the detail task level."
- "I have a sense of courage to do things that seem impossible like federal grants, travel opportunities, and internal projects. I have assumed many additional leadership roles, with grace and confidence." and
- "A terrific networking source. I was exposed to various aspects of UC - gives good perspective. Allows us to be less parochial."

In the last few years, it appeared that most UC participants learned about the program through campus-wide email announcements (AB, MH, MM, personal communication, March 22-24, 2010). A consistent theme expressed by the study participants, however, was that many of them wondered why they had not heard of the program earlier in their careers. They reconciled their curiosity by suggesting that they

had probably received emails about it, but perhaps overlooked them because they were not seeking leadership development opportunities at the time.

HEC Participants

Committees on each campus are responsible for coordinating the application and selection process each year. The criteria for selection are the same across all participating institutions and are similar to the earlier UC-based WILD program. All participants have to have worked full-time on their campuses for at least three years, and staff candidates have to be at the director level or higher. Faculty candidates may participate regardless of their rank, and all participants must have master's degrees at a minimum. Each campus selects six or seven women to participate each year.

UC's selection committee is led by the director of the Women's Center and is composed of former HEC/WILD participants. The selection process begins in the spring as the committee works to spread the word about the program and the application process. Applications are usually due in late summer, and the program formally begins in the fall. Approximately 20 women apply each year from UC for the six or seven spots. While the number of women from UC who participate is significantly less than when the program was strictly for women on campus (20 women used to participate annually, and now six or seven participate), UC continues to maintain a balance of both faculty and staff participants. Staff participants continue to represent all areas of campus including academic departments, student affairs and administrative affairs. Applicants who are not selected are encouraged to apply again the next year.

HEC Workshop Series

The program extends over the course of an academic year; seven workshops are offered, and each lasts between two and three hours. Given the change in the audience for the program, and the fact that women are representing different types of institutions, HEC workshop discussions and presentations revolve around topics that extended beyond UC, such as leadership theories, team building, career development, fundraising and finance, leadership styles, leadership and diversity, and challenges facing higher education nationally. The sessions are offered at a different host campus each month so the participants have opportunities to visit each participating campus during the program. The host campus is responsible for planning the session, securing the speaker, and organizing the meal and the workshop. While the internship program is offered and is the responsibility of each of the participating campuses, only one HEC participant applied, received funds, and completed the optional internship component of the program during the course of this study.

Outside of the monthly meetings, there are no formal gatherings of the large group or the representatives from UC. However, a couple of the HEC alumnae recently attempted to start a monthly lunch gathering for past participants of WILD and HEC. The lunches provided an informal space for the women to connect and to continue to broaden their networking opportunities, but the logistics of scheduling appeared to put an end to the lunches early on. Table 4 provides a cursory look at the structure and format of the WILD program as compared to the HEC program.

Table 4
A Comparison of the WILD and the HEC Programs

	WILD	HEC
Goals of Program	Advance women into leadership positions in higher education and ideally at UC	Create a network of women across the region with an implied goal of advancing women into leadership positions
Administration	UC WILD Director – part-time staff member; steering committee of volunteers	One administrator from one of the participating schools, one coordinator for each campus and a selection committee for each campus
Marketing	Brochures/web/alumnae	Brochures/web/alumnae
UC Participants	20 per year on average	6 or 7 per year
Structure	Twice a month gatherings over dinner; steering committee members attended each session	Once a month gathering at a different host campus each month
Topics Discussed	Decision-making at UC; financial issues at UC; leadership in higher education; human resources, student services, and instructional technology at UC	Leadership skills – salary negotiation, hiring for disposition, career mapping

Impact of the WLP/WILD/HEC Programs

Since its inception in 1999, nearly 200 UC women have participated in the women's leadership development programs. Individual participants speak very favorably of their experiences in the programs, but it has been difficult to determine how or if participation has had an impact on campus leadership. Data presented in the programs' annual progress reports suggest that they are making a positive difference on campus. The 2006-2011 UC Business Plan suggested that 21 interns had completed nearly 4,100

hours of service to UC. In very practical terms, the estimated value of this time is \$168,000, which is greater than the investment made to run the program (\$162,000).

These internships also led to the creation of new positions and departments, and to development of a strategic plan for a particular initiative. The 2006-2011 UC Business Plan also touts that 25 of the 78 graduates have received promotions since completing the programs, and that the number of women deans and administrators at the vice president and provost levels has increased by 45% percent since the programs started. Additionally, most of the women who participated in one of the programs by the 2006-2007 academic year remained at UC in vital positions (UC, 2006).

Program participants noted on their final evaluations that the programs benefited them greatly. One participant stated, “The program broadened how I think about various issues and their implications. It will help me do a better job by having gotten ‘outside’ my institution.” Another said, “I have approached job interviews with an increased level of confidence based on my increased knowledge of the topic areas discussed in the program.” Finally, another said, “Introduction to new concepts has application to my career but the networking will prove to be most beneficial. I won’t hesitate to call on my colleagues for advice and information” (UC, 2006). Similar quotations are noted throughout the progress reports for each year of the program and are used in relevant marketing materials.

By the mid-2000s, the numbers of women in academic leadership and senior staff positions had increased. Most notably, UC hired its first female president in 2003, and some reflected that her presence had a significant impact on the number of other women in senior level positions and on the experiences of women holding such positions (PR,

RS, personal communication, March 23, 2011). As Table 5 indicates, by the 2005-2006 academic year, women held 10 of the top academic leadership positions, representing quite a jump from the four who held such positions in 1998 (Rinto et al., 2006). There was a 9.5% increase in the number of women holding executive and administrative positions from 1998 (44.6%) to 2005 (54.1%). Women faculty numbers also increased to 36.5%, with a 20.5% increase in the number of women professors, a 28.5% increase in the number of women associate professors, and a 41% increase in the number of women assistant professors. The percentage of tenured female faculty increased only 5.5%, but the percentage of female faculty on the tenure track increased by 101%.

During this 7-year period, campus discussions had taken place about ways to systemically make the process of tenure more attainable for women, and UC instituted a family-friendly policy that paused the tenure process, allowing additional time to achieve tenure in the case of child or elder care responsibilities (Rinto et al., 2006). The data suggest that the campus culture and climate for women was changing, and the WIN and the WILD steering committee attributed the increased numbers of women in leadership to some of their efforts.

Table 5
Number of Men and Women in Academic and Administrative Leadership Positions 2005-2006

Position	Number of Men	Percentage	Number of Women	Percentage
President, Provost, Vice Provost, Dean	11	52.0%	10	48.0%
Executive Administrator Staff	328	45.9%	386	54.1%
Faculty	1437	63.5%	827	36.5%
Professor	589	78.7%	159	21.3%
Associate Professor	403	61.1%	257	38.9%
Assistant Professor	369	55.2%	299	44.8%
Instructor	28	34.6%	53	65.4%
Adjunct Professor	21	44.7%	26	55.3%
Librarian	27	45.0%	33	55.0%
Holds Tenure	809	71.3%	326	28.7%
Eligible for Tenure	167	49.4%	171	50.6%

More recently, the WIN worked with the institutional research office to produce a second report on the status of women at UC that included data from 2009-2010. The purpose of collecting these data and sharing the report was to “assist decision-makers and advocates to address and improve gender equality by publicly and regularly documenting women’s status at UC” (UC, 2010). The number of women in academic leadership positions and in senior administrative positions declined between 2006 and 2009. Conversely, the number of women in professorial positions increased by 22.5% percent and in associate professor positions by 12.8%. This increase matched national data, which indicated that women faculty were advancing in the faculty ranks, but not to the highest level positions (NCES, 2008). Table 6 shows the data on women in leadership positions at UC in 2009.

Table 6
Number of Men and Women in Academic and Administrative Leadership Positions 2009-2010

Position	Number of Men	Percentage	Number of Women	Percentage
President, Provost, Vice Provost, Dean	8	54.0%	7	46.0%
Executive Administrator Staff	291	43.8%	374	56.2%
Faculty	1357	59.3%	931	40.7%
Professor	547	73.6%	196	26.4%
Associate Professor	397	57.7%	291	42.3%
Assistant Professor	344	51.0%	330	49.0%
Instructor	42	34.1%	81	65.9%
Librarian	17	37.8%	28	62.2%

Summary

In conclusion, UC has a history of supporting women on campus through the work of the Women's Center and the various women's leadership development workshops, conferences, and programs. Thanks to the dedication of several women leaders on campus who paid attention to the climate and made known some of the challenges facing women in leadership and to the leaders who responded with financial support, the campus now enjoys its role as one of the only schools in the country to host a women's leadership development program for both faculty and professional staff.

In the last decade, UC administrators have made some very practical decisions about developing leaders within the campus community. These decisions are cost-effective for the university in that UC is able to save money by not sending faculty and staff off-site for professional development, and because the university benefits from participants' networking and learning. In addition, in the areas where interns completed projects, the departments gained work hours that in many cases resulted in proposals for

change or strategies for improvement. Finally, the participants gained valuable experiences and expanded their professional networks. The structure and goals of the program have changed over the years, and there are some notable differences in the experiences of the participants in the two different programs that are explored further in Chapter 5.

Introduction of Study Participants

Six women served as primary participants for the study. Three were alumnae of the WILD program and three were alumnae of the HEC program. A brief introduction of each participant provides some basic demographic information, insight into their positioning within the university, and a general sense of their career paths. Additionally, as work/life balance is a highly cited obstacle for women seeking to advance (LeBlanc, 1993; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005; Rapoport et al., 2002; Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003), I share their family and outside circumstances for additional context.

Shiple

Dr. Shiple joined the University as a faculty member. Early in her tenure, she was content with her faculty role, and other than serving as the program coordinator, she did not take on formal leadership positions within the department nor aspire to move up the leadership ranks. A single, White woman, Shiple enjoyed teaching and needed a great deal of convincing from a colleague in order to participate in the WILD program. She participated in the Winter 2000 workshop series, the first year the program was offered, and then she created an internship shadowing a dean during the spring semester. Following participation in the program, she was asked to take on a more senior-level

position. She became the associate dean, the position she holds today. Shipley spoke about applying to the program and taking on leadership roles:

I was dragged kicking and screaming to the WILD program because I just didn't see myself moving up. I was a happy camper as faculty member and that's one nice thing, if my current job as the associate dean for academic affairs in our college ended, I know I'd love going back to faculty. So that gives me the freedom in my job. I'm not worried about going to the next level. I don't want to be a dean anywhere. I'm really happy. But I didn't really want to be associate dean either. It just was never on my radar screen.

Currently in her mid-fifties, Shipley is content in the position she holds, but also is comforted to know that she can always go back to teaching. As she reflected on her hesitancy to participate in the program, she commented that she not only never saw herself taking on leadership positions, but she also had negative reactions to the thought of an all-women's group. In her words:

I grew up and I went to high school in the 70s, and we had a couple of women's groups. It was when the women's movement, I mean I had just started out with it and I never really wanted to join any kind of all female group. And the thought of going to women's leadership thing just didn't appeal to me at all. Plus I had no aspirations [to climb the leadership ladder].

Despite her hesitancy to participate in the program, Shipley spoke very favorably of the program now and recommends the experience to others. Over the years, she has remained connected to the program by serving on the steering committee, taking responsibility for archiving documents related to the program, and offering suggestions

about how to continue the program in tight budget times. Throughout her interviews, Shipley regularly referred to the different women in her cohort and talked about the ways she continues to interact and work with them. Shipley and several others from her cohort have advanced professionally, and they have found themselves connecting over their work as campus leaders. It is obvious she is fond of the women from her cohort. As was true prior to the program, she continues to shy away from calling herself a leader. She holds a position of leadership, but she prefers to see herself as a “worker bee.”

McDaniel

Upon completing her bachelor’s degree at UC, McDaniel left the state to get her master’s degree. She worked for a couple of years outside of higher education before returning to the university setting. Over the years, McDaniel has assumed both leadership and management responsibilities and positions within her discipline at UC. In 2005-2006, when she participated in the WILD program, she was a director, and she currently serves as an associate dean and director. McDaniel is White, in her early fifties, married, and has one teenage child.

McDaniel has always been one to take advantage of professional development opportunities, as lifelong learning is very important to her. She spoke of her participation in the program:

Before I did this program, I probably was pretty content with where I was.

Family-wise we were going to be staying in Cincinnati. I had a great boss who let me really run the operation the way I wanted to run it and was supportive of almost anything that I wanted to do within reason if it was going to serve the customer better. So I was in a really good place. I know some of the people that

were in my particular [WILD] class definitely wanted to use this as a springboard to move into leadership or management or more visible positions in the university. I wouldn't say that that was really my motivation for taking it. It was more to improve my own leadership skills.

McDaniel did not choose to participate in an internship because she felt her job was too demanding to be out for a day or half-day each week. She could not imagine how she would pick up extra work through the internship and manage to stay on top of her responsibilities in her office. She noted about the internship experience:

It's overwhelming, but as I look back on it, I think that probably is the key thing for anybody who really aspires to move into a different kind of management or a leadership position at the university. But on the other hand, I was grateful that it wasn't a requirement because there was just no way I could see doing it.

McDaniel is a self-described quiet leader. Throughout her life she has been encouraged and supported in taking on more responsibilities and assuming leadership positions. She presents herself in a steady and confident manner, and she has had some women role models over the years from which she has learned both good and bad lessons.

Poole

Before starting her more than 20-year career at UC, Dr. Poole worked in a medical clinic. She was invited to join the faculty at UC and was instrumental in helping to start an academic program on campus. The undergraduate program then evolved into a graduate program, and eventually a number of programs from across campus all joined

together to create a new college. Poole was a key player in the momentum to build to this centralized college on campus. She commented on the transition:

We moved from west campus to the east campus. We became a center and then a college to put all of these programs under one roof. And so with that came the opportunity to develop bylaws and write a mission statement. We got to create ground up - who are we, what we want to be, what's our mission, what do we stand for - that kind of thinking with an interdisciplinary group of people who really were located in pockets all over the institution, but we didn't have a central home...So we came together as a center. We did all this development.

Poole participated in the WILD program in 2005-2006, the same year as McDaniel. She is also in her early fifties and is White. At the time of the WILD program, she and her husband had three middle- and high school-aged children. She opted to participate in the internship experience and helped the dean in the areas of recruitment, retention, and faculty development. This internship was created at a time when some staffing changes created great need in the dean's office, and Poole was sought out to assist with these responsibilities.

In the time that Poole has been at UC, her department has grown from a single program with three faculty members to 17 full-time faculty. Poole officially serves as the department head, but she has also taken on many of the responsibilities of the associate dean. Given some of the political dynamics and her passion, she has chosen not to take the associate dean position and title. She explained:

I've been very hesitant to be in her [the dean's] office full-time. I like the role that I have as a department head. My department is really very dynamic. I have very

good people and I don't think of myself as anybody's boss. I think of myself as just a facilitator who runs interference and tries to get out of their way so they can do what they need to do. And they do it very well. They all have their own passion. Nobody wants to be anybody else. There's not any of this, "I really think I'm department head because I drew the short straw." I think I have skills and that's allowed me to be successful and help the people in my department be successful.

Hunt

Dr. Hunt teaches in a science department. Her path to and through the higher education system took some twists that surprised her and opened new doors for her. The first in her family to go to college, she paid her own way through and like many women in the 1970s, began as a nursing student. She is white, married to a faculty member who also teaches at UC, and has four children. While in college, a faculty member pointed out her talent and encouraged her to consider the pre-medicine track, and she became open to new possibilities. She took more science classes and, in her senior year, she took physics. She found that she really enjoyed physics and was good at it.

Before finishing her undergraduate degree, Hunt transferred to a larger university where she studied for four more years. While still considered an undergraduate, she aligned herself with the graduate students. She said, "This has been sort of the trick of what I always do. Pretend to be the next level because then you are almost thinking in that direction." She tried to do many things graduate students did, including teaching, conducting research and publishing papers. She graduated with a double degree in physics and astrophysics and then went on for a graduate degree. She was awarded a very

prestigious fellowship that paid her full graduate school tuition. Immediately following her graduate schooling, Hunt was awarded yet another prestigious 3-year, post-doctoral fellowship before joining the faculty at UC.

Given her background and entry into higher education, Hunt believes firmly in the undergraduate experience, and she dedicates a significant amount of her time to working with that population. Recognizing that many first-year students were failing their first physics classes, she created a new opportunity to help better prepare those students for the rigor of the program. She also works with non-traditional aged students who “always wanted to do physics” or who did not know physics was an option when they were originally in school.

In addition to her faculty position, Hunt is the associate editor of a professional journal. Hunt was very clear that there is a timeline for faculty in a research department in terms of what they focus on and when they focus on it. In her mid-to-late forties, Hunt feels she is at the peak of her research years. She commented that faculty in their thirties are really trying to get established in academia and learn the ropes. Faculty in their forties are focused on research and bringing in grant money. She suggested that taking on a department head position was really best left to those in their fifties. She was not opposed to thinking about taking on a leadership position, but that would come for her only after she had maximized her research years.

Hunt participated in the HEC program in 2008-2009. A colleague mentioned the program to her, but she was not really interested at first. She stated:

[The program] still very much seems like it is for people that are going do staff administration positions. It’s definitely trying to create upper level administrators,

and I am still in the prime of my research. The last thing I want to do is take on any more administration than I do now. I'm director of undergraduate studies already, and I've been academic advisor for all of our majors for years. I mean I have a lot of administration I already do.

With some convincing from her department head, Hunt finally applied and was accepted to the program. She believes in professional development, and her participation in the program reminded her that there are best practices available. She said, "One would be an idiot not to know what those are." She speaks fondly of the program and felt she learned valuable lessons, although she is not interested in taking on any additional formal leadership positions right now.

Mason

Having worked outside of higher education professionally for nine years, Mason transitioned from another profession into higher education as the director of a program within a professional school. In her pre-university work, she had worked in recruiting and found she really enjoyed that aspect of her job along with the training and development of new employees. In her director role at UC, she works with graduate students to enhance their professional skills by connecting them with pro bono work that benefits the community and enhances their work experience. Her office helps students explore practical externship experiences and manage employment opportunities.

In addition to a demanding career as an assistant dean, Mason and her husband are raising four young children. An African American woman in her mid-forties, she shared, "I'm really kind of new to the whole women's leadership world. It is a world, especially in higher education." Mason noted that she feels very isolated in her

department that sits on the edge of campus. For several years, she did not see the need to interact with the rest of campus since her school functioned as its own unit. At some point in her career, she started to recognize that she wanted some leadership training. It was then that she became aware of the HEC program and decided to apply. She had noticed some examples of women on campus who had come from professions other than education into the higher education community, and she was curious about how they made the transition. Explaining why she was interested in participating, she said, “Just seeing more models of success because my impression of higher education is that it’s very pedigree-oriented. And I don’t have that set of credentials.”

Mason participated in the HEC program in 2008-2009, and since then, she has served on the selection committee. She began the program out of personal interest, and she took advantage of every opportunity to meet new people and learn new things. While she had some constructive feedback about the program and identified herself as potentially having a different experience of the program than many of the other participants, she felt the program opened some doors for her and helped her make connections with some influential administrators on campus.

Berry

At 31, Berry was the youngest participant of the HEC program. She is White and single. Since completing her undergraduate degree, she has been on a steady leadership path, always looking for the next great opportunity. She started out working in admissions at a nearby university and moved to UC as soon as a position became available and she started working on a master’s degree. After working in admissions at UC for a couple of years, she started to think about her next steps. She was promoted

within admissions, but eventually moved on to work as assistant director and academic advisor in another unit on campus. She spent a couple of years in this role and then was encouraged to apply for an assistant dean position in one of the colleges. She described the position as a “stretch goal.” As she considered the position she said:

I thought, it does sort of blend a lot of these things that I’d been doing through admissions or through [the College], and I feel I have transferrable skills. While this is a step that I wouldn’t have thought that I would’ve been taking at this point in my career, I’m very ambitious. At least I feel that I am. And I am willing to challenge myself. I like that new challenge.

She was offered and accepted the position of assistant dean. Berry currently holds this position, and she continues to think about what her future holds. Always considering the kinds of experiences she needs or how she can get exposure to different functions, Berry had heard of the HEC program early in her tenure at UC but was not eligible to participate at the time. When the dean and associate dean of her college mentioned the program to her, she was excited to apply and “pleasantly surprised” when she was selected.

Berry is trying to figure out her next steps. She is considering whether or not to pursue a doctoral degree and is trying to sort out how women manage upward moving careers with having a family. She is curious and takes advantage of opportunities to learn new things, and she feels fortunate to have had others to encourage her to pursue different opportunities along the way.

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

Defining characteristics of the WILD and HEC programs are presented in this chapter along with commentary from the participants on the benefits and challenges associated with each program. The themes presented in this chapter were drawn from the data. As mentioned in Chapter 3, through the analysis process, codes were grouped if they were similar in nature and major themes were identified. After presenting the themes associated with the research questions, I next explore the impact of the programs' openness to both faculty and staff members and the impact on the participant's sense of confidence. Finally, I discuss the effect of the women-only environment and use of the cohort model.

The research questions guiding this study are:

1. How do alumnae of the women's leadership development programs describe the experience?
2. How does participation in the cohort-based programs for leadership development shape leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations, and career paths of women participants?
3. How did participation in the programs for leadership development provide experiences and opportunities that prepared participants to seek and obtain leadership positions?

Some individuals on campus talked about both the WILD and the HEC programs using the "WILD" name interchangeably—there are, however, two programs with unique goals and structures. As such, I include an in-depth look at how the alumnae of the WILD and HEC programs who participated in this study describe their experiences. Through

their stories and my interpretation of their words, the study participants share what it was like to participate in the program and how participation shaped their professional aspirations and paths. Where possible and helpful, I also include some quotes from other alumnae of the WILD and HEC program. These quotes were garnered from the document reviews.

I present interview data throughout this chapter to illustrate and support the findings. The names of the participants have been changed to protect their privacy. In an effort to identify the primary participants in this study I use the language “participant” or “study participant.” The word “alumnae” is used to denote all women who completed the programs inclusive of the study participants. Additionally, I removed subvocals (e.g., um, uh) and words and phrases such as “like,” “you know,” and “know what I mean” when their removal did not change the meaning of the thought. Finally, I made minor grammatical changes to help data readability.

Outcomes Associated with WILD and HEC

UC established the WILD program, and later the HEC program, to enhance the leadership capacity and skills of UC women faculty and staff. While the structures of the two programs were different, alumnae of both felt they gained personally and professionally from participation in the programs. Table 7 illustrates the key outcomes of the WILD and HEC programs as they relate to the research questions as expressed by the study participants. These include the kind of knowledge acquired, the types of relationships built, what the programs did to prepare participants to seek and obtain leadership positions, and the impact of participation on leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations and career paths pursued.

Table 7
Comparative Features of the WILD and HEC Programs

	WILD	HEC
Knowledge acquired	Campus knowledge; issues in higher education	Leadership skills; self-awareness
Relationship to other participants and speakers	Relationship building and networking	Some networking, but desired more connection
How program prepared participants to seek and obtain leadership positions	Doors opened through relationships and internship	Doors opened through sessions
Impact on leadership efficacy	Provided opportunities to interact with sources of self-efficacy beliefs; no way to determine if there was impact	Provided opportunities to interact with sources of self-efficacy beliefs; no way to determine if there was impact
Impact on career aspirations	Little to no impact	Aspiring more when they applied for the program
Impact on career paths	Participants saw possibilities; some change after WILD	Participants saw options; too soon to tell

As the study participants described their experiences with either the WILD or the HEC program, it became clear that there were differences in how the two programs were experienced and that the impact was different for the participants. The similarities and differences are discussed below. First, however, Table 8 outlines the different program elements, the process or how these components were delivered, and the resulting outcomes.

Table 8
Program Elements and Their Influence on Outcomes

Program Element	Process	Outcome
Career path workshop	Self-reflection	A plan for possible steps to take
Experiential workshops	Mastery experience, practice	Increased self-efficacy, confidence, knowledge
Internship	Mastery experience, practice	Increased self-efficacy, confidence, knowledge
Pre or post workshop meal	Relationship building (WILD) and networking (HEC)	Connection and support from others; knowledge of campus resources (WILD); Learned about possible career moves; understood the context of an institution matters
Senior leaders as presenters of workshops	Exposure to role models	Increased self-efficacy; exposure to key decision-makers

Knowledge Acquired

The study participants who were WILD and HEC program alumnae felt they learned from their experiences. Through participation in the WILD program, the women were well-informed about how the university functioned and were aware of strategies employed by other leaders on campus, while the HEC study participants learned about specific leadership skills and engaged in self-awareness activities. Both experiences proved to be beneficial for the women participants, but in different ways.

Learning more about campus and higher education leadership – WILD.

The topics addressed in the WILD program focused on exposing participants to issues in higher education and to topics specific to UC. Participants learned about the administrative structure and the academic environment at the University. The three participants in this study who were WILD alumnae felt they gained tremendously from learning about the roles different offices and departments played in the overall functioning of the University. Shipley described her experience:

I think that whole process, the WILD Program, opened my eyes to the rest of the university. We had the provost talk. We had people from student affairs talk. I learned so much about the university, and that was a great experience.

In their usual daily experiences, the participants were immersed in their specific responsibilities, and they felt somewhat limited in their scope of knowledge about the functioning of the university outside of their particular functional areas. This exposure to the broader campus was extremely helpful to their professional success. A couple of the study participants commented that learning about other areas of campus served their own departments well because they had broader understandings of campus culture and functions.

Each month, the WILD participants attended a workshop designed to expose them to the leadership of UC, the challenges and opportunities that go hand-in-hand in leading a university, and different styles of leadership. Typically, a panel of leaders would make presentations to the WILD participants. In one session, titled *Decision-Making at UC*, program participants were exposed to the decision-making processes at the provost and dean levels at UC. Several panelists, who were provosts and deans presented and

facilitated the discussion. The *Financial Issues at UC* session was designed to expose participants to an overview of the macro and micro-level financial issues on campus. The *Leadership in Higher Education: Structures, Cultures, and Styles* session presented a variety of leadership structures in higher education and explored the relationships between institutional culture and leadership styles through panelists who shared their personal experiences as UC leaders.

One study participant noted that she learned new approaches to leadership through the workshops, and another said her leadership vocabulary expanded as a result of her participation in the program. The *Visions for Higher Education* session provided participants opportunities to learn about the future of human resources, student services and instructional technology at UC. Other topics presented as part of the workshop series were *Issues in Higher Education* and *A Model of Management and UC History*.

Gaining exposure to departments and divisions other than their own gave participants a greater understanding of and appreciation for how different areas within the University function, how senior administrators make decisions, and how the different areas on campus effect the overall functioning of the university. McDaniel described the value:

A lot of the sessions really gave a lot of insight into different areas of the university that I didn't really know a lot about. So a lot of the sessions were very helpful to me. There were a lot of things that I learned that I just had no idea about. [After the program] I think I was better informed about how things worked at the university and how every piece of the puzzle that makes up the University of Cincinnati [contributes to the whole]. Maybe I don't understand every piece,

but I think just being more aware and better-informed helps you day-to-day make better decisions.

Poole agreed:

I've just gotten really broad exposure to the institution and I know a lot of people, which is amazingly helpful. I've never really analyzed it, but I think it's been a big catalyst for growth and movement in my department because I have a much larger view of how things work and what's strategic to do. So that's a real advantage.

The three WILD alumnae who participated in this study spoke about the value in meeting leaders from across campus and hearing about the inner workings of different functional areas—like a big puzzle coming together piece by piece, and they started to see how their areas of responsibility fit within the larger picture of the University. Each of the women talked about her lack of exposure to areas of the University outside of their particular units prior to the program, so learning about areas such as admissions and marketing, or budget planning and decision-making, proved exceptionally informative. In fact, a couple of the participants noted that being more informed meant they could make better decisions.

One participant commented that she learned a great deal about the campus culture through the WILD program. The experiences the study participants described reinforced what other past participants said about the program. One alumna offered her insight on an evaluation of the program:

I was very impressed with the program. [It] made me understand more of the politics of the university and how to better operate within the university. It was a

great opportunity to be ‘outside the box’ to professionally develop myself, and know I am on the right track.

Another alumna shared, “I appreciated the insight into the university and I am able to understand the importance of my role in the university to protect, to represent and to promote our excellence” (UC, 2002).

Overall, the women felt well-informed and connected as a result of participation in the workshops. Each of them expressed that she gained personally, professionally, and in some cases, for her entire departments simply from better understanding how areas of the University outside of her direct department’s functions. Having this knowledge allowed these women to make more informed decisions and provided them with a network of others from whom to seek counsel and advice.

The progress report from 2001-2002 (UC, 2002) shared alumnae suggestions of topics upon which they recommended the program expand, including work/life balance, institutional integrity, career stages and professional renewal, and leadership lessons from outside UC. Presentations and discussions on these topics were offered to WILD alumnae in some of the years when both the WILD and the HEC programs were being offered consecutively.

Leadership skills were enhanced through the HEC.

HEC participants met monthly and the workshops exposed participants to skills related to leadership in higher education. For example, some of the more popular presentations were made on topics such as team-building, hiring for dispositions, and negotiation skills. The sessions were very practical, and in some cases participants had

opportunities to put to good use the information they learned. Hunt shared her thoughts about the hiring for dispositions session:

It had to do with hiring, and it was an aspect of hiring that I think is completely missing within our department. I don't hire people, but at the same time, I'm big enough now, I'm a full professor, that I can have influence. And if I put the people through these various little – it's not tasks exactly, but it's a way of looking at the applicants in what is incredibly obviously the right way to do it, but I hadn't thought about it that way before. I was totally converted. I totally drank the Kool-Aid on this one, and now we're in the process of hiring!

She learned a valuable way of screening job candidates and was excited to put this new strategy to work. Mason agreed that the hiring for dispositions session was particularly “thought-provoking” and helpful. She added however, that “many of the other topics were just kind of usual suspects.”

The program also included some self-reflection sessions in which participants could personalize the program to their own experiences. The career-mapping session was particularly well-received. In this session, each participant thought about where she was and where she wanted to be professionally. Participants engaged in self-evaluation and then strategized about how to get to where they wanted to be. Each of the three HEC participants in this study commented on the value of this particular session. Interestingly, while Hunt did not think the career mapping exercise was helpful for her or other faculty, she thought about how she might translate the activity to the college women she mentors over the summer:

I help run this summer program for women. This is undergraduate women in science and engineering. I thought, “Wow, this is a great thing to do with the girls.” ...With faculty you become assistant to associate and associate to full and that pretty naturally comes to everybody that doesn't screw up too bad. To most people they're going to make it without even trying, you know. And so it was kind of funny. The only way I would do something in that career-mapping activity that was like an aggressive career move that would lead you to some really high-level thing was to go through administration. But that's not what I do. I'm a researcher, right? So it didn't work. It doesn't work.

Hunt learned a new activity that she could facilitate with her summer program participants and therefore found the workshop to be beneficial. Other participants talked about how the career mapping session was eye-opening for them and a great way to start the program.

Through these workshops, participants carved out time to think purposefully about their career paths, their strengths, and their weaknesses. One of the participants of this study said that through her HEC experience, “I’m much more aware of the implications now of how my job ties into the budget. And that’s been a great learning experience. And certainly the program helped me appreciate now what I’m doing.” The participants of the HEC program commented that some of the sessions were less effective— not because the topics were lacking, but because the presenters did not have engaging styles. Each host campus was responsible for arranging for the meals and scheduling the presenters, and clearly some schools were more successful than others.

Participants learned from other women in the HEC group, too. Berry, the youngest study participant and one of the youngest HEC participants, spoke about the value of learning about different campuses and their cultures:

Obviously each campus has its own culture and what might be true on one campus isn't necessarily true on another. So to hear how the faculty and staff even view what they're going through on one campus versus another campus just really helps broaden your frame of reference.

Overall, the participants of the HEC program felt they benefitted from the experience. They learned about themselves, they were exposed to new ideas, and they learned to think about leadership as a practice. One participant, who was not looking to advance in the short-term, said, "it reminded me again and again, which I shouldn't be surprised by, that no matter what you're doing, there are best practices out there, and you're an idiot not to know what those are."

Summary.

It is clear that the study participants from both the WILD and the HEC programs learned from their experiences and felt they benefitted from this growth. Despite the fact that they learned different things and the structures were quite different, there were some similarities in the processes they went through that led to their learning. For example, in both experiences, the participants learned from the guest presenters and from other program participants. Simply spending time with others in conversation allowed participants to exchange ideas, deepen their understanding, and broaden their views. Participants in both programs had opportunities to learn and think about holding leadership positions. Formally, the programs did not offer workshops designed to teach

participants how to find new opportunities, but through networking and self-reflection, the programs exposed the participants to information that opened doors.

The participants of WILD seemed to gain a much deeper understanding and appreciation for how UC functions. As the women learned more about divisions and departments across campus, the more they understood how each area of the University can affect the other, and how each component makes up the larger institution. The WILD participants also learned about leadership in higher education by hearing directly from some of UC's top leaders. In many ways, the women who participated in WILD were given an insider's look at the leadership of the institution, something they all found invaluable. The sessions they attended were not particularly focused on the traditional way of building leadership skills. Instead, participants learned valuable leadership lessons through the stories told by the presenters of their successes and challenges.

The HEC participants did not learn about UC at all. They took their own experiences at UC and compared them to what they learned about the other participating colleges and universities. The content of the HEC program was geared more toward teaching self-awareness and leadership skills. As mentioned previously, some sessions were more effective than others, but generally, the participants felt they gained from what they learned in the program. They were less advantaged however, than the WILD participants when it came to knowing the culture and key players at UC. The HEC women felt their participation was worthwhile, but when they learned what the WILD program offered that the HEC did not, they expressed their desire to learn more about UC and to establish deeper connections with their cohorts.

Relationship Building and Networking

The women who participated in both versions of the leadership development program spoke about the interactions they had with the other women in their cohorts, the presenters, and the steering committee members. For some, the relationships felt meaningful and long-lasting. For others, the interactions were so brief that they made no real connection. In this section, I explore the nature of the relationships and interactions that occurred as part of WILD and HEC.

Establishing relationships and building a network through WILD.

The participants of the study who were WILD alumnae felt their experiences in the program led to new relationships, and in some cases, to deeper connections with people they knew previously. Connections were made with the other participants of the WILD program and with the presenters of the sessions. The participants tended to describe the connections with other WILD participants as deepening or building “relationships,” while they referred to meeting and interacting with session presenters as “networking.”

The WILD group consisted of about 20 women total, and the group met once or sometimes twice a month depending on the year, which gave the participants opportunities to develop relationships with the other women in the group. Most of the workshop sessions were designed to engage the participants either during the sessions or over meals following the presentations. One of the participants commented on how the relationships she established with other women in the group served her well—even years after the program. She told of a time when some difficult dynamics were playing out in

her office, and she called one of the other WILD participants from her cohort to seek advice and get help in strategizing about how to handle the situation.

Through the workshop sessions, participants had opportunities to meet and learn from different campus administrators as they shared the purposes and their approaches to their work at the University. The women interviewed for this study did not necessarily develop meaningful relationships with the presenters, but they felt that the opportunities to meet so many different people established enough of connections that they could reach out to those individuals and use them as resources in the future. Each of the participants specifically commented on knowing who to contact on campus as a result of the program, or felt that they had expanded networks from which they could seek advice or assistance. Their support networks on campus expanded, and they experienced less isolation as a result of participating in the program, as described by Poole:

Large institutions and I don't think UC is an exception, I think they tend to be pretty autonomous, pretty silo-like. You don't necessarily know what's going on across campus. You're kind of doing your own thing in your own spot with the people that you work with. And so the WILD program gave me and the others who participated an opportunity to meet people from all over campus...and that was very valuable just to have more insight into how the institution works because I think if you have that insight you can be more effective because you know more. And you don't have to know everything you just have to know who to call. I mean that's the network piece. You don't have to know it all yourself.

Shipleigh also commented on how building networks and establishing relationships confirmed that she was not working in isolation:

And I think for me, it was this feeling that I am not alone. That anytime I have a problem, I can go to [insert name], or I can go to the registrar's office, or I can go to my student services center director. It's joint problem solving, which I think is the best thing. It's not up to me to make decisions really, it's how do we jointly work together to make the best decision for the student or to follow whatever policy, that sort of thing. And I think going to WILD gave me an excellent network.

McDaniel commented on the different types of relationships she established through WILD:

I really felt like for me that the two main benefits were networking and getting to know other women in the program. ...Some of the women I knew just in passing before, but I actually got to develop a much stronger relationship with through the program. ...So I think that was one of the strengths, the exposure to not just the other women but interacting with people that I normally would not have ever encountered. ...It's very helpful to have gone through the program because now I know some of the people that I may need to call or interact with.

It is important to note here that the participants felt they had opportunities through this program to engage with individuals from campus whom they would not have otherwise had the opportunity to meet and converse. Given the size of UC, the faculty and staff who participated in the program felt somewhat isolated in their specific areas of work. The WILD program provided an opportunity for the participants to leave their usual work environments and interact with others on campus with whom they had limited or no previous contact. In meeting new people and learning about different functions of the

University, the women felt more like a part of a team, and realized that they could utilize their new connections to their advantage in serving students.

The internship was an experience in which the participants developed connections. Shipley spoke about how she and the other women who were engaged in internships during the same semester met regularly to discuss their experiences. These gatherings were outside of the program; they were something the women established for themselves and found to be very valuable. Shipley said:

What happened in that very first WILD seminar was the other women who did the internships [and I] would meet and talk about our internships. And since that time, those women have been really critical in my work as associate dean. So not only did I learn a little bit about leadership from my internship, but the personal connections that I made with faculty and staff across the university through participating in WILD has served me a million fold. Because a lot of what I have to do deals with relationships with other offices. I would never have met any of them if I hadn't been in WILD. I have loved being in WILD and what it opened up for me in ways I can't even begin to count because it is every day calling this office or that office... But the deeper relationships that I remember came with the people who had done internships.

The alumnae of WILD who participated in this study attribute the open doors and new opportunities to the fact that they established relationships through the program. Whether developing relationships with other WILD participants, mentors from the internship component of the program, or with different speakers who presented workshop sessions, WILD alumnae found great value in interacting with the different people they

had the opportunity to meet. As a result of the program, they felt empowered by knowing more people and having broader networks of professionals with whom to work.

Deeper connections desired by HEC participants.

The women who participated in the HEC program and took part in this study not only had opportunities to meet other participants from UC, they also met women from different colleges and universities in the region. Unfortunately, the once-a-month meetings were too infrequent for the women to establish significant relationships. Also, the seating structure at the meetings did not allow the women to make connections with each other. In fact, the UC participants hardly had the opportunity to get to know each other. One study participant explained:

The way they arranged it, I didn't meet the other UC women very much. When you came [to a meeting], you had assigned tables, and they tended to mix the colleges up pretty good. So it wasn't like a college table of UC people and a table of [another college]. I can see why they did that because they want this cross-college sort of discussion, but I never got to meet any other UC women because they were never in my group. It was kind of interesting. So that was some negative side of it, and I would like to have gotten to know them a little better.

The organizers thought it was a good idea to mix up the tables at each meeting to allow participants to meet as many new people as possible, but there were a couple of inaccurate assumptions about this model. First, this plan assumes that participants from the same school already knew each other, and second, it assumes that people will in fact sit in their assigned seats. Berry commented on the plan:

I think they purposefully put us at tables with people, with women from different institutions, which was nice. Although I did notice that some folks didn't really pay attention to that and would move their nametags around or they would just sit where they wanted to. I thought that was purposeful and some were more eager to network. That was one of my frustrations, the networking was one of my frustrations because I've wanted to know more about what these other people did and be a sponge and get as much of that information as I possibly could.

Mason added her disappointment in not getting to establish meaningful relationships. She said, "I think it is artificial to think you can put people in a room and relationships will take place within three to four meetings. It's just artificial. It's going to take longer." She believes the structure of the program did not allow for real relationship building. As a self-proclaimed extrovert, she talked about going to the meetings and feeling comfortable just introducing herself to others. She was very proactive about trying to establish relationships with others. She stated:

My impression of higher ed is that it's very pedigree oriented, and I don't have that set of credentials. That's probably why I thought, "Well, this might be a way to get to know more people on campus and see what it's like." Just really seeing more models of success.

Given that the structure of the HEC meetings did not really allow for relationship building, the UC participants craved more networking. They recommended that the program coordinators facilitate more mixing and mingling, and perhaps that the program itself last longer than seven sessions. The UC participants desired feeling more connected to campus and to the other participants, and they took matters into their own hands to try

to make something happen. Hunt took the initiative to bring a group together after the formal program concluded. She explained her motivation:

[Name], she's a staff person, and I just thought, "she's intelligent. She's really neat, and she does completely different things than I do." And I said, "Wow, what a neat person to know better." And she seemed to be interested in getting to know the other women, too. There was a woman from [another UC] school, and she was – she turned out to be a fascinating person. She's done a lot of public sort of stuff, and so we said, "Hey, how about if we have lunches once a month?" That's why I tried to get the lunch thing going. I felt as though, "Look, we've got something kind of going here." We've got a group of women that share something in common.

Berry added:

Last year when we finished...we were doing lunches like the first Thursday [of each month]. ...And we opened it up to all of the past participants [of WILD and HEC], which was interesting. And we just had very informal lunches together over in the faculty club.

Unfortunately, these lunch gatherings were unsustainable, as the women got busy with their own work and time became scarce. However, each of the HEC participants interviewed for this study mentioned the lunches as having been a nice way to connect all former WILD and HEC participants, and they would have loved for these gatherings to have continued.

The HEC study participants desired deeper relationship building, and Mason spoke about the value of networking and leveraging those relationships:

The beauty of the program is that it is city-centric, and so it brings in these other players. But if you don't have a similar program intact on your campus, you really can't leverage. I think it's about leveraging now. I'm trying to leverage. I don't know where to go to leverage and I don't think it's clearly – I don't know that there's anywhere I can – I mean, I'm sure the director of the Women's Center can tell me. Or maybe that is how you leverage, by knowing her and staying in touch with [the senior vice president] and some of these other women. Maybe that's how, but I don't know. The points of access aren't as open. It's almost like you have to participate in this in order just to be able to lay eyes on the person to have a 5-minute conversation.

Through this statement, Mason recognized that through the program she met some influential women and made some connections that could prove beneficial. However, she seemed confused as to how to appropriately utilize those connections. She, like the others, felt that networking was valuable to successful leadership, but the program structure did not necessarily facilitate the development of strong networking relationships. Likewise, the HEC program did not teach participants about the culture and structure at UC, so the participants were not any better equipped to navigate the campus systems than before they were exposed to the HEC program.

Summary.

Alumnae of the WILD and HEC programs understood the value in relationship building and networking, but the WILD program offered more opportunities for participants to establish meaningful relationships. Having built a network of people at UC, the WILD participants benefitted daily from the connections they made through the

program. They were able to perform their job responsibilities with greater knowledge about how things work at UC and with a network of people to ask for input or assistance.

The HEC participants did not benefit from the same type of on-campus network. In fact, even after being in the program for five months, participants hardly knew each other because of the structure of how the meetings were conducted. The HEC participants spoke about their desires for more networking and connection, while the WILD participants communicated that they could not have been as successful in their jobs without the relationships they established through the program. As mentioned previously, however, meeting other people and creating networks played a role in helping participants to seek and obtain leadership positions. This was especially true for WILD participants. After completing the program, HEC participants felt that they had broader networks through which to make connections.

Leadership Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy, according to Bandura (1995), refers to one's beliefs about her capacity to manage a particular situation. Leadership self-efficacy, then, refers to one's beliefs in her capacity to be a successful leader. Bandura referred to four primary sources of self-efficacy beliefs, including vicarious experiences or role models, mastery experiences, social persuasion or verbal reinforcement, and psychological and emotional status.

Vicarious experiences or role models refers to the opportunities in which one sees others similar to herself succeed, and then in turn believes that because someone similarly situated or skilled can do it, she must also have the capabilities to master such activities. Having role models whose success can be observed and witnessed can be an influential

factor in one's self-efficacy. Having mastery experiences refers to the acquisition of knowledge and skills (Bandura, 1995). In other words, having opportunities to learn and then practice what has been learned. If one believes she has the knowledge and skills to do something, her self-efficacy will be higher. Social persuasion and verbal reinforcement is simply having others recognize one's capabilities and potential, which can increase self-efficacy. Finally, one's physiological or emotional status has an impact on self-efficacy. Simply put, feeling good about oneself in terms of physical and emotional status will aid in positive self-efficacy.

Neither the WILD program nor the HEC program purposefully spelled out that they were designed with goals of increasing participants' leadership self-efficacy. None of the program administrators or steering committee members talked about this as a goal, however, data from this study suggest that both programs may have played roles in shaping self-efficacy beliefs. The following analysis and stories indicate that participation in the programs did in fact enhance leadership self-efficacy beliefs. In most cases, the participants also had experiences outside of the WILD and HEC programs that likely contributed to their senses of leadership self-efficacy.

Leadership self-efficacy and WILD.

Two of the three study participants who were WILD alumnae displayed reluctance to being called "leaders." When they described some of their work experiences and how they function in their respective offices, they were in fact describing themselves as leaders. But, when asked directly if they saw themselves as leaders, they hesitated. The caution seemed to come from a place of not wanting to take all of the credit for work that was accomplished by a group. The women came across as confident in their work, but

they were also sensitive to the role others played in the accomplishments and did not want to take too much credit. One woman said, “I’ve never really [seen myself as a leader], I guess I must be a leader in some way. That’s a hard one. I’m not as much of a visionary. I’m the worker bee and I like that.”

Another participant shared her reflections:

But I never really thought of myself as a leader, and I never really had a vision of, ‘Oh someday I’m going to be the department head and I’m going to be an associate dean.’ In fact, I hesitate to take on those, not necessarily take on the jobs, but to take on those titles and I have refused to take on that associate dean title even though I’m doing probably three quarters of that job.

This same department head said of her relationship with her colleagues: “I think of myself as just a facilitator who runs interference and tries to get out of their way so they can do what they need to do. And they do it very well.” There is evidence that the participants accept that they perform well and are successful at what they do, but the resistance to the title “leader” is glaring.

Despite the hesitation in taking on the label of leader, the women who participated in the WILD program felt the leadership program exposed them to strong women leaders across campus who served as role models. Having strong role models is one of the experiences that can serve as a source of self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1995). One alumna commented:

What WILD did was really allow me to have a lot more exposure to women in leadership outside [of my functional area.] And, you know, what I’ve observed really since Nancy Zimpher came here as president, there was an entire sea

change in terms of leadership here. A lot more women were promoted or rewarded for their talents and promoted into positions of leadership at the University. And I think it'll be interesting now that we have a male president again to see if that continues, if there's any change at all.

Participants spoke of their personal gains in having different women leaders from across campus speak to their groups about their job functions and their personal philosophies. By having the opportunity to meet and learn from various women leaders, the participants could see possibilities for themselves.

The WILD program sessions were structured so that the participants learned about leadership through hearing from people who hold leadership positions. They learned about power, influence, and pressures as the guest speakers told their stories, but they were not exposed to leadership theories and specific leadership skills. They had exposure to the practicalities of leadership at UC, and those experiences provided opportunities for participants to acquire leadership tools that contributed to their abilities to be successful leaders in their own right. Participants also referred to the program as an experience that motivated them to take on leadership roles, and they felt the program encouraged strategic thinking. Again, connecting to Bandura's (1995) sources of self-efficacy, the structure of the WILD program appears to have provided some opportunities for developing cognitive and behavioral skills in addition to providing participants with opportunities for vicarious experiences.

Finally, the WILD alumnae who were participants in this study were encouraged in their leadership roles by others with whom they worked. Bandura (1995) referred to this source of self-efficacy beliefs as "social persuasion." Others recognized their talents,

and often participants were rewarded with increasing responsibilities and opportunities to advance. This reinforcement clearly influenced their belief in themselves as leaders, even if they were not all comfortable with the related titles and labels. One woman commented on the value of the relationship building and on being sought out for new projects:

I think what happens is people's names sort of surface... I did WILD, then I did [another leadership program], and the Provost knew that I did [those leadership programs]. ...And then you just have more people that are aware of who you are and your name comes to the surface. So I think that's one of the benefits of WILD....[I was asked to represent our office, even without a title] because I had the capability to do that and could go to those meetings and represent us and not make people angry and all that stuff that you have to worry about. It was like go to this one, go to that one, do that one, would you do this one. And you just get to know more and more and more people. And then you just get in their head.

Note that this woman in no way takes credit for being sought out because she is a strong leader; nonetheless, she speaks with confidence and pride about being asked to take on additional responsibilities. This external reinforcement certainly could have played a role in her confidence in her ability to succeed in this leadership capacity.

The alumnae of WILD were exposed to some people and experiences that, according to Bandura (1995), are sources of self-efficacy beliefs. They also were exposed to sources of self-efficacy beliefs outside of the program. The study participants appeared to believe in their capacities to take on leadership roles and be successful even when they resisted the titles. It seems therefore, safe to suggest that the WILD program provided opportunities to positively impact the leadership self-efficacy of the participants.

Possible influences on self-efficacy beliefs – HEC.

The three study participants who experienced the HEC program exhibited some confidence in their leadership abilities when they decided to apply for the program. Two of the three were encouraged to apply by their supervisors or peers. That encouragement was appreciated and reassuring, and potentially had an impact on their leadership self-efficacy. Initially, Berry noted that she thought she might be too junior in her position to be considered for the program, but she was encouraged to apply, and said, “It’s really nice to have that support and encouragement.”

Through the program, participants interacted with the steering committee, which was made up of representatives from each participating university. The HEC participants saw the steering committee members as role models and felt they could learn from them. One participant also considered the other women in the program and the presenters as strong models of women leaders. This exposure to models of women’s leadership served as a potential source of self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1995).

Beyond being encouraged to apply for this leadership program, each of the participants experienced more verbal reinforcement from their colleagues during and following the program. Whether urged to apply for another leadership development program or being the “go-to” person in the office, the study participants received positive reinforcement from others with regard to their abilities to lead. Most of the reinforcement happened separate from the structured program, but there were some opportunities within the program when participants gave each other feedback.

Participants in the HEC program also had mastery experiences, where they practiced different skills to further develop their capacities for success. One example

where this opportunity presented itself was in the negotiations session. As part of this session, the presenter shared different tips on how to negotiate salaries. Hunt recalled her experience with this particular workshop:

Anybody could use a good workshop on negotiating. It was so funny. We got paired into groups, and we were given scenarios where we would read this thing, and they read their thing. They didn't know what was on my sheet, and I didn't know what was on her sheet. We were put in a situation and had to negotiate a deal. So we only know what we have, and they only know what they have, and they don't know what we know, and it was very interesting. What was fascinating about it was the woman I was working with, I was paired with, teaches negotiating. She completely took me to the cleaners, but it was so funny. So, I learned a lot from that experience. See, you could read all this stuff, but it wasn't until I did it that it really sinks in about the importance of this and that and, say, an anchor on salary. And so I think having the activities be a little bit more engaging is better, if possible.

Clearly it was beneficial to her to have that interaction and to practice what she was learning. The other participants also commented on the effectiveness of this session. One added that she wished she had participated in the negotiations sessions before she took her current job.

About half of the HEC sessions included some interactive, hands-on learning activities, and those sessions provided participants with opportunities for mastery experiences. These experiences took place in laboratory settings, but the participants

nonetheless found them beneficial. Mason summed up her thoughts on her self-concept as it related to her readiness to participate in the HEC leadership program:

Going into it thinking that I could go to a next level, participating in it showed me that yes, I can, and gave me a little bit of the here's how. I don't know that I'd lack the belief that I can, it's more how and do I want to.

Summary.

The two programs provided some opportunity for exposure to people and experiences that may impact individuals' beliefs about their abilities as leaders. However, there is no evidence to suggest that participation in either program directly affected the participants' leadership self-efficacy. Simply being exposed to influences on self-efficacy does not translate to enhanced self-efficacy. There are also factors outside of the programs that may have influenced self-efficacy for both WILD and HEC participants.

Career Aspirations

The WILD and HEC participants did not necessarily change their career aspirations as a result of the programs, but they were exposed to new possibilities and given some tools with which to pursue options they may not have known about prior to the programs. Generally, the WILD participants spoke more frequently about having doors opened for them through the relationship building. The two staff members who participated in HEC spoke about knowing they wanted to take steps toward advancing, but not being clear about the "right" steps to take. The faculty member who participated in HEC accepted that she would eventually be in a formal leadership position within her college, but she had a very clearly defined timeline for when that would happen. In other words, participating in the program did not necessarily ignite her motivation to advance.

Instead, the motivation for professional development and upward mobility came from the participants even before they applied for the programs. The programs simply provided forums in which the participants could explore options and develop and enhance their skills.

Doors opened through WILD.

The women who participated in this study did not attribute the changes in their career aspirations directly to their participation in WILD. In fact, none of the three women participants in this study set out to climb the leadership ladder. They participated in the WILD program when they were in their late forties or early fifties, and two of the three were raising children at the time. They did not participate in WILD with the intent to gain skills to move up. Rather, they saw benefit in continuing to develop personally and professionally, and they were open to what may come their way as a result of the program. They noted, however, that through the program they learned of new possibilities in terms of their career options, and they felt doors were opened to them after completing the program.

McDaniel reflected on her career aspirations and her desire to participate in the program:

I probably never aspired in my early days to be where I am now. I know some of the people that were in my particular class definitely wanted to use this as a springboard to move into leadership or management or more visible positions in the University. I wouldn't say that that was really my motivation for taking it. It was more to improve my own leadership skills.

She continued to talk about the impact of the program on her career aspirations and the desires of others:

I really think for people who hadn't been in any kind of a leadership role before, it [the WILD program] really is a motivator. I've talked to a couple of people about that. But I don't think my career aspirations changed at all. [Participating in the program] probably just confirmed them.

Poole and Shipley also spoke about having no aspirations to be deans or department heads or to achieve other leadership roles prior to or during the program. It seems evident that the structure of the WILD program provided opportunities for the women to learn about different advancement options on campus and within the higher education hierarchy, despite the fact that it did not seem to change their aspirations.

Given that the women who participated in WILD were already holding fairly high-level positions, it is logical that many would have participated in WILD simply to enhance their skills and effectiveness in their current roles as opposed to seeking advancement opportunities. Similarly, it is not surprising that some of the women did, in fact, take on additional responsibilities or move to higher positions as they learned about different opportunities within the University.

Looking for next steps after participating in HEC.

One of the HEC participants shared her stream of consciousness as it related to her career aspirations:

As soon as I got the position I was like okay, well, because I'm always thinking about that next thing. Hopefully I can stay here and maybe after three years to five years, reach that promotion and then be there another two, three years or so and

then have that next step. And frankly I'm still debating on what path I want to take.

Like the other staff member who participated in HEC and was interviewed for this study, she knew that she wanted to keep moving up in position title and responsibility, but she was not clear on what those steps would be.

One participant talked about the corporate metaphor of a career "lattice" as opposed to the career ladder. The image of a lattice seemed to resonate with her, but she felt the model in higher education really was still geared toward an upward-focused ladder. Both of these women were the youngest of the participants interviewed for this study, and were by far the most confident in their self-assessments of their desires and abilities to advance. They were less confident though about having the knowledge on how to advance. Berry asked:

Where do you go from here? It's sort of hard to get here but then once you're here, where do you go? And while I am very motivated and I think I've got a strong work ethic and very proactive about things and ambitious. ...I feel like I'm just not sure where I can go from here that makes sense.

She also shared her thoughts about how the HEC program helped her create time to explore her future:

And so it was great to go into the WILD program because that was one of the first things we talked about was career mapping and thinking about where do you want to be in five years? Where do you want to be in 10 years? Try and be as concrete as possible. That's difficult. And especially for the little bit of experience and taste of higher education that I had had, I'm still – I still haven't been exposed to

everything and I'm still trying to learn as much as I possibly can. So it was great to go through that. ...I would say it's definitely strengthened my interest in making sure there is a next step. I don't want to be an assistant dean forever.

Berry also said that she is aware of her transferable skills; she just has to figure out what she wants to do next and determine the steps to get there.

Mason also commented on her transferable skills and how participating in the HEC program helped her see some options at UC that she had not thought about previously:

I think that in terms of career, I now see and understand that there are all these other things that you really can do like getting more closely in line with central administration, maybe doing something in HR, and that I do have very transferable skills. I think that by getting to know more people and gaining more exposure, that will help close the gap between my credentials and the stereotype of what a particular position requires. I think, with that in mind, that I am certainly looking more inward, meaning within the university community, than externally.

Mason, in her mid-forties, was really thinking about next steps. She is in the last 20 years of her professional career and wants to make the best of it. She also acknowledged that she has a family—and her loved ones also matter in her decision-making. She commented on her next career steps:

I gained, I think, a framework for creating this next phase of my career. I think that's my biggest takeaway. On some level, I felt this program was a little more junior than what I really need, but it's an entry point nevertheless. I think there's a

hierarchy, like you can't come in too high. ...I think the program helped me or encouraged me to pursue. And part of it was making perhaps a little more transparent the pathways to leadership. There is a roadmap clearly that was invisible to me before the program.

The two staff who participated in this study differed from the faculty member in terms of career aspirations. Hunt, the faculty member, was clear that she came into higher education to engage in research and she was quite content with what she was doing:

[We did a session on] career mapping it's called, right? But, it was pretty clear that I don't aspire to anything, because the only thing I can aspire to – I'm a full professor now. What else to do? I guess I can become director of a national lab or something like that, but that's administration. I am at my peak now. I have nothing more to – it sounds horrible, like I've come to a dead end. All this work since my nursing school days, but I'm right where I want to be. Maybe I want to take on a bigger [research] group, but anything bigger means less time for research, more administration. And I'm not ready to do that.

She participated in the HEC program at the encouragement of a peer with the acknowledgement that at some point in her career she will likely be the department head. For now, however, she is confident that research is what she needs to be doing. In fact, she outlined a very clear timeline for how research faculty function within the university:

There's sort of this thing that in a research department your thirty-somethings are still kind of young. They're green. They need a lot of support from the department, because they're trying to get their grants going, their research going. The forty-somethings, that is your meat and potatoes. They've got to bring in the

big grants. They've got to be the ones that are leading the vision of the department research-wise. They're the ones that are really the movers and shakers, the barnburners in your group. The fifty-somethings can continue to be that way, but many of them start to drop out. You know, they can't get funding anymore. They're starting to lose a little of their edge. They're not using the most modern methods either mathematically or computationally or whatever it's going to be. And then sometimes the ones that are still aspiring to something will then go into administration.

This clear timeline was reiterated a couple of times in the interviews, and Hunt firmly believed that she will "serve her time in administration" when she feels her research no longer needs to be her focus. She acknowledged that for staff, there is a culture of moving up, but it did not resonate for her as a research faculty member.

Summary.

Participants entered the WILD program to further develop their leadership skills and knowledge and to make connections with others across campus. From their participation, they found themselves more aware of campus partners and the challenges and opportunities campus leaders face. Through conversations spawned by WILD, they felt reassured in their abilities to take on more responsibility and/or move into higher-level positions. There was no formal career-mapping workshop during which participants could engage in self-reflection. Instead, participants were inspired by hearing others' stories and making connections across campus.

In comparison, the participants of the HEC program took part in a career-mapping session in which they purposefully thought about where they wanted to be in 5 or 10

years, mapping out their routes to get there. The staff participants found this to be very valuable, while the research faculty was less enthused. The challenge lay not in identifying some options for where they would like to be professionally, but instead on how to get there. They spoke about not being able to balance their desires for advancement professionally with their desires to have families. The program helped them to see possibilities, and for some, it opened doors. Yet the lack of relationship building seemed to have a negative effect on the confidence the women had about defining specifically what they wanted next and knowing how to achieve those goals.

Career Paths

The WILD program was created originally to advance women in academic and administrative leadership positions at UC by developing their knowledge and understanding of university leadership. The HEC program differs from the original WILD program in that its focus is on offering workshops designed to enhance participants' understanding of higher education and related decision-making processes, and to develop local networks of women in the higher education community. The transition from WILD to HEC meant the focus was no longer to develop UC women for UC leadership, although that was a welcome result.

The steering committee members attempted to keep track of job changes, promotions, and responsibility enhancements for the alumnae of both programs. They also sought to track the retention of the participants, thinking the return on their financial investments in the program would increase the longer the program alumnae continued to serve the University. In the last progress report available at the time of the data collection phase of this research, the steering committee touted that 92 of the 184 WILD and HEC

participants (50%) remained at UC “in vital positions” and that 35 women (19%) had received promotions “to levels such as associate senior vice president, associate and assistant president, associate and assistant dean, treasurer, athletic director and department head” (UC, 2006, p. 4).

The data presented in Chapter 4 suggest that at least during the mid-2000s, women at UC were advancing at greater rates than they were prior to 1999. There is no claim that more women were advancing as a result of the WILD or HEC programs, but the steering committee members clearly felt the program was having a positive impact on the participants and the University.

Responsibilities increased, women moved up as a result of WILD.

One of three WILD participants highlighted in this study was a program coordinator prior to her participation in WILD, and became an associate dean after completing the program. One WILD study participant moved from a director position to an associate dean role, and the third kept the same title of department head, but for all intents and purposes, was doing the job of the associate dean. Each of the three took on more responsibilities post-WILD, and seemed content with their evolving roles and elevated statuses on campus. They felt valued in their departments and were recognized across the University for their skills and talents. While these promotions were not contingent upon completion of WILD, and were not direct results of participation in the program, the steering committee found it encouraging that many alumnae of the program were given opportunities to advance.

Beyond the numbers of women who advanced or assumed increased responsibility after participation in WILD, it was interesting to note that the three study

participants spoke about their promotions and advancement opportunities as happening serendipitously. They were not necessarily looking to advance, but when they were presented with opportunities, they felt honored and humbled. They acknowledged that through participation in the program, they met many people from across campus and they attributed their leadership involvement to having a broader network and more exposure. Even when I spoke with women who participated in HEC, part of the appeal of the program was that they identified “the most powerful women in the entire university” as alumnae of the WILD program.

Too soon to tell if career paths have changed – HEC.

The data in the progress reports and the 2006 Business Plan highlight the number of job promotions on campus, but do not delineate whether individual participants were alumnae of the HEC or WILD programs, so there is no available data on the number of promotions for HEC alumnae specifically. The study participants who were HEC alumnae had recently completed the program and, therefore, did not have any substantial job changes to report. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the staff interviewed for this study said they were encouraged to think about advancement opportunities. Following the program, they continued to think about what they wanted in terms of their future professional positions.

One of the significant challenges for the two staff participants interviewed was imagining how to continue to move up the career ladder (or lattice) and balancing those responsibilities with family and life commitments. This element creates challenges for many working women (LeBlanc, 1993; O’Brien & Janssen, 2005; Rapoport et al., 2002; Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003), yet it was not formally addressed in the HEC workshops,

and it was evident that the younger participants were desperate for help in this area. One woman questioned:

Do I want to go to the next step and at what cost to my family? I don't think I want to end it (my employment) in my current role. So then I start thinking about, 'Well, what will the next thing be – how will it look? And who might know what parts are out there?' And so it's really incumbent upon me now to have those conversations and a part of it, quite honestly, is just where I am in my private life, too, personally. You know, I have four kids nine and under. And so there's the rub. So I've identified and have known for a while the people I should be talking to, whose radars I should be on, and the kinds of activities I need. But at the same time there's a personal cost associated. So, I'm just trying to figure all that out.

At the same time that she was negotiating her familial obligations and interests and her professional desires, this woman was keenly aware of her talents. She wanted to be thoughtful and purposeful about where she looked to go next professionally in that she wanted to be doing the kind of work she enjoyed and to best utilize her skill set. She reflected:

I would like to get into senior administration. I think I'm lazy and I want it to fall down into my lap. Yes and no. But I really see my value as being strategic. So where on campus can you use – where is that skill desired?...How can that skill be used? I'm at the point where I'm not interested in doing a lot of things that don't interest me. I just don't. And so that's the one thing is that I am strategic. I'm fairly adept in consensus building. So where are those talents welcomed?

Again, there were no data on how the HEC program may have shaped the career paths of HEC alumnae, but it was evident that for some, the program provided a jumping off point to think about future steps. The self-reflection activities allowed participants to look introspectively and identify their strengths and interests, and then to use that information in planning for the future. While some of the women felt unsure of the specifics, they also were grateful for the opportunities to explore possibilities.

Summary.

The available data show that some alumnae of the leadership development programs advanced professionally after completing the programs, but it cannot be determined whether they were WILD or HEC alumnae. Additionally, there is no way to prove that the women's advancement was specifically related to their participation in the programs. It is clear, however, that study participants from both programs found the experiences helpful and informative. Some WILD participants attribute their promotions to the knowledge they developed, relationships they made, and skills they displayed through the program. Similarly, some HEC participants felt empowered by the program to determine next steps and take action to get where they want to be professionally.

Other Notable Findings

One concept that originally shaped my study did not emerge as a significant theme when the data were analyzed, and several themes appeared that were unrelated to my research questions. In this section, I present these themes for the purpose of better understanding the experiences of the participants and the features of the program.

A theme that emerged as significant was the unique feature that both UC programs were/are open to faculty and staff. As mentioned previously, most campus-

based leadership development programs are designed either for faculty or for staff, rarely for both groups together. I reflect on this mixed-group experience in this section. The second theme concerns the concept of self-confidence, which is different from leadership self-efficacy. The third theme is participants' responses and reactions to the fact that the program is for women only. Finally, the concept of a cohort-based program is explored.

Value of program being open to faculty and staff.

Each of the study participants found it beneficial to learn with both faculty and staff, regardless of whether they are alumnae of WILD or HEC. They commented that outside of these programs, they have very little opportunity to interact with and understand the work of the other group. Shipley said, "I would never have met any of them [staff] if it had only been a faculty thing. Having faculty and staff together, helps faculty like me understand staff issues and the staff world. I hope you can hear my enthusiasm." The staff participants echoed this sentiment. Berry reflected:

When else am I going to talk to a faculty member in [a different department]?

I'm not going to see her unless I make that attempt. And the insight that she has from a faculty perspective is very different than what my perspective is. I would say that was one of the biggest advantages since we just don't get to mix and mingle necessarily a whole lot. And certainly across campus or across campuses it was very insightful because there are different approaches to how you go about your job. And then obviously each campus has its own culture and what might be true on one campus isn't necessarily true on another. So to hear how the faculty even view what they're going through on one campus versus another campus just

really helps broaden your frame of reference for not only current positions but future positions too.

Several of the study participants talked about the value of leadership training for both faculty and staff, pointing out that the type of role doesn't affect the benefit of learning about leadership. McDaniel said:

Well my guess is for the organizers it created more of a challenge than for me as a participant. It seemed like it was fairly well balanced between faculty and staff. And in my early career I had been a faculty – I had a faculty appointment. And I guess I still do if I ever would go back to that. I was tenured as a library faculty member. So from my perspective it wasn't a problem. Now a faculty member may tell you something differently, I don't know. But I think that the common bond, it really wasn't so much, are you faculty or are you administration or staff? It was really, we're here to learn about leadership. We're interested in leadership. And for many people who hadn't really assumed any kind of a leadership position in the university, it was an opportunity for them to see whether this was really a fit? And I suspect for the faculty that was more of the case.

Poole added:

I think that the descriptors that talked about a leader are kind of common whether you're leading a faculty group or you're leading a group of individuals in particular function at the university. I mean, to me those skills aren't necessarily related to the training that you had as a faculty member per se in your discipline. The skills of being able to manage people, be emotionally intelligent, all that kind of stuff is what's going to help me be successful as a manager or a leader of that

group...and that's where the technical piece comes in of my understanding how the university systems work enough so that I can help troubleshoot if needed. For me, the leadership piece is kind of universal. The exposure to the university was something, which everybody could benefit from. So, I guess I didn't see the differentiation there because our needs were basically the same, in terms of being leaders or being managers or whatever roles we were.

Shipley summed it up:

By having staff members, it was much richer. We're talking now about how we continue to pursue or support women getting into leadership positions. I love the balance of the faculty and staff and those relationships that I made with staff members. I told you I was one with blinders. I only cared about my program and now it's all those other people that make the university run smoothly. And so you know, I don't think faculty really understand what staff do and until you get to meet some of them and interact with them, serve on committees with them, need their help for solving student problems, that sort of thing.

Interestingly, the HEC staff participants felt the program was geared more toward faculty, specifically faculty who may move into administrative roles, while the faculty member thought some aspects of the program were more appropriate for staff.

Regardless, they all appreciated the opportunities to interact with women representing both constituents because it gave them insights into the experiences of the other group they did not have before. The faculty person, Hunt, said:

Staff will say, "Oh, this is an opportunity for professional development." They are so much more used to professional development than faculty. We just – we have

virtually no professional development that's really designed for us that much, but that's because faculty are so bizarre as a group....But staff are different also because the reward system is so different. You can fire staff. You can give raises to staff individually....I like meeting the staff too because I like seeing their view of the world. I think it's a very narrow mind that many faculty have when they just sort of see staff as the hired hands or something. They're not – they're critical to the success, in fact, very critical to the success of the university. But that's a general cultural education that's needed of the faculty.

She went on to talk about the power that staff holds and the significant role staff plays in keeping things running smoothly. She suggested if faculty do not at least respect what staff do, they can “really screw you.”

Confidence.

The literature on women and leadership is rich with data and conclusions suggesting women's self-confidence is an obvious barrier to their success in advancing into leadership positions (Hoyt, 2005; LeBlanc, 1993; McCormick, Tanguma, & Lopez-Foment, 2003; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005). Though not stated as a goal of the program, the UC provost said that WILD was created originally to develop the skills and confidence of the participants (CB, personal communication, March 23, 2010). This prompts some discussion of the level of self-confidence displayed by the study participants. Confidence is related to self-efficacy, but they are not the same. Confidence is broader in scope; it is a general sense someone has about her abilities to succeed. Self-efficacy is one's belief in her capabilities to succeed in a particular situation.

Interestingly, the two WILD participants who were faculty members described their career paths, their professional responsibilities, their work styles, and their successes in their work with guarded confidence. It was clear they felt positively about where they were professionally, and about their skill sets, but they were careful not to come across as over-confident or egotistical. One of them talked about how she leads her department by just doing things naturally. She simply does what seems right to her and she has been successful. The way she talked about it, she gave the impression that she does not consider what she does as leadership. The other said she “just volunteers” to do things, and she alluded to believing that when one volunteers to do something, that is not leadership.

When asked directly if they saw themselves as leaders, these two women hesitated. Poole said:

I'm not sure I describe myself as leader. I guess I've always been a person who has always been willing to pitch in. I've always been a person who kind of had a vision, not necessarily for what other people needed to be doing, but of what I thought. I'm big on not reinventing the wheel. I'm big on “if it's not broken, don't fix it.” But I am always asking, “How can we tweak this and make better, either more efficient, more effective, or both?”

It seems that these two women have some confidence about themselves and they even present positive self-efficacy around their leadership abilities, but they are not comfortable with the titles or labels associated with leaders. In other words, they appear confident that they can do whatever it is that they set out to do, but they do not want the pressure or stigma attached to the titles.

The staff member who participated in WILD owned the title of leader. She expressed a general sense of confidence as well as confidence in her abilities as a leader and in her career path. She was unassuming yet confident. When asked to describe her leadership style, she did not hesitate at all. She appeared to have a strong sense of leadership self-efficacy and a sense of confidence.

The HEC participants, on the other hand, exhibited some confidence in their abilities as professionals. They used words like “visionary,” “strategic thinker,” and “hard worker” to describe themselves. Without hesitation, they described their professional strengths and areas for growth and generally presented themselves with a strong sense of confidence. In addition to having an overall sense of confidence, they seemed to present a positive sense of leadership self-efficacy. There was no avoidance of the titles and labels, and in fact, they appeared to welcome and desire such acknowledgement.

Alumnae quoted in the progress reports also noted the changes in their sense of confidence. One woman announced, “I cannot say enough about the opportunities that I obtained as a result of the workshop. I have had individuals/peers remark on the increase in self confidence that they have seen in me as a result of my experience.” Another added that she is more confident about who she is and what she has to offer. The reports do not indicate whether the women were from WILD or HEC, but it is evident that a number of participants felt their self-confidence increased as a result of participation in the program. Another alumna wrote:

It helped me connect, professionally, and socially, with other budding women leaders at my home institution and others. The semester was revitalizing,

energizing, and a confidence-builder. I feel I am a better leader – enthusiastic and skilled thanks to the program.

One alumna commented that she has approached job interviews with more confidence as a result of her participation in the program. These quotations suggest that many participants of the leadership development programs gained confidence as a result of their experiences.

There were notable age differences between the women who proudly took on leadership roles and titles and those who shied away from them. The younger women tended to be less resistant to defining themselves as leaders. Similarly, the women who tended to avoid the labels were already at higher-level positions and were not necessarily seeking to advance further, whereas other women were still trying to establish themselves professionally and figure out what steps they wanted to take next in climbing the career ladder. These differences may help explain the differing perceptions in how the women described themselves.

Women only.

Most of the women who participated in this study were quick to say they would have gained just as much from the program if it had been mixed-gender as opposed to women-only. Several talked about having never experienced discrimination or bias based on their gender, and some women spoke with concern about being labeled a “fembot” or male-basher. Some of the women felt that men needed leadership training just as much as women, and one woman explained her hesitation with participating in the women-only program:

My generation, I'm like 57, when we first started women's groups in high school, I had this opinion of women's groups, and not a very positive opinion. And I thought oh, this would be, these WILD things would be just women getting together complaining or something like that. I still had that baggage. And I have to tell you that I have a really wonderful colleague, the other associate dean, and he happens to be male. And there is nothing for males. So I'm thinking that when we had the seminars, I'm not sure that we talked as much about women's issues as we talked about leadership. And so it would be nice for people like my colleague to have access to that kind of opportunity too.

Other participants also commented on the lack of leadership training for men and how they could benefit as well:

I think I would've learned a lot if there were men in this program. From my understanding of the history of this program and when it started, UC was not where it may be needed to be in terms of having women in leadership positions. But my goodness, we just had a president, our first female president who certainly was a great role model and example. Regardless of whether or not you agreed with her on everything. I sort of cringe at the idea that we still need to have a women's institute for leadership development in some ways because you would think by now that things would be equal. But I think the benefit, there really still is a benefit because I know pay is not [equal]. It's still not equitable based on what I hear or see from time to time and so I think it's helpful, I think.

Another participant added her thoughts about leadership training for women only, "I'm hesitant about making it always one that's so gender specific. I do think that there are

issues that women have that men don't. But, you know, it would be valuable for guys to have leadership stuff too.”

After further conversation and exploration, almost all of the study participants conceded that there were benefits to the program being for women only, but they were hesitant to outright say that a women-only experience was necessary. One participant suggested that gender really should not be a factor in leadership:

To me it was all about what you choose to do and that whatever you choose to do you can do. And the only thing that's going to limit you is your own self. So I didn't have those [gendered] restrictions even though I grew up in a pretty traditional household. It just never dawned on me. I really think I'm pretty gender neutral. I'm about allowing people to be successful and I don't think it [gender] should matter.

When the participants spoke about why they enjoyed the women-only aspect of the program, they recalled experiences where working in predominantly male-dominated environments did not feel welcoming. One woman described a committee setting where she needed some assistance in identifying the barriers to the group's ability to function:

There are times when I have personally experienced...when I was program chair, my boss actually hired a facilitator to come because I was getting frustrated with how the group was going. That facilitator...would observe our meetings and she would tell me this male only listens when some other male says the idea that you might have said two minutes ago. So that is where I learned about women's and men's interactional style in meetings, some of them. And that helped me become a better program coordinator. So I do see how if you looked at communication

issues, that would be a really great thing to have women separate. On the other hand, I have also been in meetings and workshops where the men take over everything. So maybe women just being in a workshop on their own, there wouldn't be as much opportunity for male domination of conversation. On the other hand, in any kind of group there are women that do that too.

As mentioned previously, each of the women found some value in the all-women experience, but a few of the participants connected at a deeper level with the single gender concept. One participant said:

It was just kind of refreshing to have an organization or a group that I met with regularly that was all women. Because we all tended to share the issues, I would say surrounding balancing work and your regular life; and those were discussions that came up in several of the sessions that were led by women that I'm almost positive would never have happened if had it had been a mixed [gender] group. So I think that women just tend to – I mean having men in the room just complicates things on lots of levels. But you know it was just kind of refreshing. I keep coming back to that word. To have a group where you could go in and just kind of forget about how work had been and then just talk as women about issues that you have in your world here at UC.

Another agreed:

I just felt much more able to be myself about my feelings... I mean, I don't act exactly the same with a group of women as when I'm with all men. I do act differently, not a whole lot. I'm telling a falsification, but it's – you do act a little differently. And I liked it, because women are not afraid to admit that they want

to learn to be better at something. And that whole idea of self-evaluation, I treat that very differently when I'm with a bunch of women than I do if I'm the only woman with a bunch of men. Because the men never will admit that they have any reason for self-evaluation or improvement, and thus by saying that [I need improvement in front of men], I just look like a weak woman. You see what I'm saying? And so that was probably a really neat thing about it. If you did this with just a mix of men and women, it would not be successful for the women. It may be successful for the men, but it would not work for the women.

A different participant also talked about the benefit of having shared experiences that you can only have in a single-gendered experience:

I think the benefit is an assumed commonality of experience. An assumed similarity of obstacles, and therefore, the need to remediate in the same areas, perhaps is unnecessary....I'm really kind of new to the whole women's leadership world. It is a world, especially in higher ed....It's a network. It's a very valuable network. I think you can benefit from it more readily [than if it were mixed gender trainings].

The WILD and HEC programs do not purposefully incorporate discussions on why the leadership training programs are designed for women-only. Some participants have drawn their own conclusions about why this structure works, while others are less clear about the purpose behind the design. All of the participants were ultimately able to verbalize some personal gains or understanding for why the programs were designed for women, but some felt less passionately about gender as a critical dynamic for the program success.

During 2007, the steering committee decided to host a couple of focus groups to re-evaluate the program. Alumnae were asked three primary questions:

1. How has your participation in WILD contributed to your professional development?
2. What skills sets would you like further assistance with?
3. What do you see for the future of WILD?

In the discussion about the future of the program, alumnae suggested that the program remain for women only. Their comments suggested that UC specifically and higher education in general function in a male dominated model and that women continue to have unique needs. The opportunity for networking and creating support among women was invaluable and something the alumnae felt would be compromised in a mixed-gender group.

As the focus group discussion continued, they explored opportunities for men to engage in the program. They concluded that men need to learn how to work with women in leadership, and that they should be part of the conversation around stopping the tenure clock for women faculty on maternity leave. Finally, they suggested that men need to get on board with a changing culture and embrace a women-friendly structure of leadership. From these comments, it seems many participants agreed there was substantial benefit to the women-only model.

Cohort-based model.

In embarking on this research study, I was particularly interested in the role of a cohort group in the leadership development experience for women. Although both UC programs were structured so limited groups of women went through a series of

experiences together, thus as a cohort, the language of a cohort-based model was not used by anyone to describe the experience. The participants, particularly in the WILD program, spoke favorably about the relationships they established, but there did not appear to be significant focus on establishing a sense of cohort among the participants in any given year.

In reviewing the program curricula, there were indications of some teambuilding activities, however, it was clear from my conversations with the past participants and the program administrator that the types of cohort and peer mentoring relationships which helped shape this study were not purposeful parts of the programs. In sharing my preliminary findings with the program administrator, I noted this conclusion. As the program leaders look to build on the experience for the future, they, too, believe it is an important enough concept to build more intentionally into the program.

Research Questions – Summary and Conclusions

Throughout Chapters 4 and 5, quotations from the participants were used to respond to the first research question by capturing how participants experienced and described the WILD and HEC programs. Each of the participants primarily spoke favorably of their experiences, although some HEC participants were left wanting more opportunities to connect with women leaders and aspiring women leaders at UC. The focus and content of the two programs were different, and therefore how the programs were experienced and what participants got out of the programs were unique – each offering its own benefits and challenges.

In sum, the WILD participants tended to develop deeper relationships and enhanced understandings of the way UC operates. These relationships and the knowledge

of multiple functions within the campus led to greater networking, opportunities for cross-campus collaboration, and ultimately more effective and efficient leadership from the participants. The women who participated in internships also found great value in those experiences, and often discovered that the internships provided meaningful opportunities for deeper learning and development of their skills to others. A significant number of alumnae of the WILD program (participants in this study and other alumnae of the program) found themselves in new or enhanced positions after completion of the program.

Participants of the HEC program felt they really missed out on opportunities to network with others from UC. The structure of the program simply did not support the building of meaningful relationships. Despite this challenge, the participants gained valuable insights about themselves and about leadership. They purposefully examined their own strengths and skills and thought about their career aspirations. Unlike the WILD participants, the HEC alumnae were still thinking about what they wanted next professionally, and were actively seeking answers to how to get to that next level. There were some logistical issues with the implementation of the HEC program in that traveling to different campuses created challenges for some participants. Every month they traveled to a new campus, and learning to navigate a different site took extra time and energy. On the flip side, however, some participants enjoyed the opportunities to learn about different campus cultures and used the cross-campus partnerships to broaden their understandings of higher education.

Both experiences proved to be valuable learning opportunities for the participants, and in many ways the two programs complement each other. They were different enough

that someone could have participated in both and had an exceptionally rich experience. In many ways, the HEC program offered more tangible, hands-on leadership skill training, while the WILD program exposed women to UC's higher level functioning. Chapter 6 explores the implications of these two programs on leadership practice, theory, and future research.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Chapter 5 presented the findings for this study with particular attention to the first research question, which asked, “How do alumnae of the women’s leadership development programs describe the experience?” In this concluding chapter, I return to the first research question and also discuss the significant findings related to the second and third research questions. Also, I explain how my research confirms, challenges, or expands what other scholars have found. The limitations of this study and possibilities for expanding this research in the future are also presented. Finally, this chapter concludes with the implications of this study on existing theory and practice.

Major Findings Related to Leadership Self-efficacy, Career Aspirations, and Career Path

The second research question asked, “How does participation in the cohort- based programs for leadership development shape leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations, and career paths of women participants?” Using Bandura’s (1995) theory of self-efficacy as the framework for analysis, the data from this project suggest the study participants from both the WILD and the HEC programs were exposed to conditions that have been shown to influence self-efficacy.

Given that the women who participated in the leadership development programs did so while they continued to work and maintain relationships external to the programs, it would be misleading to claim that the programs themselves were the sole factors that had impact on self-efficacy. In other words, participants were exposed to conditions within the programs and external to the programs that Bandura (1995) would suggest may have influenced their leadership self-efficacy. I have, however, discovered some of

the opportunities to which participants were exposed that likely played a role in their confidence about themselves as leaders.

Alumnae of both programs had some opportunities to have mastery experiences in which they practiced leadership skills that they learned about through some of the workshops. Some of the WILD alumnae did this through participation in internship experiences, and the HEC alumnae did this through structured hands-on learning activities. According to Bandura (1995), mastery experiences are the most influential of the four sources of efficacy. Alumnae of both programs were also exposed to role models, which connects with Bandura's concept of vicarious experiences in which people learn from seeing themselves in others. WILD and HEC alumnae had role models within the program through workshop presenters, their peers in the program, and steering committee members. Not surprisingly, most of the study participants also identified role models they had outside of the program.

Another influence on developing self-efficacy, according to Bandura (1995), is gaining verbal affirmation or support. Most of the study participants received verbal reinforcement from supervisors or peers separate from the programs, and a few suggested they also received this type of validation from their peers in the programs. Lastly, participants of both programs noted that through their participation, they had time to reflect on their careers, their strengths and growth areas. This opportunity for self-reflection is noted as having an impact on one's physiological and affective state (Bandura, 1995).

In sum, the study participants confirmed that elements of the programs which could have influenced leadership self-efficacy were present, and they also were exposed

to equally influential elements external to the programs. I therefore conclude that the programs, while not explicitly naming efficacy as an outcome, contributed to the participants' sense of self-efficacy through exposure to role models and vicarious experiences, the provision of opportunities for mastery experiences, and verbal reinforcement and encouragement. This finding is consistent with the findings related to the development of leadership self-efficacy of the Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) participants (Sloma-Williams et al., 2009) in that the participants are exposed to similar influences in each program.

We know from previous research that what women *believe* they can do has an impact on their career aspirations (Correll, 2004). In other words, if through the program women were exposed to the notion that they can be campus leaders, research suggests they will likely aspire to leadership positions. The participants in this study suggested that their professional aspirations did not change as a result of participation in the programs. Despite this, they learned of new opportunities for professional growth, and they developed confidence in themselves that they were capable of moving to the next level.

The WILD program was originally created in an effort to ready more women for leadership positions at UC, and organizers filled the program with participants who were excited and eager to learn. Some study participants joined the program with aspirations to move up, while others simply looked at the experience as an opportunity for professional development and self-improvement. Although the study participants did not say their aspirations changed after participating in WILD, many of them did in fact take on more responsibility and, in some cases, assumed higher-level positions. The way the program may have shaped career aspirations was through exposing women to a network of other

female leaders on campus, opening doors, and sending a message that women can be campus leaders.

WILD study participants spoke passionately about the relationships they established and how those relationships continue to serve them well in their day-to-day work. They also emphasized how learning about different functions of the University helped them better understand their own work in the context of the larger institution and familiarized them with other areas on campus. These experiences, which may not have changed the participants' career aspirations, certainly shaped their understandings of the University, of higher education, leadership, and the scope of what they might do professionally.

The study participants from the HEC program also said their aspirations did not change. They went into the program knowing they would eventually take on leadership roles, and they wanted to improve their knowledge and skills in order to be most effective. Some participants joined the program because they knew they wanted to advance but were not sure how to move to the next level. The HEC experience helped these women hone their leadership skills, and for some, it reinforced their desire to move up. The career mapping session was particularly valuable in helping the participants think purposefully about where they wanted to be professionally in the future. The program exposed participants to possibilities for future career goals, but those who were unsure of what steps to take next when they started HEC, completed the program with similar questions. The way the program may have shaped career paths for HEC participants was not dissimilar to the way it worked for WILD participants. The exposure to possibilities,

the honing of skills, and the networking opportunities simply confirmed aspirations to advance and may have opened some doors.

In sum, participation in the WILD and HEC programs did not necessarily motivate participants to want to move up as much as it confirmed career aspirations and opened doors for possibilities. The programs provided a place for the participants to explore the possibilities and enhance their skills. Through workshops and relationship building, the women learned about the successes and challenges of other leaders and reflected on their own strengths and desires. The campus leaders who presented workshops served as role models or career referents (Gibson & Lawrence, 2010) from whom the participants could learn. For some of the participants in this study, the programs provided reassurance about their desires to be campus leaders. For others, the networking and relationship building exposed them to interesting possibilities for career advancement opportunities that they had not necessarily considered prior to the program.

Data from the progress reports and the interviews conducted for this study suggest that the WILD program shaped the career paths of alumnae. Although the program did not change participants' career aspirations, many of the WILD alumnae have made career advancements since the time they were in the program. WILD alumnae spoke about taking on more responsibilities in their areas and many had, in fact, assumed higher-level positions.

When the HEC program was instituted, the data became muddled in that the progress reports combined information on advancement of alumnae from both the WILD and the HEC programs. It could not be determined how many of the HEC alumnae experienced changes in their career paths since completion of the program. The HEC

participants of this study had not advanced at the time these data were collected, but that was not surprising given how recently they had participated. Two of the HEC women in this study spoke of their intentions to continue moving up the career ladder and to take on more leadership responsibility. They found the program instrumental in terms of implementing their goals even though they were not sure yet what specific paths they wanted to take.

As stated earlier, this study does not suggest that the women who participated in the leadership development program advanced because of their WILD or HEC experiences, but it is reasonable to conclude that participation in the programs played a role in shaping the career paths for some given the number of women who advanced and the ways they describe their experiences. Whether by confirming desires to move up, gaining exposure to others on campus who may have had positions open, or refining leadership skills, the participants of the programs and the program administrators believe the experiences contributed to the success of women on campus.

Major Findings Related to the Experience

The first research question asked, “How do alumnae of the women’s leadership development programs describe the experience?” The full scope of what the participants said about the programs is presented in Chapter 5, but in this section I offer the study participants’ experiences with the programs as women-only and open to both faculty and staff. The all-female aspect is explored further because the primary assumption when creating the program was that women needed opportunities to develop their leadership skills in forums separate from men. I wanted to give the participants the opportunity to discuss their experiences in this type of environment. The fact that the programs were

open to faculty and staff made these programs unique from other women's leadership development programs, which were typically open to faculty only. Recognizing that faculty and staff have different paths to leadership, I wanted the study participants to share their reflections about their experiences with groups of both faculty and staff.

When asked about the benefits of the program being for women only, participants in the study initially talked about the fact that men also need leadership training and could have benefitted from the program. Their comments implied some concern about being judged for participating in an all-women experience and a genuine desire for both men and women to be exposed to leadership development opportunities. Once they voiced those thoughts, each spoke about the inherent benefits of groups of women learning together. They acknowledged the ways women learn and lead differently from men, and told stories about dynamics that often exist in mixed-gendered groups that reinforce the need for women-only groups. Comments about the women-only dynamic suggested it was beneficial to building trust and creating environments in which women could succeed. Ultimately, the participants were grateful for the all-women experience and found it to be a beneficial structure for learning about themselves and leadership. This finding compliments what Astin and Leland (1991) found about the power of all-female experiences.

Beyond what the participants said about the all-women experience, the results of the programs also suggest that it is indeed a positive environment within which women can learn from each other and together. Connecting to Gilligan's (1982) web versus hierarchy metaphor, the study participants in the WILD program felt more connected and better informed through the relationships they established in the programs. In many ways,

these relationships serve as the “social capital” Eagly and Carli (2007) recommended as a way for women to navigate through the barriers to advancement. The women in this study agreed that their connections served them well in their professional positions.

As a researcher specifically looking at women’s leadership development programs, I was intrigued that there was no discussion within the programs about why the all-female opportunity existed and why it was necessary. Clearly the women who developed the original WILD program knew and understood the need for such a program, but that was never explicitly communicated to the participants. I recommend that this be built into the program curriculum.

The study participants overwhelmingly felt positive about their opportunities to go through the leadership development experience with both faculty and staff. Most of them did not realize that this characteristic of the program is unique. The most significant finding related to this feature of the program was that both faculty and staff participants felt they benefitted from the opportunity to talk with women from the other career paths during the programs. Typically their work did not overlap, so having occasions to talk and exchange ideas helped each see the value in the other. The faculty participants in particular spoke about better understanding staff responsibilities, and staff enjoyed the opportunity to learn with faculty and better understand the demands and concerns they face. There were a few specific workshops that some participants thought were geared more toward one group, either faculty or staff, but generally speaking, both groups found the mix of populations to be a positive aspect of the programs.

Major Findings Related to Obtaining Leadership Positions

The last research question asked, “How did participation in the programs for leadership development provide experiences and opportunities that prepared participants to seek and obtain leadership positions?” As the data presented in Chapter 5 suggested, the primary ways in which the WILD and HEC programs provided such opportunities was through the range of learning experiences provided, and through the relationship building and networking that occurred. These two factors are explored further in this section; the experiences of the WILD participants are compared to those of the HEC participants.

Learning

The WILD program exposed participants to a wealth of information about the University. All of the study participants credited their big picture understanding of the University to the WILD program. LeBlanc (1993) identified the lack of big picture information as a barrier to women’s advancement, so it makes sense that the participants experienced this component of the program favorably. They felt much more connected and in tune with how their individual responsibilities fit in with the larger operation of the institution after participating in WILD. In fact, increasing their knowledge of campus operations and campus resources seemed to play a part in enhancing their self-confidence as well. By being better informed, the study participants felt more confident in their own work. WILD participants attributed some of their success to this increased knowledge. A couple of participants talked about being more successful in their current positions because of knowing other people on campus and knowing more about how different areas function on campus.

The learning that occurred through the WILD program mirrored two of the components that have proven successful in the Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) Program for Women (Richman et al., 2001). The first component touched on business functions, including fiscal planning and budgeting, organizational structure and resource management. The second component covered emerging issues, including topics like information technology, leadership, successful alliances, and organizational planning and assessment. The third component associated with the ELAM program, personal professional development, was not a part of the WILD program, but it was the focus of the HEC program.

For the HEC study participants, the value of the program was in the personal and professional skill development. They learned about specific leadership skills, such as how to hire new staff members or negotiate salaries. They also appreciated the opportunity for self-reflective activities, such as the career mapping exercise. The learning that took place in the program, like that which occurred in the WILD program, contributed to an enhanced sense of confidence for the participants even though the specifics of what was learned were really different. When the HEC participants realized that the WILD program provided participants with an in-depth look at how UC functions, they were disappointed that they, too, did not have that experience. The HEC participants learned great skills, but wished they had learned more about UC's campus because they completed their program without knowing how to access the leadership resources on campus.

A glaring omission for both the WILD and HEC programs was discussion of the challenges associated with balancing a demanding career with family. An oft cited

obstacle for women (Colbeck, 2006; LeBlanc, 1993; Mason, Goulden, & Wolfinger, 2006; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005; Rapoport et al., 2002; Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006), the omission of this topic from the conversations was noticeable. Participants of both programs spoke of the challenges of balancing home and work expectations, and the younger participants in the HEC program directly named that they do not know how to balance it all. Mason, Goulden, and Wolfinger (2006) concluded that “the future holds great promise for both the institution and its faculty” for institutions that push for gender equity and family-friendly initiatives (Mason, Goulden, & Wolfinger, 2006, p. 27). Not only is it important that the issue is discussed in leadership development programs to acknowledge the challenges and identify options, but campuses must also be taking steps to address the challenges.

Relationships

Much of the literature speaks to the value of relationships for women, and the study participants of the WILD and HEC programs also spoke to the importance of establishing and maintaining relationships. Through this study, I learned that the WILD participants had amazing opportunities to develop relationships with the other women in their cohort and with other campus leaders. These relationships were important in contributing to increased self-confidence, success in their careers, and opening doors for advancement. Additionally, having greater networks and knowing whom to call when various issues or concerns arise benefitted the University as well in that it created more efficient and effective administrators.

These findings support the study by Astin and Leland (1991) in which women found that, as a group, they had better ideas, more power, and greater opportunity for

social change. The women in this study, like the women in Astin and Leland's study, recognized the value of working with others as opposed to working alone. These findings also connect with the literature on women's identity development that suggests women learn through relationships and identify themselves in relation to others (Belenky et al., 1986; Gilligan, 1982; Josselson, 1990; Miller, 1991; Surrey, 1991). Finally, the literature on leadership theories suggest collaborative leadership is an effective way women lead (Eagly, 2005; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Rhode, 2003), and this study supports this concept as well.

Although the WILD alumnae had more opportunities to work with others and establish meaningful relationships, the fact that the HEC participants attempted to establish monthly gatherings on campus suggests that they, too, understood the importance of establishing and maintaining relationships. This study supports previous research about the ways women lead and learn in relation to others (Astin & Leland, 1991). Therefore, I conclude that leadership development programs for women should be structured in such a way that participants have ample opportunity to develop meaningful relationships, both one-on-one with other campus leaders or aspiring leaders, and with a cohort group.

Through this study I learned that many women faculty and staff at UC felt isolated in their work. The opportunities to build relationships through the leadership development programs were beneficial to the participants and were also welcome experiences. Participants were not only better informed and had networks of resources upon which to rely, but they also felt less alone in their efforts. This, too, was a valuable outcome of the women's leadership development programs at UC.

Limitations

I engaged in this study to learn about the experiences of the participants of UC's women's leadership development programs and to better understand how participation in the program shaped the lives of those who went through it. Through this research, I uncovered key components of the programs' designs and structures that may serve as models for other campuses. I learned about components of leadership development programs for female faculty and staff that had positive results, however, this program cannot simply be recreated on other campuses. After all, qualitative research is not meant to be generalizable (Stake, 1995) and should not be used to make assumptions about other people, places or programs. Should another campus wish to develop a leadership program for women faculty and staff, the culture and climate of that particular campus must be considered. The University of Cincinnati's former and current women's leadership programs offer valuable lessons and ideas to consider, but the reader will have to determine the transferability of these findings.

At the outset, I intended to look at the WILD program at UC in great depth. Merriam (1998) suggested that a case study can produce "a rich and holistic account of the phenomenon" (p. 41), and I intended to tell the story of the participants' experiences in the program. I discovered that the program changed over the years, even though many people continued to use the WILD name to refer to the newer HEC program. Given the change in the program, which I learned about during my visit to campus for interviews, I adapted this study to accommodate some comparison of the two programs. I gathered significant data and interesting findings from diverse sources, but this study is limited by the fact that I had only six total participants – three WILD alumnae and three HEC

alumnae. Additionally, four of the study participants were faculty or started as faculty, so the voices of traditional student affairs and administrative affairs staff members were not represented well. Undoubtedly, I missed valuable and pertinent stories from participants with whom I did not have the opportunity to meet. Additionally, only one of the participants was a woman of color, and while the literature suggests women of color have unique challenges related to advancement (Turner & Kappes, 2009), having only one participant who could share her experiences was not enough to draw any conclusions about the roles of race or ethnicity in the UC program.

Another limitation is due to the fact that the WILD participants I interviewed participated in the program more than four years prior to this study. As I conducted my interviews, all of the WILD alumnae pulled out their notebooks from the program to help jog their memories about what they did during the program. It is common that people remember positive experiences more favorably over time, so there may have been some unintentional embellishments or exaggerations made with regard to the benefits of the program. On the other side of that argument, however, is that because the women had been out of the program for a few years, it was easier to look at the changes in their professional paths in the time since they participated in the program. Because the HEC participants in this study had only completed the program one year prior to my data collection, it was too soon for them to have experienced significant mobility or changes in responsibilities.

In case study research, the researcher is the primary tool for data collection and analysis (Merriam, 1998). This allowed me to become intimately involved in the construction of meaning around the topic under investigation, and it also meant I carried

into the study my own beliefs about women in leadership and my experiences within higher education. I attempted to control for these limitations created by clarification of my biases and of my role, and by member-checking the data. I also had an external auditor review my codes and theme categories in an effort to ensure that the data told the story I thought I was hearing.

Finally, the data gathered for this study were collected through individual interviews, a focus group, and document reviews. Unfortunately, there was not good documentation about the history of the WILD program, and the initial and only full-time person who served as the director of the program was not available to help inform the study. The poor documentation and the confusion due to campus constituents using the name WILD in reference to both the WILD and HEC programs complicated my ability to distinguish between the two programs in some cases. Specifically, the progress reports do not delineate between the two programs with regard to the promotions that have occurred for alumnae of the programs. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether alumnae of the HEC program have advanced in any significant numbers. Similarly, the progress reports include quotations from past participants, but they are not cited in a way that credits individual quotations to WILD or HEC participants.

Future Research

One finding of this study related to the confidence of the participants in their leadership abilities. While most of the women presented themselves with confidence about what they had done professionally, what they were doing, and their potential, two of the oldest and highest ranking participants were reticent to be called leaders, and they were quick to attribute their success to the help of others. I am not clear as to the reason

for the hesitation—it spawns more questions about the meaning some women attach to the title “leader,” about the potential interpretations associated with taking on the label “leader,” and about the implications for oneself and others when one takes on the title of “leader.” I wonder what role, if any, the age or generational influences of the participants has to do with their willingness to take on the label “leader.” Or does the professional ranking of the participants play a role?

With regard to women crediting others for their successes, the findings in this study confirm what other studies have shown as well (McCormick et al., 2003), and unfortunately this behavior contributes little to one’s self-efficacy. Some of the explanation for the reluctance to take on the title of leader may be due to the way some women have constructed the meaning of the word “leader.” Perhaps when they think about what a leader looks like or how a leader operates, their images do not fit how they see themselves. More research in this area is needed to better understand this complex issue.

Another area for further investigation relates to the career aspirations of professional women. From this study, it appeared that the younger, more junior level professionals wanted to move up the career ladder. Was this difference due to the fact that they potentially have more time to make career moves (speaking to their ages), because they have more opportunities in which to advance (speaking to their professional ranks), or because they are of a generation where possibilities for women are more expansive than what was available for women of previous generations? Further research in this area will better explain the differences in motivation for career advancement.

Much research has been done to expose the barriers and challenges to women's advancement (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Carli & Eagly, 2007; Hoyt, 2005; Kellerman, 2003; Kellerman & Rhode, 2007; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005; Rhode, 2003) and in recent years, there have been books published sharing the success stories of high-ranking women in a variety of fields (Kellerman & Rhode, 2007; Madsen, 2008). What seems to be missing, however, is a meaningful discussion about how women who have broken through the glass ceiling and hold senior leadership positions are able to create change from the top to the very systems and structures that help build these barriers. In other words, when women achieve senior positions, are they able to dismantle some of the barriers, or are they too busy trying to "prove themselves?" More research is needed in this area.

Implications for Theory

The findings from this study confirm what others have found in terms of how women often learn and lead in a relational manner. Working with others and understanding how one's work connects with others creates a dynamic where women usually feel more knowledgeable and confident. Simply put, the women in this study who developed meaningful relationships named those relationships as central to their success, and the women who felt they did not get enough networking and relationship building out of the program named it as a glaring omission from the experience.

While this study intended to expand the literature about peer mentoring, the programs under investigation were not purposeful about creating peer-mentoring relationships and this was not a goal of the programs. Nonetheless, I believe the relationship-building that occurred through the WILD program allowed the women to

serve as peer mentors to each other, particularly for the participants who completed internships. As mentioned above, the women in WILD established meaningful relationships that they continue to call upon today. The women did not use the language of peer mentoring, but they agreed that they utilize their networks as informal peer mentors.

Implications for Practice

This project has implications for higher education, and potentially for other fields where women are disproportionately underrepresented in leadership positions. In my summary, there is much to learn from UC on how to create a leadership development program for women that develops their knowledge, skills, and confidence. As a result of this study, I believe there is great promise in creating purposeful learning opportunities for women seeking to advance on individual campuses. I believe there is potential that this model may also work in other contexts as well.

Implications for Individual Campuses

Previous research suggests there are steps individual campuses can have an impact gender equity by creating commissions, changing policies, developing programs, and dedicating spaces for research on and support for women in higher education (Bornstein, 2008; Sagaria & Van Horn, 2007). Additionally, having women serve in senior level positions can legitimize the idea of women as leaders and it can play a significant role in changing the campus culture around women and leadership.

This study suggests that leadership development programs for women provide benefits for individual campuses and participants. Campus-based programs also give universities a good place to start. Unlike sending women to state or national leadership

conferences, campus-based programs allow participants to create support networks of colleagues at their own institutions. Additionally, there is tremendous potential for participants to learn in-depth information about their own campuses, which helps build more informed and better connected employees. This dynamic may also, in turn, lead to more campus efficiency and job satisfaction.

As mentioned previously, HEC and WILD offer valuable experiences for women participants, and both serve as strong models for other campuses. First, because HEC is a more skill-based, self-reflection type program, it would serve as an entry-level type program for women who want to develop their leadership skills. Expanding one's leadership skills and doing introspective work is beneficial for women at any level of a hierarchy. The bigger picture and more in-depth look at the functions within the university—the WILD program—may be better suited for mid-level women and those striving to hold senior level positions. I believe these two structures complement each other well, and the entry-level program serves as a nice stepping stone for the next program. Given some of the challenges UC program leaders experienced with feeling like they “tapped out” the qualified women for the WILD program, these two programs could be offered in alternative years so as to continually create a developmental experience and pipeline for the programs and for leadership positions.

Campuses wishing to institute a leadership development program for women can learn from the challenges and successes of UC. In particular, recognizing the tremendous gain the WILD participants experienced by establishing meaningful relationships and the missed opportunity to do this in the HEC program, schools wishing to develop a program should purposefully create opportunities for the participants to get to know each other.

Complementing Bornstein's (2008) recommendation that women have opportunities for training, mentors, visibility, and support networks, this study confirms that these are important ways to "unclog" the pipeline to leadership for women.

As mentioned previously, consistent, on-going meetings alone will not guarantee relationship building. The organizers of the program must purposefully create opportunities for participants to establish and build relationships with the other women in the group. This may be accomplished in a number of ways including having purposeful team building activities and workshops, structuring the workshops and discussions in ways that encourage personal sharing, ensuring the group meets at least once a month over the course of a year, creating smaller peer-mentoring groups that meet beyond the formal meeting times, or offering opportunities for women in the group to connect informally between the formal meeting times. Recognizing that participants in programs like this will likely be very busy, it is important to have meeting times organized and scheduled in advance so participants know ahead of time what is expected.

Through the study of the UC programs, it became evident that there were two significant conversations missing from the curricula—a discussion about why the original program was designed for women only and a discussion about the challenges of balancing work, family and life. Campuses considering starting programs should find ways to have conversations with the participants about these two important dynamics. With regard to the women-only aspect, if campuses are looking to create programs for women specifically, they likely have good reasons for doing so. Participants should understand this dynamic, even if they do not think they have been victim to discrimination or faced barriers based on gender. This is important because many people

do not understand why women need such opportunities. If the participants in the program cannot explain why it is needed, there is greater threat to being able to maintain such programs. Based on the literature, there is still a need for all-women experiences, and people must understand the need in order to support it.

In terms of the conversation about work, family, and life balance, this too is an often cited dynamic that makes advancement challenging for women (Colbeck, 2006; Glazer-Raymo, 2008; LeBlanc, 1993; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005; Mason et al., 2006; Rapoport et al., 2002; Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006).

Because this is a challenge for so many women, it needs to be discussed in realistic, up-front ways. Women need to hear from other women who have found ways to balance family and upward mobility at work, and they also need to hear honest reflections about the success and the struggles with the issue. They need to hear from women who have chosen advancement in their careers over family, and vice versa. Younger women in particular have been surrounded by messages that they can do anything they want. These women believe it, but then when they confront situations that force them to choose one path or another, they are overwhelmed and may feel like failures for not being able to do it all.

Several participants of this study and some of the women who responded to evaluations about the UC programs recommended having "homework" assignments that participants work on between the formal meetings. They felt that having work to do outside of attending meetings would keep them more actively engaged in the leadership development experience and would continue their learning. Some participants suggested the incorporation of reading assignments or interviews with campus leaders as options for

engagement outside of the meetings. Some campuses might consider the “homework” assignments be done in small groups as a way to continue to build relationships.

As institutions consider developing leadership development opportunities for women on campus, institutional size, context, culture, and mission must be considered. Some of the program elements that worked at UC may have been successful because of the size of the institution. For example, UC is a large university and the size contributed to the fact that many work in silos within their departments. A smaller institution may more easily foster relationships across departments and therefore need less time allotted during a program for participants to get to know each other.

Similarly, the context and culture of an institution can greatly impact the delivery and reception of a leadership development program for women. On some campuses, women may feel more freedom to connect with other participants and share openly their own challenges and successes if they are not going through the program with other women in their department or division. Each campus’ unique dynamics must be taken into consideration when designing and implementing a program.

Implications for Higher Education

If institutions of higher education want their senior leadership to more accurately reflect the population of students pursuing degrees, we must pay attention to the developmental opportunities we are providing women at a myriad of levels, including graduate students, entry and mid-level professionals, and faculty members. Creating purposeful leadership development experiences for women cannot alone change campus cultures, but it helps, and it sends a powerful message about an institution’s values. Through such experiences, women may develop relationships and networks that will

serve them well professionally and personally. We know that as women feel more connected and informed, they are better equipped to do their jobs and are more confident in their roles.

In addition, institutions need to find ways to connect with male leaders on campus to be sure they begin to understand why both men and women benefit from women-only leadership development experiences. Men can and should be partners in this effort (Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000)—they are supervisors and coworkers, so it follows that if they are partners in supporting the representation and development of women in senior leadership, we will see faster results. We need partners to help promote leadership development opportunities and to help change the campus structures that continue to create barriers for women's success.

Conclusions

Women continue to be under-represented in senior leadership positions on college and university campuses (NCES, 2008, 2009). Based on my research, I believe that the WILD and HEC programs offer value to other campuses trying to support women leaders. While the two programs took different approaches in terms of content and structure, they both yielded valuable learning for the participants.

In particular, I believe the HEC program can serve as a model for an introductory leadership development experience. The content, which focused mostly on personal self-reflection and skill development, would benefit women at any level of an organization. My recommendation would be to offer junior-level faculty and staff this type of workshop, followed by a program modeled after the WILD program for mid-level faculty and staff who aspire to move into more senior positions.

The concept of having the program open to both faculty and staff appeared to have more benefits than drawbacks, so I would recommend that administrators consider the dynamics on their own campuses in determining the model and target participants. With regard to the relationship-building and duration of the program, it is imperative that the participants have the opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with the others in the group. With purposeful attention to networking or establishing a sense of the cohort, the curriculum of a program can assist in the relationship building.

UC has reaped great benefit from its efforts to develop women leaders—program alumnae have enjoyed personal benefits and have also given back to UC in countless ways. Campuses across the country can learn much from the University of Cincinnati.

APPENDIX A: SOLICITATION LETTER TO EXPERT NOMINATORS

Date

Dear:

I am currently the Acting Director of Student Life at the University of Maryland Baltimore County, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counseling and Personnel Services Administration program at the University of Maryland, College Park. I am preparing to conduct my dissertation research on a cohort-based model of leadership development for women faculty and staff at a particular university.

I am writing you to ask for your assistance in identifying campus programs for me to consider for this case study research. As an established professional in higher education with connections to and knowledge about women's programs specifically, I am hopeful that you may be aware of programs that meet the following criteria:

1. The program has been in existence for at least three years,
2. The program is open to both faculty and staff,
3. A cohort of women go through a series of activities and exercises together,
4. The program is designed to be at least one semester in duration, and
5. Some of the women who participated in the program have advanced to higher positions since participating.

I believe there are valuable lessons to be learned from women participants of such programs. Through a case study analysis, I will explore the experiences of a cohort-based model of leadership development, and I will seek to understand how participation in such a program shaped the leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations and career paths of the women participants. Finally, I will learn about the opportunities the program may have offered to prepare women to seek and obtain higher positions.

Please email your recommendations to calizo@umbc.edu or call me at 410-455-1754. If you have questions regarding this study, feel free to contact me or my advisor, Dr. Susan Komives at 301-405-2870 or komives@umd.edu. This study has received human subjects approval through the University of Maryland, IRB # 08-xxxx.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.

Lee Hawthorne Calizo

APPENDIX B: LETTER TO PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS
(PAST PARTICIPANTS OF THE PROGRAM)

Date

Dear Women's Institute for Leadership Development member,

I am a doctoral candidate in the Counseling and Personnel Services program at the University of Maryland, College Park and a college administrator for over 10 years. I am preparing to conduct my dissertation research on a cohort-based model of leadership development for women faculty and staff.

The WILD program at the University of Cincinnati is the focus of my research, and I have been in contact with Dr. XXXXX, the program coordinator to learn more about the program and to identify possible participants for my study. She gave me your name as a past participant who is interested and willing to participate in my study.

I would like to invite you to participate in my study. The leadership development program at the University of Cincinnati is quite unique. I have identified very few programs in the United States that are structured like the one in which you participated. Through a case study analysis, I want to explore your experience in a cohort-based model of leadership development and understand how participation in such a program shaped the leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations and career paths of the participants.

Over the course of the next year, I am planning to meet with past participants of the program, the program coordinator, members of the senior leadership team at the University of Cincinnati, and with your approval your supervisor at the time that you participated in the program. Although your participation in this study is optional, I believe your story along with others will provide valuable insight for other campuses and higher education professionals seeking to support the advancement of women.

Identifying Primary Participants:

In the coming weeks, I plan to select a primary group of participants with whom I will meet on my first visit to Cincinnati on December 8, 9, and 10, for about an hour and a half each. Below are a few questions that will help me determine which women to invite to be in the primary participant group. Please take 5 minutes to respond to these questions by *Friday, November 13*.

Focus Group:

During my second visit to campus, I will meet again with primary participants for about an hour and half and then with all of you in a focus group to verify that I am identifying themes that resonate across participants and/or to identify additional themes that I need to explore further. Overall, I expect participation for primary participants to require about 6 to 8 hours of time over the next 8 to 10 months. Focus group participation will require about 3-5 hours of time.

Attached you will find the informed consent form that explains the specifics of how I plan to conduct this research and how the data I collect will be handled. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns about this study. Should you agree to participate in the study, I need you to sign the consent form and return it to me by *Friday, November 13*. You may fax it to me at [410-455-1097](tel:410-455-1097) or scan it and email it to me at calizo@umbc.edu.

Sincerely,

Lee Hawthorne Calizo

Questions - Please email your responses to me by Friday, Nov. 13.

1. In what year did you participate in WILD?
2. How many women were in your cohort?
3. What is your race/ethnicity?
4. What is your age?
5. During the time of your participation in WILD, were you married, partnered, or single?
6. During the time of your participation in WILD, did you have children?
If yes, how many and what age(s)?
7. What was your job title when you joined the WILD program and in what department did you work?
8. Have you changed positions since participating in the WILD program?
Please describe.
9. Are you aware of any women in your cohort who had strong views/reactions the program that may be different from your own views and reactions? In other words, are there opinions of the WILD program that differ from yours that I should be sure to hear?
10. Are you available to meet with me for about an hour and half during my visit on Dec 8, 9, 10?

APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Page 1 of 3

Initials _____ Date _____

Project Title	A CASE ANALYSIS OF A COHORT-BASED WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
INVESTIGATOR	Lee Hawthorne Calizo, Graduate Researcher at the University of Maryland, College Park and Acting Director of Student Life at the University of Maryland Baltimore County; 410-455-1754; calizo@umbc.edu
WHY IS THIS RESEARCH BEING DONE?	<p>The purpose of this research project is to explore the experiences of a cohort-based model of leadership development and understand how participation in such a program shaped the leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations and career paths of the participants. Additionally, the research is being conducted to learn about the opportunities the program may have offered to prepare participants to seek and obtain higher positions.</p> <p>You are invited to participate in this research project because you _____. (one of four roles will be filled in here):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. participated in the leadership development program in XX years and can share your personal experiences. 2. are the program coordinator and can provide information to me about the logistics of running the program, the goals of the program and access to participants and written materials about the program. 3. supervised a program participant and may provide valuable insight into how the program shaped your supervisee's work experience. 4. are a senior staff member at UC and can share what you know of the leadership development program and its impact on campus.
What will I be asked to do?	As a participant in this study, you will be interviewed two/one times by the researcher for approximately an hour and a half each time. Interviews will take place on the UC campus and/or by phone. Interviews will be audio taped and transcribed with your permission. You may be asked to provide the researcher with documents for review including program descriptions and marketing materials, program goals and schedule, and assessment/evaluations of the program.

Initials _____ Date _____

<p>What about confidentiality?</p>	<p>For the purposes of the researcher's dissertation, the name of the institution and participants will be kept confidential. Pseudonyms will be used to protect the identity of the institution and participants. Data will be maintained on jump drives and in locked filing cabinets and will only be accessible to the researcher.</p> <p>For possible follow-up articles, the program director will have the authority to determine whether or not the program and institution can be named, but the researcher will do everything possible to protect the identity of the participants.</p>
<p>What are the risks of this research?</p>	<p>There are no known risks associated with participating in this research project.</p>
<p>What are the benefits of this research?</p>	<p>This research is not designed to help you personally, but the results may help the investigator learn more about cohort models of leadership development for women. Hopefully, other women seeking to advance might benefit from this study through improved understanding of possible options for leadership development experiences.</p>
<p>Do I have to be in this research? May I stop participating at any time?</p>	<p>Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you decide to participate in this research, you may stop participating at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized in any way.</p>
<p>What if I have questions?</p>	<p>This research is being conducted by Lee Calizo at the University of Maryland, College Park under the advisement of Dr. Susan R. Komives. If you have any questions about the research study itself, please contact Lee at: 410-455-1754 or calizo@umbc.edu or Susan at 301-405-2870 or komives@umd.edu.</p> <p>If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact: Institutional Review Board Office, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742; (e-mail) irb@deans.umd.edu; (telephone) 301-405-0678</p> <p>This research has been reviewed according to the University of Maryland, College Park IRB procedures for research involving human subjects.</p>
<p>Statement of Age of Subject and Consent</p>	<p>Your signature indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - you are at least 18 years of age; - the research has been explained to you; - your questions have been fully answered; and - you freely and voluntarily choose to participate in this research project.

Page 3 of 3

Initials _____ Date _____

<p>Please, check the box appropriate regarding the use of recording instruments during the research:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I give permission to record my interviews (audio) for the sole purpose of allowing the researcher to have access to our conversations at a later point for transcription and/or clarification.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, I do not give permission to record my interviews (audio).</p>
<p>Printed Name</p>	
<p>Signature</p>	
<p>Email Address</p>	
<p>Phone Number</p>	
<p>Date</p>	

APPENDIX D: LETTER TO PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS
(SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS/PAST SUPERVISORS)

Date

Dear Senior Administrator or Past Supervisor of Program Participant:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Counseling and Personnel Services Administration program at the University of Maryland, College Park, and I am preparing to conduct my dissertation research on a cohort-based model of leadership development for women faculty and staff. The women's leadership development program at the University of Cincinnati is the focus of my research, and I have been in contact with XXX, the program coordinator to learn more about the program and to identify possible participants for my study. Your name was given to me by XXX.

I would like to tell you about my research interests and the questions I am seeking to answer, and invite you to participate in my study. To begin, the leadership development program at the University of Cincinnati is quite unique. I have identified fewer than xx programs in the United States that are structured like the one in which you participated. However, based on my knowledge and understanding of women's learning and leadership styles, I believe there is much to learn from the program on your campus. Through a case study analysis, I want to explore the benefits and drawbacks of a cohort-based model of leadership development and understand how participation in such a program shaped the leadership self-efficacy, career aspirations and career paths of the participants. Finally, I want to learn about the opportunities the program may have offered to prepare participants to seek and obtain higher positions.

Over the course of the next year, I am planning to meet with past participants of the program, the program coordinator(s), members of the senior leadership team at UC, and with the supervisors of the past participants (with participants' permission). While your participation in this study is optional, I believe you will provide valuable insight into the program for other campuses and higher education professionals seeking to support the advancement of women.

Attached you will find the informed consent form that explains the specifics of how I plan to conduct this research and how the data I collect will be handled. I anticipate needing to meet with you for about an hour and half during one of my visits to campus.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns about this study. Should you agree to participate in the study, I need you to sign the consent form and mail it to me by xxxxx.

Sincerely,
Lee Hawthorne Calizo

APPENDIX E: DOCUMENT REVIEW FORM

Document title: _____

Date document received: _____ Document number: _____

Type of document:

Marketing Article Report Evaluation Other _____

Description of document: _____

Date document was written: _____

Author(s): _____

Intended audience: _____

How disseminated: _____

Why document was created:

Summary of contents:

Key learning from documents:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

(Miles & Huberman, 1994)

APPENDIX F: QUESTIONS GUIDING MEETINGS WITH PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR(S)

Pre-Visit Topics for Discussion

- Validate that the program meets my study criteria
- Share an overview of my research, what I want to do and why
- What I will do with the results of my study
- Names and contact information for past participants/supervisors/senior administrators
- Acquire documents for document review (promotional/marketing materials, evaluations/assessments, readings or activities participants use, etc.)
- How to gain access to campus

First Visit - (questions may be altered depending on what I learn about the program prior to my visit). Need to first establish relationship with the program administrator(s) by sharing information about myself and my interests.

1. What is your role in designing and implementing the program?
2. What is your educational/professional background?
3. When and why was the program created? Who started the program?
4. How has the program changed since it was started?
5. How are participants selected to participate in the program? (selection process – application, invitation; how cohort group is put together)
6. What role does diversity of participants play in selection of participants?
7. What is the role of the cohort group in this leadership development experience?
8. Are you familiar with the term peer mentoring? If no, explain. If yes, do you think the program is structured in a way that peer mentoring occurs?
9. How widespread on campus is knowledge and familiarity with the program?
10. What is the budget for the program? What resources does the University commit to the program?
11. What evaluations and assessments of the program have been conducted on this leadership development experience?
12. What advice would you give me before I begin interviewing past participants of the program?

Second Visit

1. Follow up questions based on my reading of first set of transcripts/interviews with past participants.
2. What do you see as the greatest strengths of this program?
3. What are the greatest successes of the program?
4. Do you believe this program could serve as a model for other campuses? Why or why not.
5. What advice might you offer other campuses seeking to start a cohort-based program on their own campus?

APPENDIX G: QUESTIONS GUIDING MEETINGS WITH PAST PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

First Visit - (questions may be altered depending on what I learn about the program prior to my visit). I need to first establish relationship/build trust with the past program participants by sharing information about myself and my interests and getting to know them.

- Share my professional and educational background
 - Share my research interests and how I came to want to study this
1. What is your educational and professional background? (ask for resume)
 2. What did you know about the program before you applied/were selected?
 3. How did you know this about the program?
 4. Why did you want to participate in the program?
 5. Prior to starting the program, what was your professional position?
 6. Prior to starting the program, what were your career aspirations?
 7. What was your relationship to the other women in the group prior to beginning the program?
 8. What is the role of the cohort group in this leadership development experience?
 9. Tell me about your experience with your cohort group. (If applicable) How was cohesion built amongst the cohort group?
 10. Did peer mentoring occur in the program?
 11. What role did diversity play in the cohort?
 12. How did other aspects of your identity, other than your sex, influence your involvement and experience in the program?
 13. How did the cohort relationships facilitate your career advancement?
 14. What did you do as a participant in the program? Summarize the experience for me.
 15. How much did you get to shape your experiences in this program?
 16. Which activities do you think were most helpful in your development as a leader?
 17. What if changed would have made this a better experience?

Ask for permission to speak with their supervisors at the time they participated in the program.

Second Interview

1. Follow up with any questions after reviewing Interview One notes
2. What experience(s) during the program led you to want or reject pursuing leadership positions?
3. What was most valuable to you about the program?
4. What were the limitations or problems with the program?
5. When you were participating in the program, how did your supervisor support or not support your participation?

6. When you were participating in the program, what do you think others not in the program thought about the program?
7. What other leadership development experiences have you participated in?
8. How did participation in the program change what you do?
9. What barriers do you see in women becoming senior leaders in higher education?
10. What if any, relationship do you have to your cohort group today?
11. Upon completion of the program, what were your career aspirations?
12. What has been your career path since participating?

Questions adapted from O'Brien and Janssen (2005)

APPENDIX H: QUESTIONS GUIDING MEETINGS
WITH SUPERVISORS OF PAST PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

On Second Visit - (questions may be altered depending on what I learn about the program during my first visit).

- Share my professional and educational background
- Share my research interests and how I came to want to study this
 1. What do you know about the women' leadership program?
 2. What did you know about the program prior to XXX's participation?
 3. Throughout XXX's participation in the program, what was your role and/or involvement?
 4. Would you/do you encourage other women to participate in the program?
 5. What do you think are the greatest outcomes of the leadership program?
 6. How do you think participation in the program influenced XXX?
 7. What barriers do you see in women becoming senior leaders in higher education?

Questions Guiding Meetings with Senior Leadership Team Members

On Second Visit - (questions may be altered depending on what I learn about the program during my first visit).

- Share my professional and educational background
- Share my research interests and how I came to want to study this
 1. What do you know about the women' leadership program?
 2. How has the program influenced numbers or success of women in leadership positions on campus? What if any, changes have you noticed in terms of numbers of women in leadership positions on campus as a result of the program?
 3. What role do you play in supporting or participating in the program?
 4. Would you/do you encourage women to participate in the program? How?
 5. What do you think are the greatest outcomes of the leadership program?
 6. Offering a program like this is not typical on college campuses. Why do you feel it is important to offer this program?
 7. How could the program be more effective?
 8. What barriers do you see in women becoming senior leaders in higher education?

APPENDIX I: CODES

The “tree codes” (or themes) are bolded below. The number in parentheses following the codes represents the number of times that idea surfaced in the data or how many codes fall within that category. The 750 individual codes garnered from the line by line coding process were grouped and then organized into the tree codes. Individual codes are shown below in these groupings and within the tree codes. Tree codes are presented in alphabetical order and are separated by five asterisks (*****).

Administering the Program (110)

Why Program Created - Developed program for succession planning; we noticed there weren't a lot of women at the top; WILD created to create balance in leadership; WILD created to develop leaders on campus; WILD started after some returned from HERS; WILD was created to keep people at university

Budget - Concern about funding; dinners were costly; funding was issue (2); in tight budgets support for WILD was cut; program became too costly; Multiple women's groups compete for funds; WILD internship cost the program; Women's efforts should not compete for funds

Criteria for participation - criteria for selection; Criteria is to be at Univ for 3 years

Marketing - Didn't know much about program prior to starting (2); Email recruitment doesn't necessarily work for faculty; faculty need to hear from other faculty that program is worthwhile; Hope participants will help recruit new folks to participate; Learned of program through email; Need to partner with Deans and Dpt heads to promote program; not enough people on campus know about WILD; Strategies to invite more people to participate; WILD reputation was favorable; WILD would have liked to have known about it sooner; women staff know more about program than women faculty

Sessions – Diversity session weak (2); interactive sessions were good; Leadership profile session helpful; missing sessions was hard; Need skilled facilitators; Team Building

Logistics

Seating at meetings - during sessions people sat with people they knew; Have to push self to mix with others you don't know; mixing up tables didn't allow me to meet UC people

Other - Group came together over food; WILD met once a month; WILD time commitment is reasonable; Session evaluations were rather basic

Staffing - few good people made the program happen; Having an administrative staff person would be helpful; Helpful to have steering committee present; It was a lot of work

on volunteers to keep program running; Need an organizer (4); Significant time commitment for volunteers; Steering Committee cared about success of program; Steering committee members helped facilitate

Peer Mentoring/Relationship Building - Program needs to last longer to allow for relationship development; Program not really set up for peer mentoring; (see recommendations section and logistics/seating section too); Surface relationships resulted from workshops

Learning - Learning about aspects of the University that I don't work with daily was valuable (3); Desired practical use of material

Participants - Didn't know other participants prior to program; One said she didn't really want to participate in WILD when she first heard about it (2); Did not see self moving up

Support for Participants - men and dept. heads don't know much about program; Provost hasn't been approached in a while; Supervisor minimally involved; Supervisor not engaged in WILD program; Supervisor supported financially; Supervisor was actively interested in her learning

Challenges - Did they tap out all eligible women (2); Don't have good data; New President and some other leaders didn't want to run this program; Program hasn't yielded overwhelming success; Program needed institutional home; rotating campuses was difficult (HEC); when opened to other campuses, lost UC focus; WILD just died; WILD may be easier for staff

Benefits of Program - effective program can benefit the university; may not think you need prof dev but learn none the less; Other schools saw benefit to the program; Program led to promotion for some; Other schools treat program as feeder

Recommendations –

Relationship Building - follow up a year after the program was good; follow up gatherings are good; Not much interaction with other participants today; More networking needs to be a part of the program (2); Program needs to last longer to allow for relationship development; Recommendation to do reunions; Recommended use of technology to continue interaction; Require participants to sit with different people to broaden the network; don't change who sits at the table each time;

Other - Looking for what's next after formal program ended; Need institutional commitment; Need strong campus program too (from participant of HEC); need to be clear from beginning about expectations (2); Needed homework; Meeting more regularly would keep it fresh in our minds; Program not rigorous enough; Institutional size and culture impacts kind of program

Other

Not familiar with HEC

Reward system for staff is different

Thinks favorably of the program

Want participants to give feedback about program

Would have participated in program if it were mixed gender too

Age and Feminism/All women group (15)

Concerns - Doesn't want to be seen as angry feminist; Had negative reaction to all female groups; No interest in women's only group; Prior to program, concerned it would be bitch session; Hesitant about all female group; Doesn't want to think she got where she is because she's a woman

All Women Groups Not Needed - Glass ceiling has been broken; Has experienced no gender related barriers; Not convinced that all women environment was necessary; Don't like the idea of needing women's leadership training institute

Other

Male dominated environments can be competitive

Men could benefit from training like this too

Men's Network

My field is led by women mostly

Plenty of women candidates in astrophysics

Warning others not to spend too much time on feminist stuff

Taking on leadership role is life changing

Barriers for Women (52)

Access (1) – Didn't see place for herself within the structure; Frustrated with access to people who are in the know; Stuck; I don't have the right look; Leadership still is very white

Age (1)

Confidence (1)

Credentials (1)- Ph.D., Not enough high ranking faculty positions

Gender roles/stereotypes (2); followed accepted career path for female; Stereotypes of women and mothers; Warning others not to spend too much time on feminist stuff;

Learned from others about gender dynamics (others helped her realize how men can say the same thing a woman says in a meeting and be heard/get credit)

Life, Work, School balance (18), conflicting priorities; faculty balancing research and administrative roles; family obligations (3); Leaving work for family obligations is looked down upon; weighing personal sacrifice and moving up; Putting work on hold to pursue school or family doesn't seem like smart option; Struggle with how to have family and work; Women managing the home life too

Sexism (1)- old boy's network; experience of gender discrimination; Is there a perception that men can do it better; Male dominated environs can be competitive; Men not understanding what women put into managing a home; Men's Network; Women have to prove their capabilities; Recognition that her department gender split is not universal (some dpts dominated by males)

Silos - her office works pretty independently

Systemic (1)- Limited women in leadership in the medical college; Even in female dominated fields, men hold leadership positions; mentoring girls doesn't get rewarded in physics dpt; Pay inequity issue; Some work doesn't get faculty credit; Career lattice versus latter in higher ed still

No experience of barriers - Has experienced no gender related barriers (2)

Other Barriers

Geographically bound

Other

Gender matters in hiring

Benefits of All Women's Group (25)

Mixed gender group – Could have learned with men too; Not convinced that all women environment was necessary; would have participated in program if it were mixed gender too; Can learn from men; Adding men to the group would change the dynamic; Experience would not be as beneficial for women if it was mixed gender

What they liked about all women - All women creates commonality of experience; All female group talked about work life issues; Hard to describe why all women works; All women group was refreshing; Different experiences even on same campus; getting others feedback is helpful; There are others to support me; with all women group, can be honest about self evaluation; Benefit of all women was networking; benefits of all women group is that I can be myself; Refreshing to be with all women; Wasn't aware of gender dynamics in meetings

Hesitant - doesn't want to be seen as angry feminist

Other

All women idea is new to me
 All women is a hi ed thing
 Does work with girls in her dept too
 The need still exists for women only programs

Didn't experience gender discrimination herself
 She has no direct experience of inequality

Change is Hard for Some (6)

Wait to see about the agenda of the new pres
 Unsure of impact male president will have
 Caught off guard by changes in dept
 Lots of change within the dpt
 Hesitation to take on role was due to relationship with secretary
 She worries about someone else controlling her time

Characteristics of Participants (140)

Prior to Program

Even as shy child, peers saw her as leader; Her modest beginning has shaped her work;
 Paid for college education on her own; Saw self as leader early on; Practicing attorney
 before law school administrator; Showed leadership qualities prior to WILD

Tasks/Type of Work

Crisis management and response; Enjoys project work; Multifaceted responsibilities (2);
 Less hands on with students now; Transferrable skills

Attitude/Beliefs

Happy where I am; I say yes a lot; I owe it to the department to take on the leadership
 role; I want to be where I can make the most impact; I want to feel a sense of
 accomplishment; Like being treated as an equal; Liked position, just didn't feel
 passionate; What keeps her satisfied is knowing she is making a difference; Not sure she
 wanted more administrative responsibilities; Sees when work needs to be done and steps
 up; I step up to get the job done; She has the belief that she can do next level, not sure
 how; Takes environmental cues to learn about self; When I do take on leadership I want
 to do it right; Need to or Shoulds; More thought about what each step means for me
 personally; Positive feedback even in rejection; Recognizes her strengths; Recognizes she
 does more than others; Thought she could do the best job so she volunteered;

Volunteered because someone needs to do it; When asked to take something on, she felt positively

Leadership Style

Dreaming big; Hard worker; Willing to work beyond scope of job; Humble about success; Challenging myself; I like the challenge; I gravitate to the challenge; I am a servant leader; I am using my natural strengths; Leadership style; Listens to others; Need to be authentic; Problem solving; Observation time before change; Quiet unless things are going in direction she disagrees with; She has follow through and is dependable; Responsible; Showed initiative (6); Strategy to get to the next level; Strategic thinker; She was the go to person in the office to strategize with; Strong work ethic; Took risk (2); Thinking on behalf of department and college; Willing to put controversial issues on the table; Motivation (2); Recognized need for change

People person - Cares about people; Sees others strengths; Credits others; Recognize others good work; Saw value in others and at the same time saw deficits in others; Makes others feel valued; Everyone brings something different to the team; I am a connector; I facilitate others; I am a consensus builder (see leadership style); Putting others before self;

Student Centered - Cares about students; Serve students; She gives attention to undergrads; Students at the center (4); Enjoyed working with students; Less hands on with students now

Relationships - Leading with people not telling others what to do; Relational leadership (2); Relationships are important; Worked on team to create a college; Seeking relationships

Organization - Detail oriented; Have to work ahead of deadlines; Works ahead of deadline; Organized; Pays attention to details

Goal Setting/Future Planning -Enjoys moving forward and improving the situation; Forward thinking (2); Sees self as visionary;

Dislikes/Challenges

Certain jobs were hard so she wanted to avoid them; Days don't always go as planned; Doesn't want to be seen as angry feminist; Felt pressure and guilt to participate in program; Not interested in program initially; Mentoring girls doesn't get rewarded in physics dept; Others don't understand approach

How Participants See Themselves

Describes herself using same language she used to define leader but doesn't define self as leader; Doesn't describe self as leader now; I am not anybody's boss; Never saw self as leader; Saw self as leader prior to program; See self as leader; See self as leader today

Learning

Enjoy learning (3); I enjoy learning new things; Knows she doesn't know everything; Learned new role as she was in it; Learning how things are done in hi ed; Looking for leadership development; Participated in professional development opportunities; Looking for opportunities to develop leadership skills; Opportunity to grow and learn; Takes advantage of leadership dev opps; Seeking toolkit; Taking advantage of opps; Trainings are important; Mentors are important; Seeking advancement and new opportunities (2); Understanding about how to lead has broadened

Other

Demonstrating leadership

Does work with girls in her dept too

Has experienced no gender related barriers; Sees home life as gender balanced

Helps to write and set aside for a bit then come back to it

Increasing responsibility; Moved up; Only in positions for short time

Merge happened in department

Moved into higher education administration

New opportunities presented themselves to her

Not recognizing or looking for women leaders – had blinders on

Not sure what she needs next

Peers see her as a leader; Seen as leader and contact for many things

Reported mostly to women

Self efficacy

Serves on many campus committees

She created new center

Working in male dominated field; Works in male dominated field

Characteristics of Program (53)

Logistics - can't imagine fitting in an internship on top of job; Experience would not be as beneficial for women if it was mixed gender; Need to understand men to work with them; Presenters were male and female; WILD assignment to interview leaders; Developed program for succession planning

Particular Sessions - Session not helpful to her directly, but to her students; Sessions affirmed me; Sessions didn't focus on women's issues;

Career mapping - activity was powerful; Career mapping very helpful

Negotiations presentation good

Financial Planning - need more; Financial sessions were particularly informative

Hiring session was useful

Team building session important to faculty doing collaborative research

Relationship building/Networking - Forced interaction with others; Forced to meet new people; Didn't get to debrief with peers in program; Encourage more networking amongst participants; Relationship building was most valuable; There are others to support me; WILD provided opp to meet people across campus; Seeking advice from others

Learning - active learning is key; Great to learn about different areas of campus; Leadership vocabulary expanded through WILD; Learn about campus culture; Learned activities to do with her mentees; learned best practices; Sessions helped to broaden my understanding of the university; WILD was natural place for me to learn more

Who is the Program for - Content focused on faculty to admin; Program geared toward faculty; Likes that WILD brings people from other campuses

Results - Program helped with confidence; Program started to create new opportunities for women; WILD assignment exposed participants to male and female leaders; WILD classes help prepare you for leadership; WILD created entry point; WILD created network; WILD created understanding; WILD exposed her to strong women leaders; WILD exposed her to women leaders at Univ; WILD exposed me to whole new world; WILD helped me think about next steps; WILD learned valuable lessons; WILD motivated people to take on leadership; WILD pushed strategic thinking; WILD showed me I can get to next level; Women developed skills; WILD was the beginning of my broadening my scope; WILD challenged participants

Cohort Building (12)

WILD

Bonding occurred over the internship experience
Cohort became critical to my work
Cohort members rely on each other for support
Encourage more networking amongst participants
Group connected
Have connection with people in my class

HEC

Connected with a few on and off campus
Desired more networking (2)
Didn't feel connected to program or people
Learning from each other
Not enough opp to really connect with others

Program Administrator

Want participants to have network of support

Confidence (51)

How Participant Sees Self

As Leader - could see herself in another woman leader; Even as shy child, peers saw her as leader; Sees self as visionary; Strategic thinker (participant sees this as a strength)

Not as Leader - Didn't see self as leader; Didn't see self as leader nor aspired to leadership roles; Didn't see self as leader prior to WILD; Didn't see self moving into leadership; Didn't see self moving up; Doesn't describe self as leader now; Doesn't see self as a boss; Even in program not seeing self as leader; Never saw self as leader; Not seeing self ready for position yet; Thinks that because she does things naturally it's not leadership; Serving at the pleasure of the Dean

Displaying confidence - asked for what she wanted; Confidence; Confidence displayed(3); Demonstrating leadership; Feel more connected on campus; Found something she really liked; I have the skills to do this well; I stepped up because I knew I could do the job; Knows she will be dept head at some point; Now recognizes transferable skills; program helped with confidence; Recognizes her strengths; Recognizes she does more than others; Making leadership decisions in position – thinking like a leader; Sees others strengths; More thought about what each step means for me personally; Self-efficacy; She feels a part of the team;

Lack of Confidence - Being in higher position feels uncomfortable; Comparing self to others; Hesitant about next step; I don't have the right look; Not fully taking the credit for her work; Shaky confidence (5); Discounted the work involved; Doesn't feel worthy; Surprised by what others see in her; Volunteering for something doesn't equate to leader in her mind; No aspirations

Doesn't want to think she got where she is because she's a woman

**I don't mind doing the work but I don't need the titles

Success in role due to success in legal profession

Cost of Leadership

Doesn't want to leave research for administration

Doesn't want to move up and lose the people connection

Female first pres didn't want to always be known as first

Holding leadership position is political

I don't mind doing the work but I don't need the titles

It gets lonely at the top

Taking on leadership role is life changing

Faculty Experience (64)

Benefit of participating in program with Staff - Faculty and staff needs are similar in regards to leadership dev; Faculty and staff program was good for breaking down silos; Faculty don't always appreciate staff; Faculty don't always know what staff do; Faculty need to learn about role of staff; Including faculty allowed more to think about dept head; Interactions with staff were positive; Didn't matter if you were faculty or staff, program was about learning leadership

Challenges for faculty –

Timing - Can't imagine leaving faculty right now; Career mapping doesn't work for faculty researcher; Clear career path given age and field; Doesn't want to abandon her department; Doesn't want to leave research for administration; When faculty leave research it's hard to get back into it; Faculty timeline; Faculty timeline is different; Struggle with when to take on administrative role

Tenure/Credit - Faculty didn't note this in annual review (it doesn't really earn credit toward tenure); Some work doesn't get faculty credit; Faculty who put in more get same raise as other faculty;

Other - Faculty does so many different things; Faculty don't go into teaching with the hopes of becoming administrators; Faculty don't like the administrative jobs; Hard to get faculty to move into administration; Faculty versus administration; For faculty there are 2 sides - faculty and the other; Not an easy transition for faculty to move to admin; Faculty member sees self as administrator; Faculty joining administration means giving up independence; Faculty social skills don't help relationship building; Some of the topics were a stretch for research faculty; Transitioning between faculty and admin is difficult; Working in isolation

Leadership Training for faculty - Faculty not trained to be leaders; Faculty take on leadership but don't think about leadership; People need to be trained for leadership positions; Struggle to see how faculty need leadership training; Faculty need to learn about team building and diversity; Team building session important to faculty doing collaborative research

Things to Consider in Trying to Market/Appeal to Faculty – Faculty have flexibility in schedules; Convincing faculty to do anything is hard; Faculty need to hear from other faculty that program is worthwhile; Email recruitment doesn't necessarily work for faculty; Many faculty content with what they were doing, not looking to advance; Research and faculty job was priority; Not interested in program initially; Incentive different for faculty and staff; Internship seems to work for faculty schedules

Role of Department Chair - Anticipated being asked to be dpt chair; Hard to select dpt

chair; Knows she will be dept head at some point; No training to be dpt chair; Switch gears to be dept head rather than faculty

Other

Always thinking about the benefit for the dept; I owe it to the department to take on the leadership role

Faculty and staff view professional dev differently; May not think you need professional dev but learn none the less

Faculty are lifelong hires

Faculty private about personal lives

Faculty takes teaching seriously

Staff always looking for advancement

Faculty who does administrative duties all day

Few women in her department

Unsure of leadership's commitment to leadership development

Faculty/staff Dynamic in program (17)

Benefit of faculty and staff; Program for faculty and staff was beneficial; Value in having program for faculty and staff; Value of faculty and staff in-group; Positive to have faculty and staff together

Faculty and staff program was good for breaking down silos; Faculty don't always appreciate staff

Faculty don't always know what staff do; Faculty need to learn about role of staff

Didn't matter if you were faculty or staff

Exposed to new ideas

Faculty and staff needs are similar in regards to leadership dev

Faculty and staff view professional dev differently

Frustrating that it felt geared toward faculty

Good relationships between faculty and staff

Interactions with staff were positive

Program for faculty and staff may have been challenging to coordinate

Integrating the Learning (7)

Incorporating what she learned

Integrated the learning (2)

Making leadership decisions in position
 My knowledge has helped the department
 Not being in position can sometimes lead to more power to change
 Using something she learned now

Internship (17)

Cohort/Relationship Building - Created cohort with others doing internship; Interns decided to meet every few weeks; Opportunity for peer mentoring through internship; Peer mentoring in internship

Scheduling - Harder for staff to do internship because of time; Internship seems to work for faculty schedules; Schedule didn't allow her to participate in internship

Benefit - Internship gave opportunity for others to see your skills; Internship is key to moving up; Internships seemed to lead to promotions

Should internship be requirement
 WILD internship cost the program
 Chose female dean for internship
 Created own internship program
 Took on multiple responsibilities
 Wanted internship at different college
 Would have liked the opportunity for internship (HEC)

Leader, as Defined by Participants (46)

Consensus Builder - Consensus builder; Consensus building; Leader builds consensus

Values others - Everyone brings something different to the team; Sees others strengths; Leader makes others feel valued; Leadership is knowing who to call; Leaders care about others

Visionary - A leader has vision; Leader sets vision; Sees self as visionary; Leader is forward thinking; Strategic thinker

A leader motivates others; Leader motivates others
 Can learn from leader even if you disagree
 Difference between being a leader and being aggressive
 Doesn't see self as a boss
 Leader can be fair
 Leader can make decisions

Leader can navigate the technical skills and the relationships
 Leader can't take away all problems
 Leader doesn't shy away from controversy
 Leader has core values
 Leader has emotional intelligence
 Leader helps group understand common goal
 Leader is ethical
 Leader is good listener
 Leader is organized
 Leader is trusted
 Leader is willing to do any aspect of work
 Leader knows strengths and weaknesses
 Leader makes data driven decisions
 Leader needs to be a good communicator
 Leader needs to have best interest of group in mind
 Leader needs to think about how to lead and problem solve
 Leader needs to understand the context and the technical skills
 Leader should be present and respect the past
 Leader takes responsibility
 Leadership is innate
 Leadership is more political; I don't have the right look; Leadership still is very white
 Leadership style
 Managers are different than leaders
 People want to follow a good leader

Men and Leadership (11)

Men and dept heads don't know much about program
 Men could benefit from training like this too; Need leadership training for men too
 Men's Network
 Need to understand men to work with them
 Response from male supervisor not what was expected
 Society opens leadership doors for men more often
 Stereotypes of women and mothers
 Unsure of impact male president will have
 Value of leadership training with men
 Would have participated in program if it were mixed gender too

Not Looking to Advance

Not looking for advancement
 Not looking for upward mobility

Not looking to advance
 Not sure she wanted more administrative responsibilities
 Where she wants to be right now

Not Sure What She Needs Next

Not sure what she needs next
 Seeking toolkit
 She has the belief that she can do next level, not sure how
 Unsure of where she wants to go next
 Wants something different but not sure what or how
 Wants to do something using her skills not sure where that is

Other Leadership Training

Had other leadership development opps
 Leadership training opps
 Learned about leadership through shadowing and interviewing leaders
 Learned from role model
 Learned good and bad from more senior woman
 Takes advantage of leadership dev opps
 Took advantage of other leadership dev activities

Peer Mentoring

Peer mentoring
 Peer mentoring in internship
 Program not really set up for peer mentoring

Post Program (46)

Attitude - WILD showed me I can get to next level; You don't have to do everything yourself; Doesn't describe self as leader now; Career aspirations didn't change for me; Favorable memories of program; Feels favorably about program; Sharing notes with others so others can benefit too; Worked in her silo, now sees benefit to working with others

Skills

As result proposed a new position; Created a solution to a problem; Conscious thought about negotiating salary; Participants developed skills and confidence; Changes she instituted; Now recognizes transferable skills; Wondering if networking is the key to

advancing

Knowledge

As result of WILD now see more possibilities for future; Aware of broader implications of decisions; Better informed as a result of WILD; Exposed to areas of the Univ I didn't know about; Exposed to new ideas; Learned new approaches through WILD; Using something she learned now; Now she sees options to stay on campus and advance; Helpful to think about leadership as a practice; My knowledge has helped the department; Being more informed means making better decisions; Department benefitted from broad knowledge of campus; Through program developed network I call on regularly;

Concrete

Benefit of program -some have advanced; Past participants are key leaders at univ now; WILD did result in more women in senior leadership; Some new faces came to administration through program; Some women got promotions as result of program; Some women have advanced or taken on more responsibility; Success of past participants; Sees growth in WILD participants

Group Connection - Group continued to meet; Initiated lunches for any past participant; Desired continued contact with participants; Not much interaction with other participants today

Next Steps for Participants - Looking for what's next after formal program ended; Not sure what she needs next

Other

Connection gained her a speaking engagement
Creative ideas
Effective program can benefit the university
Taking on more responsibility

Power

Distribution of power matters
Her title makes her a leader
I don't seek power
Not being in position can sometimes lead to more power to change
Power

Program Opened Doors

Feel constrained by relationships she has
Gained information about other resources

I have learned a lot about the university
 Knowing people across campus is very helpful
 Knowing people on campus is helpful to getting more involved in leadership
 Networking will help open doors
 Now she sees options to stay on campus and advance
 Opened doors
 Participating in WILD will open doors
 WILD - opened doors

Reinforcement From Others

Encouragement from others
 Increasing responsibility; Significant responsibilities
 Moved up
 Opportunities came to her, didn't seek them out
 Opportunity to grow and learn
 Others recognized her talent
 Peers see her as a leader
 Previous work leads to new opps
 Received positive feedback about leadership earlier in her career
 Recruited for position
 Seen as leader and contact for many things
 She was the go to person in the office to strategize with
 Supervisor encouragement
 Surprised by what others see in her
 Took on minor leadership role

Relationship Building (45)

Before program

Didn't know others - Didn't know other participants prior to program; No connection with other participants prior to program

Knew others - Knew a few of the other participants

During program

Building relationships across the university; Creating support network; Relied on other women to help strategize; Helpful to have others ask questions;

Desired more networking; More networking needs to be a part of the program; Encourage more networking amongst participants;

Mixing up tables didn't allow me to meet UC people; Have to push self to mix with others you don't know; Faculty social skills don't help relationship building;

Someone like me gets me – didn't find this at HEC but at ACE

After program

Connection - Deepened already established relationships; Made good connections with women; Strong bond; Surface relationships resulted from workshops (HEC); Personal connections have served me well; Desired continued contact with participants; Feel more connected on campus; Program needs to last longer to allow for relationship development; Initiated lunches for any past participant;

Others are resource – Having these relationships helps me do my work; I have learned a lot about the univ; Continued connections meant greater learning; I have to say that when this whole – relied on relationship for advice; Through program developed network I call on regularly; You don't have to do everything yourself; Seeking advice from others; Wondering if networking is the key;

Knowing Others - Know people now I wouldn't have known otherwise; Relationship building was most valuable; Networking paid off; Networking valuable to me as new professional; Networking was valuable;

Silos broken down - Networking will help open doors; Feel constrained by relationships she has- program opened doors; Doing committee work helps you get noticed; Intangible benefit - breaking down silos; Working in silos;

Seeking relationships; Sees value in relationships; Relationships are important

Different experiences even on same campus

Responsibility to Future Generations

Feels responsible for next generation of leadership
Taking responsibility for next generation of leaders
Thinking about next generation of women leaders

Still looking for ways to get more women in leadership

Mentoring girls doesn't get rewarded in physics dept
Mentoring others

Role Models (17)

Limited number of women role models; Limited women in leadership in the medical

college; Not many women role models; Women role models; Women role models exist in our world; Female role model; Had no female Deans to serve as models; Some women bosses were role models; President and leadership committee were role models; Steering Committee were role models; Support from other women in leadership

Mentoring others

Particular projects meant she worked with higher level women leaders

Reported mostly to women

Seeing role models was important

Seen change from old boy's network

Learned good and bad from more senior woman

Role of Higher Ed in Leadership

Hi ed needs to do training for positions

Hi ed should be model

Institutions should develop their own

Serendipity

It just happened without planning

Opportunities came to her, didn't seek them out

Things keep happening

Merge happened in department

Silos

Different experiences even on same campus

Intangible benefit - breaking down silos

Unclear Path

Dead end road

Didn't see self moving into leadership; Didn't see self moving up

Hesitant and fearful of unclear path; Unsure about career path; Unsure of where she wants to go next

No aspirations

Purposefully thinking about where she can do what she most enjoys

Struggle with when to take on administrative role

Women Leaders Led to More Women in Leadership

Female president helped change the tides; Woman president changed the feel on campus for women

Limited women in leadership in the medical college

President and leadership committee were role models

Seen change from old boy's network

Women of Color

Looking to increase women of color in leadership specifically too

Need programs for women of color too

Still want more women in leadership

REFERENCES

- Allen, K. E., & Cherrey, C. (2000). *Systemic leadership*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Allen, W., Epps, E., Guillory, E., Suh, S., Bonus-Hammarth, M., & Stassen, M. (1991). Outsiders within: Race, gender, and faculty status in U.S. higher education. In P. Altbah & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 189-220). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- American Association of University Women. (2003). *Women at work*. Retrieved from <http://www.aauw.org/research/womenatwork.cfm>
- American Council on Education. (2007). *The American college president: 2007 edition*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Babcock, L., & Laschever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Badaracco, J. (2002). *Leading quietly: An unorthodox guide to doing the right thing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28, 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

- Bandura, A. S., Millard, M., Peluso, E. A., & Ortman, N. (2000). Effects of peer education training on peer educators: Leadership, self-esteem, health knowledge, and health behaviors. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(5), 471-478.
- Baruch, Y., & Hall, D. T. (2004). Preface for the JVB special issue on careers in academia. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*(2), 237-240.
- Baumgartner, M. S., & Schneider, D. E. (2010). Perceptions of women in management: A thematic analysis of razing the glass ceiling. *Journal of Career Development, 37*(2), 559-576.
- Beer, M. (1999). Leading learning and learning to lead. In J. Conger, G. Spreitzer, & E. Lawler (Eds.), *The leader's change handbook* (pp. 127-161). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Berkeley, K. C. (1999). *The women's liberation movement in America*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Berryman-Fink, C., Bardes, B., Nelson, K., Sheets, R., Taylor, J., & Trent, J. (1999). *Panel presentation*. Annual meeting of the University of Cincinnati Women's Leadership Conference. Cincinnati, OH.
- Blau, F. D., & DeVaro, J. (2007). New evidence on gender difference in promotion rates: An empirical analysis of a sample of new hires. *Industrial Relations, 46*, 511-550.
- Bornstein, R. (2008). Women and the college presidency. In Glazer-Raymo (Ed.), *Unfinished agendas* (pp. 162-184). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

- Bower, F. L. (1993). Women and mentoring in higher education administration. In P. T. Mitchell (Ed.), *Cracking the wall: Women in higher education administration* (pp. 90-97). Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.
- Brown, T. M. (2005). Mentorship and the female college president. *Sex Roles*, 52(9/10), 659-666.
- Canul, K. (2003). Latina/o cultural values and the academy: Latinas navigating through the administrative role. In J. Castellanos & L. Jones (Eds.), *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education* (pp. 167-175). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Carli, L. L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 725-741.
- Carli, L. L., & Eagly, A. H. (2007). Overcoming resistance to women leaders: The importance of leadership style. In B. Kellerman & D. L. Rhode (Eds.), *Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Carnell, E., MacDonald, J., & Askew, S. (2006). *Coaching and mentoring in higher education: A learning-centered approach*. London, England: Institute of Education.
- Catalyst. (2007). *The double-bind dilemma for women in leadership: Damned if you do, doomed if you don't*. Retrieved from <http://www.catalyst.org/publication/83/the-double-bind-dilemma-for-women-in-leadership-damned-if-you-do-doomed-if-you-dont>

- Chemers, M. M. (2001). Efficacy and effectiveness: Integrating models of leadership and intelligence. In R. E. Riggio & S. E. Murphy (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. 139-160). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chowwen, C. O. (2004). Mentoring and women's perceived professional growth. *Ifè Psychologia*, 12(1), 126-132.
- Chronicle of Higher Education. (2007). *The Chronicle almanac*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/free/almanac/2007/nation/nation_index.htm#faculty
- Colbeck, C. L. (2006). How female and male faculty with families manage work and personal roles. In S. Bracken, J. Allen, & D. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 31-50). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Correll, S. J. (2004). Constraints into preferences: Gender, status, and emerging career aspirations. *American Sociological Review*, 69, 93-113.
- Coughlin, L., Wingard, E., & Hollihan, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Enlightened power: How women are transforming the practice of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Crenshaw, K. (1995). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1993, February). *Benefits of a mentoring program for aspiring administrators*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Orlando, FL.
- DeWitt, D. (Reporter). (2011, June 7). *Equal pay elusive for women on campus* [Radio broadcast]. WUNC North Carolina Public Radio. Retrieved from <http://wunc.org/programs/news/archive/NDD060711.mp3/view>
- Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 459-474.
- Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 1-12.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 807-834.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Eliasson, M., Berggren, H., & Bondestam, F. (2000). Mentor programmes – a shortcut for women's academic careers? *Higher Education in Europe, 25*(2), 173.
- Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000). Theories of gender in organizations: A new approach to organizational analysis and change. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 22*, 103-152.

- Ender, S. C., & Kay, K. (2001). Peer leadership programs: A rationale and review of the literature. In S. L. Hamid (Ed.), *Peer leadership: A primer on program essentials* (Monograph No. 32, pp. 1-12). Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York, NY: Crown.
- Farnham, C. A. (1994). *The education of the southern belle: Higher education and student socialization in the antebellum south*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Fletcher, J. K. (2004). The paradox of postheroic leadership: An essay on gender, power, and transformational change. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 647-661.
- Flynn, M. T. (1993). Questioning the system: A feminist perspective. In P. T. Mitchell (Ed.), *Cracking the wall: Women in higher education administration* (pp. 112-121). Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.
- Fobbs, J. (1988, March 9). *Barriers and biases toward women: Impediments to administrative progression*. Paper presented at the Burlington International Women's Week, Burlington, VT.
- Freeman, J. S. (1975). *The politics of women's liberation: A case study of an emerging social movement and its relation to the policy process*. New York, NY: David McKay.
- Freeman, J. S. (1995). From suffrage to women's liberation: Feminism in twentieth-century America. In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective* (5th ed., pp. 509-528). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

- Freeman, J. S., Bourque, S. C., & Shelton, C. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Women on power: Leadership redefined*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Gibson, D. E., & Lawrence, B. S. (2010). Women's and men's career referents: How gender composition and comparison level shape career expectations. *Organization Science*, 21(6), 1159-1175.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (2008). Epilogue. In Glazer-Raymo (Ed.), *Unfinished agendas* (pp. 273-284). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1982). *The classroom climate: A chilly one for women?* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Heckert, T. M., Droste, H. E., Adams, P. J., Griffin, C. M., Roberts, L. L., Mueller, M. A., & Wallis, H. A. (2002). Gender differences in anticipated salary: Role of salary estimates for others, job characteristics, career paths, and job inputs. *Sex Roles*, 47(3-4), 139-151.
- Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

- Helgesen, S. (1995). *The web of inclusion*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Hewlett, S. A. (2007). Off-ramps and on-ramps: Women's nonlinear career paths. In B. Kellerman & D. Rhode (Eds.), *Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change* (pp. 407-430). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Higher Education Resource Services. (n.d.). *Why attend a HERS institute?* Retrieved from <http://www.hersnet.org/whyhers.asp>
- Hoyt, C. L. (2005). The role of leadership efficacy and stereotype activation in women's identification with leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies*, *11*(4), 2-14.
- Hoyt, C. L. (2010). Women, men, and leadership: Exploring the gender gap at the top. *Social and personality psychology compass*, *4*(7), 484-498.
- Hoyt, C. L., & Blascovich, J. (2007). Leadership self-efficacy and women leaders' responses to stereotype activation. *Group processes and intergroup relations*, *10*, 595-616.
- Hubbard, S. (1998). Mentoring: A catalyst for advancement in administration. *Journal of Career Development*, *24*(4), 289-299.
- Hunter, D. (2004, May/June). Peer to peer: Effective college learning. *Change*, 40-44.
- Jaschik, S. (2008, September 22). New questions on women, academe and careers. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set./print/news/2008/09/22/women>
- John-Steiner, V. (2000). *Creative collaboration*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Jones, S. R., & Komives, S. R. (2003, March). *A centennial reflection: Historical and contemporary perspectives on women as senior student affairs officers*. Presentation at the annual meeting of ACPA: College Student Educators International in Minneapolis, MN.
- Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(4), 405-414.
- Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Josselson, R. (1990). *Finding herself: Pathways to identity development in women*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kadar, R. S. (2006). *Peer-mentoring relationships: Toward a non-hierarchical mentoring approach for women faculty*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Kaufman, D. R. (1995). Professional women: How real are the recent gains? In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective* (pp. 287-305). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Keaveny, T. J., & Inderrieden, E. J. (2000). Gender differences in pay satisfaction and pay expectations. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 12*(3), 363-379.
- Kellerman, B. (2003). You've come a long way, baby – and you've got miles to go. In D. L. Rhode (Ed.), *The difference "difference" makes: Women and leadership* (pp. 53-58). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Kellerman, B., & Rhode, D. L. (Eds.). (2007). *Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolb, J. A. (1999). The effect of gender role, attitude toward leadership, and self-confidence on leader emergence: Implications for leadership development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 10*(4), 305-320.
- Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S., Owen, J., Mainella, F., & Osteen, L. (2006). A leadership identity development model: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*, 401-420.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2007). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kram, K. E. (1985a). Improving the mentoring process. *Training & Development Journal, 39*(4), 40-43.
- Kram, K. E. (1985b). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Kram, K. E. (1988). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- LeBlanc, D. S. (1993). Barriers to women's advancement into higher education administration. In P. T. Mitchell (Ed.), *Cracking the wall: Women in higher education administration* (pp. 40-49). Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Locke, E. A., & Lathan, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal-setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Madsen, S. R. (2008). *On becoming a woman leader: Learning from the experience of university presidents*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 293-355). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2002). Do babies matter? The effect of family formation on the lifelong careers of academic men and women. *Academe* 88(6), 21-27.
- Mason, M. A., Goulden, M. & Wolfinger, N. H. (2006). Babies matter. In S. Bracken, J. Allen, & D. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 9-30). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Mavrincac, M. A. (2005). Transformational leadership: Peer mentoring as a values-based learning process. *Libraries and the Academy*, 5(3), 391.
- McCormick, M., Tanguma, J., & Lopez-Forment, A. S. (2003, Spring). Gender differences in beliefs about leadership capabilities: Exploring the glass ceiling phenomenon with self-efficacy theory. *Leadership Review*. Retrieved from http://www.leadershipreview.org/2003spring/article2_spring_2003.asp
- McDade, S. A., Nooks, K. A., King, P. J., Sloma-Williams, L., Chuang, Y. C., Richman, R. C., & Morahan, P. S. (2008). A window into the culture of leadership within higher education through the leadership definitions of women faculty: A case study of ELAM women faculty alumnae. *NASPA Journal about Women in Higher Education*, 1(1), 74-102.

- Merriam, S. B., (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*.
San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd
ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology:
Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Thousand
Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyerson, D. E., & Ely, R. J. (2003). Using difference to make a difference. In D. L.
Rhode (Ed.), *The difference "difference" makes: Women and leadership* (pp. 129-
143). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Meyerson, D. E., & Fletcher, J. K. (2000). A modest manifesto for shattering the glass
ceiling. *Harvard Business Review*, 127-136.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks,
CA: Sage.
- Miller, J. B. (1976). *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Miller, J. B. (1991). The development of women's sense of self. In J. V. Jordan, A. G.
Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver & J. L. Surrey (Eds.), *Women's growth in
connection: Writings from the stone center* (pp. 11-26). New York, NY: Guilford
Press.
- Mitchell, P. T. (Ed.). (1993). *Cracking the wall: Women in higher education
administration*. Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.
- Moses, Y. T. (2009). Advice from the field: Guiding women of color to academic
leadership. In D. R. Dean, S. J. Bracken, & J. K. Allen (Eds.), *Women in*

academic leadership: Professional strategies, personal choices (pp. 181-207).

Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Murray, L. R. (2003). Sick and tired of being sick and tired: Implications for racial and ethnic disparities in occupational health. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*, 221-226.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *Digest of Education Statistics (chap. 3)*.

Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from

http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d04/ch_3.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *Digest of Education Statistics*.

Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from

http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d08/tables/dt08_253.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Digest of Education Statistics*.

Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from

http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_250.asp?referrer=list

O'Brien, S. P., & Janssen, K. N. (2005). Internships for women in higher education administration: Springboards for success? *Work: Journal of Prevention, Assessment & Rehabilitation, 24*(4), 353-359.

O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 57-80.

O'Meara, K., Kaufman, R. R., & Kuntz, A. M. (2003). Faculty work in challenging times: Trends, consequences, and implications. *Liberal Education, 89*, 6-23.

O'Meara, K., Terosky, A., & Neumann, A. (2008). Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 34*(3).

- Pascarella, E. T., Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L. S., & Yeager, P. M. (1997). Women's perceptions of a "chilly climate" and their cognitive outcomes during the first year of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*(2), 109-124.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). All those years ago: The historical underpinnings of shared leadership. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perry, W. (1981). Cognitive and ethical growth: The making of meaning. In A. W. A. Chickering (Ed.), *The modern American college* (pp. 76-116). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rapoport, R., Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J. K., & Pruitt, B. Y. (2002). *Beyond work-family balance: Advancing gender equity and workplace performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rhode, D. L. (Ed.). (2003). *The difference "difference" makes: Women and leadership*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Richman, R. C., Morahan, P. S., Cohen, D. W., & McDade, S. A. (2001). Advancing women and closing the leadership gap: The executive leadership in academic medicine (ELAM) program experience. *Journal of Women's Health and Gender-Based Medicine, 10*(3), 271-277.
- Rinto, B., Berryman-Fink, C., Faaborg, K., Graviss, L., & Mortimer, L., (2006). *Report on the status of UC women*. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati Women's Initiatives Network.

- Rios, A., & Longnion, J. (2000). *Agenda for the 21st century: Executive summary*. Minneapolis, MN: National Initiative for Women in Higher Education.
- Roan, A., & Rooney, D. (2006). Shadowing experiences and the extension of communities of practice: A case study of women education managers. *Management Learning*, 37(4), 433.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Sagaria, M. A. D. & Van Horn, P. S. (2007). Academic excellence and gender equality at Ohio State University. In M. A. D. Sagaria (Ed.), *Women, universities, and change: Gender equality in the European Union and the United States* (pp. 179-196). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Sandler, B. R., & Hall, R. M. (1986). *The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Scanlon, K. (1997). Mentoring women administrators: Breaking through the glass ceiling. *Initiatives*, 58, 39-59.
- Shapiro, E. C., Haseltine, F. P., & Rowe, M. P. (1978). Moving up: Role models, mentors, and the "patron system." *Sloan Management Review*, 19(3), 51-58.
- Sharpe, R. (2000, November 20). As leaders, women rule. *Business Week*, 75-84.
- Sloma-Williams, L., McDade, S. A., Richman, R. C., & Morahan, P. S. (2009). The role of self-efficacy in developing women leaders: A case of women in academic medicine and dentistry. In D. R. Dean, S. J. Bracken, & J. K. Allen (Eds.), *Women in academic leadership: Professional strategies, personal choices* (pp. 50-73). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sumner, K. E., & Brown, T. J. (1996). Men, women and money: Exploring the role of gender, gender-linkage of college major and career-information sources in salary expectations. *Sex Roles, 34*(11-12), 823-839.
- Surrey, J. L. (1991). The "self-in-relation": A theory of women's development. In J. V. Jordan, A. G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J. L. Surrey (Eds.), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 51-66). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Taylor, B. G. (1989). Presence and power: Answering the need for women leaders in higher education. *CUPA Journal, 40*, 27-33.
- Touchton, J., Musil, C. M., & Campbell, K. P. (2008). *A measure of equality: Women's progress in higher education* (Report). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Turner, C. S. V., & Kappes, J. (2009). Preparing women of color for leadership. In D. R. Dean, S. J. Bracken, & J. K. Allen (Eds.), *Women in academic leadership: Professional strategies, personal choices* (pp. 149-180). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- University of Cincinnati. (n.d.). *UC facts*. Retrieved from <http://www.uc.edu/about/ucfactsheet.html>

- University of Cincinnati. (2000a). *Thoughts shared by former and current interns*.
University of Cincinnati Archives, Cincinnati, OH.
- University of Cincinnati. (2000b). *Women's leadership program for UC faculty and administrators*. University of Cincinnati Archives, Cincinnati, OH.
- University of Cincinnati. (2001). *Progress report: Women's institute for leadership*.
University of Cincinnati Archives, Cincinnati, OH.
- University of Cincinnati. (2002). *Progress report: Women's institute for leadership*.
University of Cincinnati Archives, Cincinnati, OH.
- University of Cincinnati. (2005). *Women's leadership program: Higher education collaborative for women's leadership development*. [Flyer]. University of Cincinnati Archives, Cincinnati, OH.
- University of Cincinnati. (2006). *Progress report: Women's institute for leadership*.
University of Cincinnati Archives, Cincinnati, OH.
- University of Cincinnati. (2010). *Report on the status of UC women: 2009-10 academic year*. Retrieved from http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/win/docs/Status%20of%20Women_2009_1207_Final.pdf
- University of Cincinnati Women's Center. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from <http://www.uc.edu/ucwc/about.html>
- University of Cincinnati Women's Initiatives Network. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from <http://www.uc.edu/win.html>
- Vinnicombe, S., & Singh, V. (2003). Women-only management training: An essential part of women's leadership development. *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 294.

- Warner, R., & DeFleur, L. B. (1993). Career paths of women in higher education administration. In P. T. Mitchell (Ed.), *Cracking the wall: Women in higher education administration* (pp. 1-18). Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.
- Wolf-Wendel, L. & Ward, K. (2006). Faculty work and family life. In S. Bracken, J. Allen, & D. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 51-72). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Women's College Coalition. (n.d.). *History of women's colleges*. Retrieved from <http://www.womenscolleges.org/>
- Williams, J. (2004). Hitting the maternal wall. *Academe* 90(6), 16-20.
- Williams, J. C., Alon, T., & Bornstein, S. (2006). Beyond the 'chilly climate': Eliminating bias against women. *Thought & Action*, 22 79-96.
- Wirth, L. (2001). *Breaking through the glass ceiling: Women in management*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organization.
- Woody, T. (1929). *A history of women's education in the United States*. New York, NY: Science Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed. Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.