Distributed Leadership: Working Together to Ride the Waves: The Self Enabling Reflective Tool (ASERT).

Sandra Jones[1]
RMIT, Melbourne,
sandra.jones@rmit.edu.au

Marina Harvey
Macquarie University, Sydney,
marina.harvey@vc.mq.edu.au

Geraldine Lefoe,
University of Wollongong, Wollongong
glefoe@uow.edu.au

Kevin Ryland
RMIT, Melbourne,
kevin.ryland@edupm.com.au

Abstract

New models of leadership are required if the Higher Education sector is to continue to provide leading edge change. While multiple theories of leadership exist, the Higher Education sector requires a less hierarchical approach that takes account of its specialised and professional context. This paper explores how a self enabling tool, developed from research into the experience of several higher education institutions, can be used to support a distributed leadership process to build leadership capacity. While the focus of the project that underpinned the tool was on building leadership capacity of academics for learning and teaching, the findings demonstrate the need for an inclusive participative approach by which professional, administrative and academic staff need to collaborate to build a systematic, multi-facetted leadership approach appropriate for the sector.

Key Words
Distributed leadership; leading change, collaboration

[1] The paper acknowledges the contribution of Annette Schneider and Anne Applebee from Australian Catholic University to this project

INTRODUCTION: LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

New approaches to leadership in higher education are being explored as universities face the dual challenges of competing in a globally competitive world while at the same time designing opportunities to build and develop sustainable leadership. To be successful in the complex and ambiguous world in which new social, political and environmental challenges are ever-emergent, new governance and leadership models are needed. While similar challenges are experienced in all industries, higher education occupies a unique position given its role in the development of new, and dissemination of existing, knowledge. Any new model of leadership for higher education needs to go beyond the 'managerialist', corporate 'service' focus on documenting, formalising and systematising interactions and networks between groups across the university that has been described by Lumby (2003) as 'waves of managerialism' that demonstrate either 'overt oppression' or 'subtle manipulation'. Rather, the new leadership model needs to encompass more participative approaches that encourage and support collaboration and acknowledges the individual autonomy that underpins creative and innovative thinking needed to encourage and develop knowledge.

What is needed is a more blended approach to leadership that combines a focus on the traits, skills and behaviours of individual leaders (Stogdill 1948; Du Brin & Dagliesh 2003; Stogdill & Coons 1957) within the context, situation, environments and contingency in of higher education (Fiedler 1967; Hersey and Blanchard 1988; Vroom & Yetton 1973; Blau 1964; Burns 1978; Kouzes& Pousner 1987), particularly the more distributed context. Gronn (2008) has recently described this as the need for a 'hybrid leadership approach. This is in keeping with Marshall's (2006, p.5) description of the development of leadership capability in higher education as "not a simple process…rather, it is a complex, multifaceted process that must focus on the development of individuals as well as the organisational contexts in which they are called to operate. This new approach needs to more overtly identify the difference between management and leadership to incorporate what Anderson & Johnson (2006) describe as the difference between management (that relies on formal positions, often attracts relatively conservative and risk-adverse personnel and relies more on systems maintenance with decisions based in data analysis, rather than change) and leadership (that is change oriented, aiming at a perceived vision for the future that is achieved by encouraging a culture of enthusiasm for change). Finally, the new approach needs to recognise the need for both cultural and structural adjustments in recognition of the fact that academic leadership "is a highly specialised and professional activity" (Anderson & Johnson 2006, p.3). Ramsden (1998, p.4) has scoped the breadth of change required as:

> a practical and everyday process of supporting, managing, developing and inspiring academic colleagues….leadership in universities should be by everyone from the Vice Chancellor to the casual car parking attendant, leadership is to do with how people relate to each other.

Such a degree of change requires an integrated, inclusive university-wide approach that is anchored in the overall strategic direction and budgetary provisions of the university. Failure to recognise that changes made in one part of an organisational system will have an impact on other parts of the system will, as Marshall (2006, p.5) explains "inevitably leads to organisational environments that stifle rather than enable the development of leadership capability". In so saying, while identifying the central role of academics in leading in learning and teaching, Marshall acknowledges and emphasises the contribution made by professional staff. He includes amongst these professional staff senior executives as well as service providers such as student learning services professionals, librarians, IT specialists,

facilities managers, laboratory managers/technicians and administrators. He describes these professionals as staff who:

> do not hold academic appointments but who are actively involved in the planning and decision making processes associated with the development of the organisational context in which learning and teaching occurs….*[and provide]…* expert advice and support in their area of specialist expertise to enable others with more specific responsibilities for learning and teaching …to make informed decisions" (Marshall 2006, p.9.

In Australia this lack of a clear framework for effective leadership in higher education, led in 2005 the then Carrick Institute (now Australian Learning and Teaching Council [ALTC]) to establish a Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program. The overall aim of the program was to "fund projects that could provide empirical evidence on which to base new understanding and definitions of effective leadership in the context of Australian higher education learning and teaching in which there is need to promote and support strategic change" (Parker 2006, p.6). The ALTC (2010) has described the Leadership Program as classifying projects into two priority areas - institutional and disciplinary and cross-disciplinary, leadership. The first priority area - Institutional leadership - was broadly defined as contributing to an institution's capacity to effect change in learning and teaching either through specific roles and structural arrangements through the support of staff with expertise and passion who engage with colleagues to strengthen learning and teaching as part of their general duties. The Institutional leadership classification was further separated into two categories of leadership. Positional/Structural leadership includes persons with particular responsibilities for learning and teaching or supporting the development of systems that assist leaders to effect change in learning and teaching. Distributed Leadership offers a framework which encourages the active participation and partnering of experts and enthusiasts and the networks and communities of practices that are built to achieve organisational change. The second priority area- Disciplinary/Cross Disciplinary Leadership - was described as identifying models of leadership that enhance community partnering.

To date 61 projects have been funded as ALTC Leadership for Excellence projects, 24 as Positional/Structural leadership; 19 as Distributed Leadership and 18 as Disciplinary/Cross Disciplinary networks (ALTC 2011). As the projects identified under this last category aim to build leaders in learning and teaching in specific discipline areas and is closer to distributed leadership, this results in 37 projects implementing a distributed leadership approach. Included in this number are also 8 projects funded to consolidate the outcomes of earlier projects - 4 Positional/Structural, 3 distributed leadership and 1 disciplinary/Cross disciplinary).

The diversity of leadership projects and their outcomes was recently described by the ALTC (2011, p.ix) as enabling "the testing of a number of approaches to the development of the capacity and capability for leadership to effect ongoing improvements in outcomes for both undergraduate and postgraduate students in Australian Institutions". One outcome from the Institutional Positional/Structural leadership projects was a major cross-institutional report on the capabilities that make an educationally effective higher education leader (Scott et al 2008). The impact of this report is evidenced by the use of the Scott et al survey by the Association for Tertiary Education management (ATEM, 2011) to identify the capabilities most important to effective practice for experienced leaders in professional and executive roles in tertiary education institutions in Australia and New Zealand who are not employed

under a teaching classification (ATEM, p.9). This paper now focuses on the second of the Institutional leadership classifications, distributed leadership.

DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Distributed leadership is being recognised in a variety of developed countries as an emergent leadership concept relevant to the culture of the educational sector as a whole (primary, secondary and higher education). In the USA, the focus has been on primary and secondary education (Spillane et al 2001; Spillane 2006; Spillane & Diamond 2007; Spillane et al 2009; Leithwood et al 2009), while in the UK (Bennett at al 2003; Harris 2005, 2008 & 2009; Woods et al 2004; Bolden, Petrov & Gosling 2008;) and Australia (Dinham at al 2009; Gronn 2000, 2002, 2003, & 2009; Gronn & Hamilton 2004) all three sectors have been explored. In his early writings Gronn (2002) described distributed leadership as a 'new architecture for leadership' that incorporates a complex interplay in which activity bridges agency (the traits/behaviours of individual leaders) and structure (the systemic properties and role structures in concertive action. When combined with activity theory (Engestrom 1999) distributed leadership offers a new conception of workplace ecology for higher education in which contextual factors are incorporated to identify both a more holistic perspective of organisational work and a focus on emergent approaches.

Literature on distributed leadership from both the USA provides detailed empirical examples of how distributed leadership occurs within schools, while from the UK the focus has been on theoretical conceptualisation. The Leadership for Excellence project in Australia tries to bridge the gap between conceptual theory and empirical practice by adopting a praxis approach and focusing on the operationalisation of distributed leadership to build leadership capacity in learning and teaching (ALTC 2011) Projects funded to utilise a distributed leadership approach to learning and teaching have taken either an issue-based focus (leadership and assessment; on-line learning; emerging technologies; student feedback; peer review) or targeted leadership development (indigenous research, indigenous curriculum development and indigenous women; building communities of practice and networks; developing faculty scholars). Projects funded to develop disciplinary and cross-disciplinary networks have focussed on building discipline-based leaders by networking specialists in a broad range of disciplines including maths and stats, scientists, dentistry, chemistry, childhood education, nursing, speech pathology, languages, law, mental health, creative arts, social sciences and humanities, engineering and clinical health (ALTC 2011).

In 2009 the ALTC funded a consolidation project whose aim was to identify the synergies between four completed ALTC Projects[2] funded as Institutional Leadership (distributed leadership) grants in order to design a matrix of, and self enabling tool for, distributed leadership (Jones et al, 2009a). Three of these projects had used an issue-based approach (assessment, on-line learning and student feedback) while the fourth had targeted leadership development (Faculty scholars) (Harvey 2008; Lefoe and Parris 2008; Schneider et al 2008). A critical common factor identified during this analysis was the need to support a complex interplay of participants from across the institution between formal managers and formal and informal leaders at all levels of the institution and between academics, professionals and administrative personnel involved in a range of functions It is to this finding that this paper is focussed.

[2] RMIT (Student Feedback LE67); Macquarie University and University of Wollongong (Effective Assessment (LE612 & LE69) and Australian Catholic University (On-line Learning and Teaching LE68)

METHOD

The methodological framework that underpinned the consolidation project (LE9-1222) built on the common methods and strategies of an action research methodology and participant reflection that was used in the four initial projects. Over an eighteen month period the project used a participatory and inquiry-based action research methodology of reflexive inquiry (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988). This provided the opportunity to implement and research change simultaneously using an action research cycle of plan, act, observe and reflect. The action research methodology offered the benefit of an emphasis upon collaboration and collegiality, considered essential to the multi-dimensional, interdisciplinary, multi-university and multi-campus project. The great strength of the model was its inherent flexibility that enabled adaptation of the project in response to ongoing evaluation that was achieved through reflective practice of the project team and the reference group at each project phase. In three cases the process involved cycles of change using an action research approach that relied upon reflection, on and in, action by the participants. An early project action was to collect and share the reflections of each of the project team leaders of the original projects, this was validated at an ALTC meeting of a group of leaders of learning and teaching (recipients of ALTC funded leadership projects). Based on these reflections and feedback from these leaders the Project Team identified a series of further questions that required detailed responses from participants representing the four original projects. These participants met as a Community of Practice reflective workshops in each of their respective institutions and elicited responses from the participants on the contextual conditions and leadership skills needed to achieve an effective distributed leadership process. These responses provided the data that was collated into a draft Distributed Leadership Matrix. The Matrix was then reviewed by the Project Reference Group of national experts in distributed leadership, with their feedback included in the final design of an Action Self Enabling Tool (ASERT) for distributed leadership. This tool was assessed by a second group of leaders of learning and teaching for its potential to assist universities to design distributed leadership approach on issues relating to learning and teaching.

RESULTS

Given that the outcomes of this project were iterative they are presented below according to the major phases of the project.

Phase 1

The first (scoping) phase confirmed theoretical research undertaken in the United Kingdom, namely that there are five Dimensions to distributed leadership - context, culture, change, relationships and activity as follows:

1. Context - distributed leadership is effective in a context in which there are both external and internal influences. In this project the cases under analysis were designed to respond to an external (government) pressure on higher education to improve the quality of learning and teaching while concurrently increasing research output. This resulted in creating (common) internal pressures to review existing hierarchical (managerialist) leadership approaches that, it was recognised, are being subject to increase resistance from by academics who are used to acting autonomously. In all projects it was recognised that the establishment of the Leadership for Excellence program by the ALTC was an important external stimulus to the executive leadership of the institutions to recognise the importance of building leadership in learning and teaching. In several cases new learning and teaching

strategies that encourage greater engagement in distributed leadership were implemented. For example, in several cases changes were made to criteria for promotion to encourage greater participation and involvement in leading change to improving learning and teaching quality.

2. Culture - the importance of adopting new leadership approaches that support the existing and deeply embedded culture of academic autonomy was evidenced. In each project academics self selected for participation in the projects based on their interest and expertise rather than having a formal (structural) position. While identifying this, the essential need for persons in formal managerial and leadership positions to overtly support a distributed leadership approach was recognised. In addition it was recognised that while the projects were focussed on the role of academics in the delivery of a quality learning and teaching environment, the contribution by, and concomitant need for, collaboration between academics and members of the executive, professionals and administrators, was identified as part of the supporting culture. This multi-level and cross-functional collaboration provided each of the projects with a range of 'lenses' (Brookfield, 1995),or perspectives, to better inform innovation and project decision making.

3. Change and Development - the central need for change was recognised in all cases, supported by an integrated change process that includes formal senior leaders making policy at the top of the organisation as well a the informal leaders implementing policy (academics-as-teachers). In each case institutional change was required that had wide impact designed to produce a mix of top-down policy with bottom-up implementation strategies. In each case, the important role played by the Executive (in the form of the Deputy (Pro) Vice Chancellor/Provost of Learning and) in positively and overtly encouraging, endorsing, supporting and recognising the contribution being made by the informal leaders and in providing mentoring and coaching support, was identified. In several cases at the conclusion of the projects, several participant who had become acknowledged as leading experts of learning and teaching as a result of their engagement in the project, were appointed to formal positions.

4. Activity – the role of teams that consisted of academics, professional and administrative staff with expertise in a broad range of relevant knowledge, ideas and values in collaborative processes of change, was acknowledged. This was examples by the fact that in each case the participants were assisted by academics, professional and administrative staff from the Learning and Teaching Units who adopted a facilitative role using regular sharing of individual reflections on activities and change such as through the embedding of Supported Reflection (Harvey, 2008). The importance of the provision of resources in the form of finance to 'buy-out' time from other tasks to enable networking and communicating opportunities, provision of rooms and IT facilities and training in leadership and professional development, was acknowledged.

5. Conflict Resolution – while the theoretical research from the United Kingdom identified the need for discrete conflict resolution mechanisms, this was not recognised as an important factor in the Australian projects. However it was acknowledged that adoption of an action research methodology, with evaluation and reflection inherent in each cycle, have obviated the need for conflict resolution

mechanism as it enabled the flexibility for timely adjustments to be made if potential conflicts arose .

These findings were validated for their broad relevance across institutions by leaders of learning and teaching at a national (ALTC Leadership) forum in February 2010. Feedback from participants emphasised two meta-factors underpinning these dimensions - the need for activity to produce change and the importance of a blended approach in which executive and senior (formal) leaders champion the distributed leadership approach and encouraged the 'voice' of (informal) experts to be heard.

Phase 2

In the second, Community of Practice phase, responses from the participants in the four original projects to questions that arose from the original scoping study were sought. The issues identified for further reflection by these participants included:

- what motivated participants to become involved in their institutional project
- how did they see the original project as being influenced by university policy and leadership what challenges were there in the development of collaborative process
- what processes, factors, resources and support were most effective in encouraging collaboration
- what skills did they believe were needed by participants in a distributed leadership process

Participants met in a Community of Practice organised as a focus group, with their responses compared across the four institutions then used to inform the development of a two-part Distributed Leadership Matrix. Distributed Leadership Matrix A (DLMA-Appendix 1) identifies the responses under the headings of Dimensions, Elements and Inputs of Distributed Leadership. The dimensions and associated elements were identified as:

- a context underpinned by influence rather than power
- a culture underpinned by autonomy rather than control
- a change process underpinned by interdependence between top-down, bottom-up and multi-level policy development and implementation
- relationships focused on collective rather than individual identity
- activity based on shared purpose through cycles of change using reflective practice.

The Inputs required to achieve these dimension and elements included:

- encouragement for the involvement of people
- creation of supportive processes
- development of shared or distributed leadership
- resourcing of collaborative activities
- support for individual participation.

The skills, traits and behaviours considered most effective in encouraging collaboration were incorporated in part B of the matrix. Distributed Leadership Matrix B (DLMB-Appendix 2) identified personal (and organisational) values required to support distributed leadership including - trust, respect, recognition, collaboration and commitment to reflective practice. Associated with these values were behaviours that included the ability to - consider self-in-relation to others, support social interactions, engage in dialogue through learning conversations and grow as leaders through connecting with others.

The two-part Distributed Leadership Matrix was reviewed and analysed by the Reference Group of experts. This review confirmed the central role of Actions taken by participants and the management of Relationships between participants as vital in developing capacity for distributed leadership, rather than the traditional emphasis on the skills and traits of individual leaders. The 'fit' between four particular elements was identified - the people involved, the processes developed, the professional development provided and resources made available. It was recognised that this classification is pragmatic as in practice each action is an integrated and interdependent part of a holistic process that includes all levels and functions across the university.

The outcome of this phase was agreement that while it is difficult to define distributed leadership given the need for flexibility to accommodate different institutional contexts, it can be described as "a form of shared leadership that is underpinned by a more collective and inclusive philosophy than traditional leadership theory that focuses on skills, traits and behaviours of individual leaders" (Jones et al 2011).

Phase 3

The third, and final, reflective, phase of the project used the findings identified in the DLM and the agreed description of distributed leadership to design a two-part Action Self Enabling Reflective Tool (ASERT) to be used as a framework to assist institutions that are considering the adoption of a distributed leadership process. Part 1 (Appendix 3a) of the ASERT is identified as an Action Self Enabling Tool (ASET). This provides a description of how the philosophy and principles that underpin distributed leadership are identified in terms of the Dimensions, Values and Criteria for distributed leadership. On the one axis the Dimensions of distributed leadership include:

- a context in which trust rather than regulation exists
- a culture of autonomy rather than control
- change that recognises a variety of inputs
- relationships that build collaboration rather than individualism
- activity based on shared purpose rather than individual purpose.

These dimensions are associated with the values of: trust rather than regulation, respect for expertise, recognition of contribution, collaboration and reflective practice through action research cycles.

On the other axis criteria for distributed leadership are identified. This includes identification of the people involved in distributed leadership, the process required to support the process, the form of professional development required, and the type of resources needed to support the process. The cells that are created through the intersection of these dimensions, values and criteria identify a mix of behaviours and actions required to use a distributed leadership process to achieve change. For example, a context in which trust rather that regulation is emphasized requires people involved for the expertise they can offer to inform decisions. This in turn requires processes through which leadership is seen as a collaborative process that involves many people rather than being invested in a single person who is identified by their formal position. In turn this requires the provision of professional development by which any 9and all) leadership training includes a component on distributed leadership. Finally, resources such as space, time and finance, need to be provided to support collaboration for collaboration.

Part 2 of the ASERT is an Action Self Reflective Prompt Tool (ASRT) Appendix 3b) that uses a process of scaffolded Reflective Prompts (Vygotsky 1962) to assist participants to identify action needed to move towards a more distributed leadership approach.

In combination the ASERT provides a tool for institutions who have identified that distributed leadership can be used to build leadership capacity for change. The ASERT provides a useful tool to assist institutions that have made the decision to implement a distributed leadership process for change based on principles and practices identified from an in-depth exploration of the synergies between four projects funded by the ALTC to use a distributed leadership approach to build leadership capacity in learning and teaching. Based on this tool, a further two-year study designed to develop a systematic evidence-based benchmarking framework for Distributed Leadership, designed as a web-based interactive tool, to facilitate benchmarking across the sector has recently been funded by the ALTC (Jones et al 2011). The benchmarking framework will be identified from a national survey of existing practice of using distributed leadership to build leadership capacity. Through the identification of benchmark indicators the project will provide the means to ascertain areas for improvement. This will provide a valuable contribution to identifying an effective response to the impending crisis of leadership facing HE identified in a recent study as:
not conducive to encouraging new staff to enter the academic profession nor … for keeping existing staff enthusiastic and retained…this carries serious implications for sustaining and developing the academic profession. It suggests radical change is needed in the institutional climate within which academics operate (Coates et al 2009, p. 28). The benchmarking framework will provide the opportunity to test the need for "clear leadership devolved from the top throughout the institution….through….management and leadership styles that are aligned with the specific nature of the university" (Coates et al 2009, p. 31). The benchmarking framework will provide opportunities for international benchmarking of leadership development (see for example findings of a UK report by Burgoyne, Mackness & Williams 2009).

DISCUSSION

Given the learning and teaching focus of the ALTC projects that have been the subject of this paper, it is not surprising that the focus of attention has been on engaging academics in the distributed leadership process. What is interesting, however, has been the emphasis in the findings on the importance of engaging professionals, administrators and academics in collaborative processes if distributed leadership is be effective. While the paper recognised that this is not a new revelation, its importance in distributed leadership is particularly emphasised in these projects. Examples of this include the Project Team that oversaw the initial project (RMIT) consisted of a diverse team that included academics and professional representatives (including heads of academic schools (departments), managers of IT systems, Property Services and the Survey Centre, and administrative staff responsible for academic development assistance). Similarly the Reference Group of experts included academic, professional and executive representatives. The Plenary sessions that operated as Communities of Practice did attract academic and professional participants (from Human Resources and Student Services). In addition, one of the major outcomes of this project was the establishment of a cross-functional leadership group to advise on future teaching spaces (Jones & Novak, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c.). In a second project (ACU) the importance of instructional designers, academics and IT experts working collaboratively to build and operate an effective approach to on-line learning that was both technically capable and pedagogically anchored, was emphasised. In a third project (Macquarie University) the focus

on leading assessment engaged academics across all levels (from sessional to senior full-time staff) with professional staff that included policy developers as well as departmental, faculty and organisational administrators inclusive of human resources and IT services (Harvey 2008).

The question of how to engage professional and administrative staff in a more integrated way in an inclusive participative approach built on collaboration up, down and across institutions remains to be researched in more detail. While the ASERT identifies the need for any change process to involve interdependent, top-down, bottom-up and multi-level out processes in which policy and practice operate to be mutually supportive through the engagement of experts from multi-levels and multi-functions, the senior executive encourages the involvement of all stakeholders and systems and infrastructure are designed to support engagement, how this may occur, what are the challenges involved (including differences in work methods between autonomous academics and more structured professional and administrative approaches), has to date remained largely unexplored. This paper is presented to commence discourse upon how this further research may be advanced.

CONCLUSION

While multiple theories of leadership exist, the Higher Education sector requires a less hierarchical approach that takes account of its highly specialised and professional context. This paper has argued that there is need to develop a less hierarchical, more distributed leadership approach to leadership for Higher Education if the sector is to continue to provide leading edge change. In so arguing, however, the paper does not eschew the important role of formal, structural leadership, but rather argues for a dual, or hybrid, approach in which formal leaders and informal experts are recognised for the leadership contribution they make. The paper presents the Action Self Enabling Reflective Tool developed from the experience of distributed leadership to build capacity in learning and teaching as a tool to assist institutions that have realised the value of adopting a distributed leadership process. While the focus of the project that underpinned the tool was on building leadership capacity of academics for learning and teaching, the findings demonstrate the need for an inclusive participative approach by which professional, administrative and academic staff, collaborate to build a systematic, multi-facetted leadership approach appropriate for the sector. The paper concludes by proposing the need to undertake further research into how academics, professional and administrative staff may be supported to develop more effective distributed leadership approaches to change.

REFERENCES:

Anderson, D., & Johnson, R. (2006). Ideas of leadership underpinning proposals to the Carrick Institute. Retrieved on 30.05.2011 from http://www.altc.edu.au/resources-ideas-of-leadership-underpinning-proposals-altc-2006,.

ALTC (2011). Report; Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, Completed and Continuing Leadership Projects, ALTC, Strawberry Hills. NSW.

Association for Tertiary Education Management (2011). Professional and Executive leaders in Higher Education Report, ATEM Matters, Issue 40, p.9

Bennett, N; Harvey, J.; Wise, C. & Woods, P. (2003). 'Distributed Leadership: A Desk Study', www.ncsl.org.uk/literature reviews. Retrieved 27.1.2010.

Blau, P. (1964). Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley.

Bolden, R.; Petrov, G. & Gosling, J. (2008). 'Developing collective leadership in Higher Education, Final Report, Research and Development Series, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education: UK.

Brookfield, S.D. (1995). Becoming a critically reflective teacher. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burgoyne, J; Mackness, J. & Williams, S. (2009). Survey results for consultation; baseline study of leadership development in Higher Education, Leadership Foundation: UK.

Burns, J. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Coates, H; Dobson, I; Edwards, D; Friedman, T; Goedegebuure, L. & Meek, l. (2009).The attractiveness of the Australian academic profession: a comparative analysis, Research Briefing, L.H Martin Institute, Education Policy Unit, ACER, http://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=higher_education. Accessed 31.03.2010

Dinham S, Brennan K, Collier J, Deece A and Mulford B (2009) The Secondary Head of Department: key links in the quality of teaching and learning chain, Quality Teaching Series, No.2, Australian College of Education: 1-35

DuBrin, A.J. & Dalglish, C. (2003). Leadership, an Australasian Focus. Australia: John Wiley and Sons.

Engestrom, Y. (1999). 'Activity theory and individual and social transformation'. In Engestrom, Y; Meittinen, R. & Punamaki, L. (Eds.), Perspectives on Activity Theory, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.19-38.

Fiedler, F. (1967). A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties, Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 28(3), 317-338.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, pp. 423-451.

Gronn P (2003) Distributing and intensifying school leadership. In Bennett N and Anderson . (eds). Rethinking Educational Leadership: Challenging the Conventions, London-Sage: 60-73

Gronn P and Hamilton A (2004) Á bit more life in leadership, co-principalship as distributed leadership practice. Leadership in Policy and Schools, 3(1): 3-35

Gronn P. (2008). Hybrid leadership. In Leithwood K, Mascall B and Strauss T (eds). Distributed Leadership According to the Evidence. New York: London:Routledge: 17-40

Harris, A. (2004). 'Teacher leadership and distributed leadership': an exploration of the literature', Leading and Managing, 10(2), 1-9.

Harris, A. (2005). 'OP-ED Leading or misleading? Distributed leadership and school improvement'. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 37(3), 255–265

Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: according to the evidence. Journal of Educational Administration, 46(2), 172-188.

Harris, A. (Ed.). (2009). Distributed Leadership – Different Perspectives. Dordrecht: Springer

Harris A (2009a) Distributed leadership and knowledge creation. In Leithwood, K., Mascall B and Strauss T (eds). Distributed Leadership According to the Evidence, New York, London:Routledge

Harris A and Chapman C (2002) Democratic leadership for school improvement in challenging contexts Paper presented at the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement: Copenhagen.

Harvey, M. (2008). Leadership and Assessment: Strengthening the Nexus. Final Report. Strawberry Hills; Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Available from: http://www.altc.edu.au/resource-leadership-assessment-mq-2008 Retrieved 03/05/09.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1988). Management of Organizational Resources: Utilising Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice Hall

Jones, S; Hadgraft, R; Harvey, M. and Lefoe, G. (2011) Evidence-based benchmarking framework for a distributed leadership approach to capacity building in learning & teaching, ALTC, LE11-2000, Strawberry Hills, Sydney

Jones, S; Applebee, A; Harvey, M. & Lefoe, G. (2009a) Lessons learnt: identifying synergies in Distributed Leadership projects, ALTC LE9-1222, Strawberry Hills, Sydney

Jones, S; Applebee, A; Harvey, M. & Lefoe, G. (2010) Scoping a Distributed Leadership matrix for higher education; Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the 2010 Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia, Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia.

Jones, S; Harvey, M; Lefoe. G; Ryland, K. & Schneider, A. (2011) LE9-2222, Report to ALTC Leadership Meeting February.

Jones, S. & Novak, B. (2009a). 'Enhancing the student experience through responding to student feedback, The Student Experience, Proceedings of the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference 6-9 July 2009, Darwin. Retrieved August 9, 2009 from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2009/papers/HERDSA2009_Jones, S. & Novak, B.pdf.

Jones, S. & Novak, B. (2009b). Student Feedback and Leadership', Final Report. Strawberry Hills; Australian Learning and Teaching Council. http://www.altc.edu.au/resource-leadership-assessment-rmit-2009. Retrieved 06/06/09.

Jones, S. & Novak, B. (2009c). Student Feedback and Leadership, Resource Portfolio Strawberry Hills; Australian Learning and Teaching Council. http://www.altc.edu.au/resource-leadership-assessment-rmit-2009. Retrieved 06/06/09.

Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (1988). *The action research planner. 3rd edition*. Geelong: Deakin University.

Kinni, T. (2003). The Art of Appreciative Inquiry, The Harvard Business School Working Knowledge for Business Leaders Newsletter, September 22.

Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (1987). The Leadership Challenge. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Base.

Lefoe, G. & Parris, D. (2008). The GREEN Report: Growing, Reflecting, Enabling, Engaging, Networking, Final Report Strawberry Hills; Australian Learning and Teaching Council. http://www.altc.edu.au/resource-leadership-assessment- ouw -2008 Retrieved 9/3/09

Leithwood, K; Mascall, B. & Strauss, T. (2009). Distributed Leadership According to the Evidence, London: Routledge.

Marshall, S. J. (2006). Issues in the Development of Leadership for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. Sydney: ALTC Exchange. http://www.altc.edu.au/resource-issues-development-leadership-learning-macquarie, accessed 12/02/2008

Parker, L. (2006). Synthesis of leadership colloquium discussion. http://www.altc.edu.au/resource-leadership-colloquium-altc-2006 accessed 29.02.2011

Parker, L. (2008). Review of the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) Program 2006-2008, ALTC: Sydney.

Ramsden P. (1998). Learning to Lead in Higher Education. London: Routledge

Schneider, A., Applebee, A. C. & Perry, J. (2008). 'Leading from within: Distributing leadership to enhance eLearning at Australian Catholic University'. In Hello! Where are you in the landscape of educational technology? Proceedings Ascilite Melbourne 2008. http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne08/procs/schneider.pdf

Scott, G; Coates, H; Anderson, M. (2008), Academic leadership capacities for Australian Higher Education, http://www.altc.edu.au/resource-learning-leaders-change-uws-2008. Accessed 08.06.2011.

Spillane, J. (2006). Distributed Leadership, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass

Spillane, J. & Diamond, J. (Eds.), (2007). Distributed Leadership in Practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Spillane, J; Camburn, E; Pustejovsky, J; Pareja, A. & Lewis, G. (2009). 'Taking a distributed perspective in studying school leadership and management: the challenge of study operations'. In Harris, A. (Ed.). Distributed Leadership, Springer, http://springer.cpm/series/6543.

Spillane J, Halverson R and Diamond J (2001) Investigating School Leadership and Practice: A Distributed Perspective. Research News and Comments, (April): 23-7

Stogdill, R. (1948). Handbook of Leadership. New York: Free Press.

Stogdill, R. & Coons, A. (Eds.), (1957). Leaders Behaviour: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research: Ohio State University.

Vroom, V. & Yetton, P. (1973). Leadership and Decision Making. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1962). Thought and Language. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Woods, P; Bennett, N; Harvey, J. and Wise, C. (2004). Variables and dualities in distributed leadership, Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 32(4), 439-457.

Appendix 1

The Distributed Leadership Matrix 'A' - Dimensions and Inputs

Inputs **(required to move towards DL)**	**Dimensions (and elements) of Distributed Leadership**				
	Context **From power** **to influence**	**Culture** **From control** **to autonomy**	**Change** **From top-down** **to interdependent, multi-level and bottom-up**	**Relationships** **From individual** **to collective identity**	**Activity** **Shared purpose through cycles of change**
Encourage Involvement	Move from regulation to trust	Value staff expertise identified in university vision and strategy	Policy influenced by practice at multi-levels and multi-functions	Create opportunities for self-identification of participants as leaders as well as teachers/scholars	Establish action research cycle with identified plan, role, activity timetable and responsibilities
Create Process	Formal leaders to support informal leaders	Develop culture of respect for expertise	Introduce opportunities for practice to influence policy	Encourage collaborative groups e.g. CoPs action research teams	Development of action research cycles and reflective practice techniques and tools
Develop Shared Leadership	Formal leadership training to include DL	Encourage representation on decentralised committees	Senior Exec. support involve all stakeholders	PD workshop on of DL opportunities for dialogue and networking	Encourage reflective practice as methodology
Resource Collaborative opportunities	Time and finance for collaborative activities	Leadership contribution recognised	Mentor and facilitate collaboration	Encourage regular meetings (Face-to-Face and online) & cross university networking	Fund time for reflective activities
Support engagement	Work-plans identify contribution	Leadership contribution rewarded	Systems and infrastructure support	Diagnostic tool to demonstrate outputs	Skilled facilitators for PAR process

Appendix 2

The Distributed Leadership Matrix 'B' - Values and Practices

Practices of leadership **(X Axis)**	**Values for Distributed Leadership (Y axis)**				
	Trust not regulation	**Respect** for expertise	**Recognition** of leadership capabilities	**Collaboration** as 'conjoint agents'	**Reflective Practice** for continuous change
Self-in-relation	Not ego-centric	Adaptable -open to new idea, ambiguity & change authentic credible	Mentor encourage	Forthright but flexible	Reflective as individual and group
Social interactions	Proactive resilient	Recognise peers	Willing to share philosophies	Beyond self interest	Critique not critical
Dialogue through learning conversations	Represent issues not positions	L&T expert	Accept free ranging discussion	Willing to listen, good communicator	Share goals
Growth-in-connection	Accept responsibility, work independently	Work outside comfort zone	Forthright but flexible	Accept shared goals, not authoritarian	Focus on growth-fostering outcomes

Action Self Enabling Reflective Tool (ASERT) for DL

Part 1: Action Self Enabling Tool (ASET)

Criteria for Distributed Leadership (X Axis)	Dimensions and Values to enable development of Distributed Leadership (Y Axis)			
	CONTEXT Trust	CULTURE Respect	CHANGE Recognition	RELATIONSHIPS Collaboration
People are involved	Expertise of individuals is used to inform decisions	Individuals participate in decision making	All levels and functions have input into policy development	Expertise of individuals contributes to collective decision making
Processes are supportive	Shared leadership is demonstrated	Decentralised groups engage in decision making	All levels and functions have input into policy implementation	Communities of Practice are modeled
Professional development is provided	DL is a component of leadership training	Mentoring for DL is available	Leaders at all levels proactively encourage DL	Collaboration is facilitated
Resources are available	Space, time & finance for collaboration are available	Leadership contribution is recognised and rewarded	Flexibility is built into infrastructure and systems	Opportunities for regular networking are supported

Action Self Enabling Reflective Tool for DL

Part 2 Action Research (AR) for DL: Reflective Prompts

ONE: Identify where (ie level of the Institution) at which a DL approach is to be enabled

NOTE: If the Institution as a whole desires to introduce a DL approach at multiple levels the question needs to be asked about each level.

TWO: Identify the Criterion for DL on which to focus (*eg Involve People*)

THREE: Identify the Dimension (*eg Context*) for DL in relation to the chosen Criteria

FOUR – Reflection on action

What is the extent to which the identified action item occurs currently? (*eg extent to which the expertise of individuals is used to inform decisions*)

EG Individuals (both academic and professional) are asked for input on their experience as a means to inform Policy

FIVE – Reflection for future action

i) What action could be taken to identify existing opportunities that have not yet been taken advantage of? (*eg for individuals to contribute their expertise to decision making processes*).

EG Individuals (both academic and professional) could be asked for feedback on areas in which their expertise is not currently utilised

ii) What action could be taken to identify new opportunities? (*eg for individuals to contribute their expertise to decision making processes)*

EG Individuals (both academic and professional) could asked to identify areas in which their expertise could be utilised

iii) What action could be taken to generate new opportunities? (*eg for individuals to contribute their expertise to decision making processes*)

EG Professional development could include exploration of issues that could benefit from input of expertise more broadly

iv) What action should be taken to ensure these new opportunities are sustainable?

EG Develop a culture in which new ideas are celebrated

SIX: Reflection to ensure integrated concerted, supportive action

i) How does the proposed action arising from these reflective prompts affect the other criterion and dimensions?
ii) What change is needed in the other four Criteria to ensure that the proposed action is implemented?

EXAMPLES OF ASET from the Lessons Learnt project in relation to:

…….Extent to which the expertise of individuals is used to inform decisions

** Individuals were encouraged to contribute ideas with meeting notes acknowledging contributions*
** More regular communication and consultation was encouraged using both F2F and electronic media*
** Newsletters were established to share practice on a regular basis*

SEVEN: Identify a plan of activity to achieve to desired Action outcome