Faculty involvement comprises a critical part of the assessment process. The literature spends far more space discussing faculty roles than the roles of administrative leadership in developing assessment programs. Since faculty involvement is crucial to the success of any assessment effort, the authors address both the barriers to faculty involvement and models that nurture faculty involvement in the assessment process. The authors also review the assessment literature which marginalizes administrative leadership process as well as a smaller body of literature that supports administrative leadership in assessment programs.

The authors turn their attention to creating campus cultures that promote effective administrative leadership. Two steps recommended for administrators creating this culture include creating a culture that is conducive to assessment and adopting a variety of leadership characteristics that they can apply using the Hersey-Blanchard situational leadership model. The mission and vision of administrative leaders, their listening, and their knowledge of what is essential should reflect in what they pay attention to, measure, and control as well as in the criteria for allocations of reward and status and in the criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and termination. In regard to assessment, this means that administrative leaders must present a mission and vision for assessment.

The systematic collection, use, and review of information about educational programs to improve student development and learning, to paraphrase Palomba and Banta (1999), defines the essence of student assessment in education. Despite the simple elegance of this statement, the implementation of this process is far from simple. One of the
The ironies of developing an assessment plan are that beyond the general commonality of the overall process, "faculty and administrators at each institution must develop their own understanding of assessment" (Palomba and Banta, p. 3) within the context of the mission and learning goals they establish. Thus, every assessment program can be both universal and unique, and the problems of implementation will vary from institution to institution.

Of the universal points, one on which the assessment literature agrees is that faculty involvement lies at the core of developing any successful assessment program. As Palomba and Banta (1999) remark, involvement must extend beyond awareness to assuming the responsibility for "designing, implementing, and carrying out the assessment program" (p. 10). Unless faculty own and drive the student learning assessment process, the chances of the data collected producing any meaningful change seem remote. In fact, faculty involvement comprises such a critical part of the process that the literature often spends far more space discussing this aspect than the role of administrative leadership in developing an assessment program.

Although the virtues of measuring and evaluating student learning are obvious enough to some administrators and faculty to ensure their efforts in creating an effective assessment process, still other administrators and faculty wonder what all the fuss is about, believing that grades should be enough. But when confronted with the reality that assessment involves more than grades, these educators often rebel. Like most students these institutions serve, many staff and faculty become used to sitting in the same seats enjoying the sense of security that falling into a routine brings. Using a concept from Rogers, Gray (1997) contends that an idea that seems new to the individual is labeled an innovation. Thus, at those institutions for which the creation or re-creation of a system to collect, use, and review data about what and how well students are learning is perceived as "new," this process can thus be labeled as an innovation.

A reluctance to embrace innovation can, in part, account for the failure of some assessment programs to take root. For institutions just embarking on a concerted effort to introduce assessment to the campus, Gray (1997) contends that two critical components to ensure the success of the process are leadership and a well-conceived series of activities to move assessment from innovation to institutionalization. To accomplish these tasks, administrators must acknowledge the potential barriers to faculty adoptions of these innovations and then take action to facilitate the transformation. Perhaps in focusing so much attention on faculty role in transforming the teaching and learning
assessment process, too little attention is directed toward administrative leadership in transforming the faculty as a critical early step in moving assessment from innovation to institutionalization.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Most discussions centering on creating an effective assessment process mention the importance of administrative leadership, but administrative leadership’s role comprises only one small component of a process that ultimately belongs to the faculty. Recent sources comment on the general need for administrative leadership to communicate the importance of student assessment; to present the purpose, broad parameters, and intended uses of assessment efforts; and to provide adequate resources in support of the institutional assessment process. However, few sources focus on the role administrative leadership plays beyond the level of encouragement and support for assessment activities. Instead, the literature stresses the importance of faculty in the process.

Marginalizing Administrative Leadership in the Assessment Process

Brewer, Denney, and Struhar (1997) acknowledge that a climate of administrative support along with the availability of resources assisted in the formation of Sinclair Community College’s assessment process but was, however, focused on the role of faculty leadership in the process. Administrative leadership was manifested through reassigning faculty time for development of assessment projects, providing resources for participation at national conferences, and inviting recognized experts and scholars to campus. However, in a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Association on linking institutional effectiveness and assessment, Easterling and others (1996) stress only the role the Assessment Steering Committee at Sinclair played in the college’s policy adoptions concerning mandatory assessment and placement, mandatory summative assessment of students’ skills in their major, mandatory assessment of general education skills, and guaranteeing career graduates’ performance and transfer units. The role of administrative leadership failed to receive even a mention.

The administrative leader’s role in an effective assessment program again draws just a passing mention in the case studies of Northeast Missouri State University (now called Truman State University), Johnson County Community College, Longwood College, St. Louis
University, James Madison University, and the University of Scranton (Hyman, Beeler, & Benedict, 1994). At St. Louis University improvement resulted from assessment, follow-up planning, and administrative initiative, and the first of five key factors contributing to successful assessment and improvement at the six institutions studied asserts that a commitment to self-examination is necessary for meaningful assessment to occur and that in this regard, “internal leadership and collegiality are hallmarks of a successful assessment effort” (Hyman et al., 1994, p. 29). Yet the term “internal leadership” could apply to faculty leadership and staff leadership as well as administrative leadership, but otherwise, the role of administration is absent from the discussion.

Advice to institutions from at least one accrediting agency (the North Central Association) is somewhat mixed in terms of the role of administration in the assessment process. Mather (1991) notes that involvement of and responsibility by faculty are essential in designing and implementing an assessment program and even recommends involving students in the process, but the role of administration fails to draw a mention. Lopez (1996) provides advice from the perspective of evaluators of institutions as they examine the entire assessment program. Two paragraphs of her 20-page staff paper comment on the importance of program administration from the chief academic officer. “Evaluators are clear that committees alone cannot provide effective leadership” (p. 6) and that any assessment committee should report directly to the chief academic officer. Lopez also distinguishes between a chief academic officer who supervises and takes initiative in the assessment process versus an officer who merely monitors it. Thus, the implication is that administrators should involve themselves actively in assessment.

Eisenman (1991), also writing for the North Central Association, focuses attention mainly on the importance of faculty participation in the assessment process. Yet he acknowledges that, “The attitude toward assessment is clearly a reflection of the campus culture, and campus culture is clearly a reflection of priorities and values inherent in the actions and decisions of campus leaders” (p. 460). Resource allocation and institutional decision-making, reflecting and reinforcing the assessment program, constitute the two specific examples that Eisenman provides for administrative actions. Additionally, he provides specific steps leaders can take to overcome resistance. Despite the lack of discussion of the role of administration in some of the literature, other scholars provide more discussion on the importance of administrative leadership to the success of institutionalizing an assessment process.
Including Administrative Leadership in the Assessment Process

In reviewing the literature on institutional support for student assessment, Peterson and Einarson (1999) maintain that two major areas that indicate institutional support are leadership and governance patterns. Administrative leadership contributes a key ingredient in initiating, implementing, and institutionalizing student assessment efforts. Sorenson (1996) asserts that, “Board members, the President, and other administrators must take an appropriately active role in understanding and fostering assessment goals and activities so that assessment becomes a routine way of life at the institution” (p. 532). Such calls for participation from the highest levels of administration are justified in the literature by accounts of how the president and other high ranking administrative leaders have received the credit for initiating and fostering their institutional assessment programs.

Young and Knight (1993) and Magruder, McManis, and Young (1997) discuss the roles Charles J. McClain, the president at Truman State University (formerly called Northeast Missouri State University) and Darrell W. Kreuger, the dean of instruction, played in causing the assessment of student learning to flourish. By continually asking questions of faculty about student learning and assessment, by fostering a collegial, low-risk environment, and by incorporating assessment data in their analyses of the college’s strengths and weaknesses, these leaders generated an atmosphere and attitude that aided in the success at Truman State, making it a model for assessment before the assessment movement began (Magruder, McManis, and Young, 1997). Palomba and Banta (1999) cite Nichols, who advises that selecting a faculty member as coordinator may increase credibility, thus adding another responsibility to administrative leadership as they empower faculty leadership in the assessment process. Support and directives from the president to initiate an assessment program appear in various sources as factors leading to implementing an assessment program at Ball State University, Ohio University, State University of New York College at Fredonia, and Mt. Hood Community College (Hurtgen, 1997; Palomba, 1997; Walleri & Stoering, 1997; Williford, 1997).

Palomba and Banta (1999) remark that administrators should be willing to express and reiterate a genuine commitment to assessment, to allow time for faculty understanding, acceptance, and implementation of assessment, to encourage and support the use of the findings, and to be flexible in their approach. Furthermore, faculty development relating to assessment must be an ongoing process.
According to Banta (1997), assessment, when undertaken in a respective, supportive, and enabling environment, is most effective. Administrative leadership should strive to create such an environment.

Despite the assertions about the importance of administrative leadership in promoting a successful assessment program, Peterson and Einarson (1998) found no empirical evidence regarding specific leadership support in relation to student assessment efforts.

INSTITUTIONALIZING THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS THROUGH PROMOTING FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN ASSESSMENT

With so much attention placed on the importance of the faculty in creating and implementing the process and so little attention placed on the administrative leadership role, one might have the impression that as long as the president and the chief academic officer verbally support the effort, select the right faculty leaders, provide adequate resources, and include assessment in the planning and budgeting process, assessment will succeed. Certainly, without administrative encouragement and support, faculty will likely tend to view the assessment process as merely an add-on activity done for accountability to external agencies such as the state legislature or regional and professional accrediting agencies. However, as Magruder, McManis, and Young (1997) assert, “Strong organizational [administrative] leadership is essential if the natural conservatism, autonomy, and inertia of the academy [faculty] are to be overcome” (p. 22). Terenzini (1989) discusses what he found to be the two primary faculty objections: fear of personal evaluation and a belief that outcomes are not measurable and that measuring outcomes is misleading, oversimplifying, or inaccurate. Yet another possible concern is organizational entropy that occurs when lack of energy leads to a breakdown or a running down of the organization (Young & Knight, 1993).

Barriers to Faculty Involvement

Whether because of conservatism, autonomy, inertia, fear, mistrust, or organizational entropy, faculty generally tend to display either skepticism about any assessment efforts, apathy toward involvement, or even outright resistance to the process. Overcoming this faculty resistance and assisting faculty leadership in overcoming the resistance is another challenge facing administrative leadership. Administrative leaders may find themselves in the dilemma of wanting to avoid taking
too much control of the process for fear that faculty will resist anything that appears administratively driven and controlled while also needing to keep the assessment process moving and supporting those faculty who are involved. In other words, how actively involved can and should administrative leadership be without appearing to take control of the process?

Gray (1997) places the barriers to faculty participation in context. Faculty react to educational innovations, such as an assessment process that causes an organizational transformation at every level—from the institution as a whole to programs to the classroom. For some faculty, assessing student learning that involves more than grades that appear on the grade report at the end of the semester threatens the status quo and appears to be an assault on their academic freedom. Gray cites Rogers, who contends that five factors appear to affect the rate of adoption of innovations: (1) relative advantage—the degree to which the innovation is perceived as an improvement; (2) compatibility—the degree of consistency among the innovation, existing values, past experiences, and needs of the adopters; (3) complexity—the degree the innovation is perceived as difficult to understand and use; (4) trialability—the degree to which an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis; and (5) observability—the degree of visibility of results to others (pp. 6–7). Rogers contends that educational innovations are often viewed as having little relative advantage, a low compatibility with existing values and past experiences, and a low visibility of results (Gray, 1997, p. 7). Administrative leaders, therefore, who want to see the assessment program move from innovation to institutionalization must prepare to address these barriers to faculty involvement.

From Rogers, Gray (1997) also applies the five types of users of innovations, which include the innovators, the early adopters, the early majority, the late majority, and the laggards (pp. 11–12). The critical bridging point in adopting innovations such as assessment comes between the chasm that exists between the innovators/early adopters within an institution and the early majority. The early majority is the most sensitive to the factors that impact adoption, and it is convincing the early majority to accept and work with the innovation that will move it toward institutionalization. Gray (1997) uses Geoghegan’s contrasts between the early adopters and the early majority to help explain why this chasm exists (p. 12):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor revolutionary change</th>
<th>Favor evolutionary change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project oriented</td>
<td>Process oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk takers  Risk averse
Willing to experiment  Want proven practices
Generally self-sufficient  May need significant support
Horizontally connected  Vertically connected

Early adopters want proven practices built upon current processes to minimize risk. “They look to central administrators [administrative leadership] and local opinion leaders within the hierarchy of the institution for guidance and confirmation of the innovation’s worth. And they need more support than do early adopters because they take a pragmatic approach to change, realizing that there always are costs associated with it” (Gray, 1997, p. 13). Since the innovators and early adopters comprise only about 16% of the faculty, bridging the chasm to the early majority, who comprise the next 34%, is a critical faculty barrier to address in order to move assessment toward institutionalization.

Models That Nurture Faculty Involvement

Gray (1997) presents the stages of concern as described by Hall, Wallace, and Dossett and by Hall, George, and Rutherford, as well as the levels of use as presented by Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, and Newlove. The levels of concern chart the phases of development through which individuals move in adopting an innovation. The levels of use distinguish the degrees that individuals and groups embrace the innovation. The levels of concern and of use pair with each other as follows: (1) awareness (having no knowledge or concern about the innovation) and nonuse (taking no action concerning the innovation); (2) informational (wanting to know more about the innovation) and orientation (seeking information about the innovation); (3) personal (having concern about the effects of the innovation on one personally) and preparation (preparing for first use of the innovation); (4) management (focusing on the processes and tasks of using the innovation in a more or less rote manner) and mechanical use (focusing on the short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little reflection); (5) consequence (viewing the impact of the innovation) and routine and refinement (stabilizing use because of increased comfort and varying the implementation to increase the impact of the innovation); (6) collaboration (coordinating and cooperating with others regarding the use of the innovation) and integration (deliberately coordinating with others in using the innovation); and (7) refocusing (turning attention to improving the innovation or seeking something that will work better) and renewal (reevaluating the
quality of the use of the innovation and seeking major modifications or alternatives). These levels of concern and use provide a valuable framework for administrative leaders in gauging the degrees of acceptance of any assessment program, and they mirror the stages of development of an assessment program itself as it progresses through the collection, use, and review of the data and its impact on modifying or changing the processes.

These levels of concern and use along with the five types of users of innovations can be transposed against Lacoursiere’s (1980) five-stage developmental model, which consists of orientation, dissatisfaction, resolution, production, and termination (Baker, 1992). This model describes the stages that groups move through during their life cycles. One could take this model and apply it to the process of developing an assessment program over time. The orientation stage may correlate with levels 1 and 2 of the concerns and uses. Dissatisfaction may reflect level 3. Resolution may begin at level 4 and move into level 5. Perhaps level 5 and certainly level 6 would equate with the production stage, and when faculty reach level 7, one could assume that arrival here would mark the termination of the process of moving from innovation to institutionalization.

During the orientation stage, the group defines goals and tasks, how to approach them, and the skills needed. When an administrative leader initiates an interest in seeing the institution develop an effective assessment program, usually the first to respond are the innovators and early adopters, for they are the most likely to share the administrative leader’s vision of what assessment could mean in terms of enhancing teaching and learning. As Baker (1992) points out, organizations with complex goals (such as developing an assessment program) may find that this stage could take 30–60% of the life cycle of the group, or in this case, the process.

The most critical stages are the next two: the dissatisfaction stage and the resolution stage. A dip in morale and intensity occurs in the dissatisfaction stage. Members perceive the discrepancy between initial expectations and the reality of the situation, thus leading to dissatisfaction, frustration, or anger about goals and tasks. According to Baker (1992), resolution at this stage depends partly on redefining goals and tasks to make them achievable. Once the innovators and early adopters develop a preliminary assessment plan, they face the chasm—obtaining the cooperation and support of the early majority. One could theorize that dissatisfaction occurs, in part, because of the developers’ expectations that the faculty will just naturally embrace the concept of assessing student learning although the assessment methods proposed clash with the reality that the majority of the
faculty greet their efforts with skepticism, apathy, disdain, or even open opposition.

The resolution stage finds members becoming less dissatisfied as they begin to work together to resolve differences. As they accomplish tasks, the group’s self-esteem increases with its sense of accomplishment, and pleasure replaces dissatisfaction. Resolution will occur in the assessment process when the innovators and early adopters bridge the chasm between themselves and the early majority. With the acceptance from their peers (initially from the early majority and afterwards from the late majority), resolution will occur.

During the production stage, members are eager to be part of the group, have confidence about outcomes, work well both together and autonomously, and communicate well. Focus is on accomplishing the task rather than on resistance and dissatisfaction. In terms of the levels of use and concern, this stage is probably the point at which the early majority are reaching the consequence/routine or the collaboration/integration levels with the late majority perhaps moving into the management/mechanical use stage or higher.

Although assessment is an ongoing process that never truly reaches termination, once assessment moves from innovation to institutionalization, one might consider that this phase of the process has reached the termination stage. According to Baker (1992), in this stage the group has completed its work, and feels both accomplishment and sadness about the ending of the task. In terms of the assessment process, it is likely that assessment committee membership will change over time. However, it is unlikely that the assessment process will ever have the type of termination that Lacoursiere (1980) is probably referring to in respect to a group project.

The problem confronting administrative leadership is how to provide the critical assistance and support that the innovators and the early adopters seek while avoiding the appearance of trying to control the process. Administrative leaders must be actively involved without being controlling. According to the literature cited earlier, the administrative leader generally articulates the shared vision for developing an assessment program and keeps that vision in the forefront of the institution. However, the critical factors to the administrative leader’s successful involvement are that the faculty must perceive the administrative leadership as people they can trust. Additionally, the administrative leader must be willing to empower faculty totally in this process and conceive of his or her role as purely advisory. Otherwise, faculty will view themselves as being manipulated and the process as being a ruse for administrative control. An examination of leadership concepts can offer some solutions.
CREATING A CULTURE TO PROMOTE EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

With so much emphasis placed on the role of faculty in developing an effective assessment program, it might be easy to assume that the administrative leaders are abdicating their authority to the faculty in this matter. If the administrative leaders and the faculty consider each other adversaries, then it might matter who has the power to affect an assessment program. However, ideally, administrators and faculty should work as partners in developing an effective assessment program that can continually improve the teaching and learning process. “Leaders cannot empower others by disempowering themselves. They need to help others find and make productive use of many sources of power—information, resources, allies, access, and autonomy” (Bolman & Deal, 1995, p. 108). Bolman and Deal also assert that effective leadership is not the isolated archetypal hero but is rather a relationship rooted in community. Administrative leaders who assume the characteristics of being a leader rather than a manager can prove to be an essential element of the transformation from innovation to institutionalization. By being a source of information and providing resources, by creating alliances among various constituencies and access, and by allowing the faculty to have the autonomy to create an assessment program, administrative leaders can realize their role in helping to develop an effective assessment program.

Two steps that administrators could take to assist in moving the assessment process from innovation to institutionalization include creating a culture that is conducive to assessment and adopting a variety of leadership characteristics that they can apply using the Hersey-Blanchard (1988) situational leadership model. A leader’s ability to transform a culture and a leader’s leadership qualities are inextricably bound. Therefore, it is perhaps misleading to begin by discussing one before the other. Because the literature on assessment does discuss the importance of creating a culture that supports assessment of student learning, the discussion of these two steps will begin with the creation of culture.

Since implementation of a new assessment program must transform innovation into institutionalization, this process will likely modify or recreate the culture of a college. To the nine Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning developed by the American Association of Higher Education in 1992, Banta, Lund, Black, and Oblander (1996) added a tenth: “Assessment is most effective when undertaken in an environment that is receptive, supportive, and enabling” (p. 62; Banta, 1997, p. 81). Creating such an
environment would, in essence, engender a culture that is conducive for assessment. The literature generally provides broad recommendations about what institutions should do to develop such a culture. Magruder, McMannis, and Young (1997) consider four factors as essential. These include the leadership’s clarity and driving commitment, the reliance on faculty to develop and implement assessment, the integration of assessment into university processes from program review and accreditation to planning and committee work, and timing and motivation for assessment initiatives.

Gray (1997) contends that administrative leaders must make assessment a priority, create pathways and permissions to accomplish results, and work to involve opinion leaders in the assessment process. Additionally, administrative leaders can facilitate change by creating a climate where change can occur, by helping define and shape issues giving rise to innovations, by being visionary but coupled with two-way communication, by building community-wide coalitions in support of change and monitoring progress, by providing funds and incentives, and facilitating by gathering information, communicating, developing coalitions, and identifying existing coalitions that perceive their members as stakeholders in the process.

One cannot speak of the creation of a culture without acknowledging the role that leadership plays in the development of that culture. Biggerstaff (1992) presents Schein’s (1985) five primary mechanisms for transmitting and embedding culture: (1) what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control; (2) leader reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises; (3) deliberate role modeling, teaching, and coaching; (4) criteria for allocations of rewards and status; and (5) criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and termination (pp. 50–59). Interestingly, Schein’s (1985) five primary mechanisms for transmitting and embedding culture overlap with Smith’s characteristics for innovative leaders: “(1) they have a mission; (2) they create a vision; (3) they trust employees; (4) they keep their heads in a crisis; (5) they encourage risk taking; (6) they are experts; (7) they know what is essential; (8) they listen; and (9) they are teachers and mentors” (Satterlee, 1997, p. 14). The combination of these mechanisms and traits provides one set of criteria to help guide administrative leaders as they work to promote developing an assessment program.

The mission and vision of administrative leaders, their listening, and their knowledge of what is essential should reflect in what they pay attention to, measure, and control as well as in the criteria for allocations of reward and status and in the criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and termination. In regard to assessment, this means that administrative leaders must present
a mission and vision for assessment, just as James L. McClain and many other presidents have done at their institutions. Additionally, these criteria call for administrative leadership to possess a comprehensive knowledge of assessment—to know not only what it means but also what tools will help assess students, not just cognitively but affectively and behaviorally as well, and what models other institutions’ programs can provide to facilitate development.

The criteria for allocations of reward and status as well as for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and termination would also connect with the trust in employees and the encouragement of risk taking. Administrative leaders must provide the rewards and status necessary to endow the process of planning and implementing an assessment program with value. Furthermore, in the recruitment, selection, and promotion of faculty and staff, administrators must seek those who already have knowledge of and a commitment to assessment of student learning.

Schein’s (1985) criterion about leader reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises relates directly to Smith’s criterion of keeping one’s head in a crisis. When the assessment process reaches Lacoursiere’s (1980) dissatisfaction stage, this point could be a crisis for the process. How administrative leaders react at this point will determine whether people are able to work through the dissatisfaction stage to resolution or whether the process will fall apart.

Deliberate role modeling, teaching, and coaching correlate with administrative leaders as experts and as teachers and mentors. It is in this capacity that administrative leaders must function to help bridge the chasm between the innovators/early adopters and the early majority. Administrative leaders who embed culture using Schein’s (1985) mechanisms and who transmit and practice the characteristics of innovative leaders are likely to have people in the institution perceive them as leaders. Satterlee (1997) defines leadership as “persuading other people to set aside their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the welfare of a group” (p. i). He distinguishes between “managers” (those who maintain the status quo) and “leaders” (those who innovate). This same distinction applies to what Bass (1985) labels as “transactional” and “transformational” leaders.

Just as Schein’s (1985) primary mechanisms for embedding culture relate to Smith’s innovative leader, so, too, does the concept of the transformational leader. Roe (1992) presents Bass’s (1985) four transformational factors: (1) charismatic leadership; (2) consideration for others; (3) intellectual stimulation (“the capacity to influence and organize meaning for members of the institution”) (p. 84); and (4) ability
to vary style and behavior to fit the situation. Added to these factors are five themes that characterize the transformational leader: (1) a theme of vision as the centerpiece of leadership; (2) an orientation toward people and awareness of leader/follower interaction as essential for organizational success; (3) an orientation toward motivation which binds leaders and followers to achieve shared visions; (4) an orientation toward influence through accepting one’s own individuality and the empowerment of oneself; and (5) an orientation toward values that permeate the institution (Roe, 1992, pp. 86–87). Again, so many of these qualities not only overlap with Schein’s (1985) and Smith’s mechanisms and traits but also reinforce the idea that administrative leaders have an active role to play in ensuring the success of the transformation of the assessment process from innovation to institutionalization. Bass’s (1985) four factors are critical to help administrative leaders work with faculty to bridge the chasm. Transformational (or innovative) leaders impact the culture of their institutions.

If administrative leaders are those who persuade other people to set aside their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the welfare of a group, then by practicing the behaviors of the innovative/transformational leader along with the mechanisms for embedding culture, administrative leaders will likely build the trust. This trust is needed so that the administrative leader may join the innovators and early adopters through the assessment committee, and the trust is needed to reassure the other faculty, particularly the early majority, that the purpose of assessment is to improve teaching and learning rather than to harm any individual student, faculty member, or program. The trust that transformational/innovative leaders build enable these leaders to coach the faculty through the transition from dissatisfaction to resolution as it relates to the Hersey-Blanchard Model of Situational Leadership Styles (1988).

Baker (1992) introduces the Hersey-Blanchard Model, which presents four leadership styles: directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating. Situational leaders adapt their leadership style to fit the circumstances. According to this model, supportive behavior relates to maintenance functions, and the directive behavior relates to task functions. Supportive behavior involves the extent to which a leader participates in two-way communication, listening, providing encouragement and support, facilitating interaction, as well as involving subordinates in decision making. In contrast, one-way communication, defining member roles, directing subordinates what to do, when, and how, and closely supervising activities would characterize directive behavior. The four leadership styles represent
different combinations of supportive and directive behavior. Directing leaders are high on direction, low on support; coaching leaders are high on direction and high on support; supporting leaders exhibit low direction and high support; and delegating leaders provide low direction and low support.

With these characteristics in mind and in relation to Lacoursiere’s (1980) five-stage developmental model, Baker contends that directing is for the orientation stage, coaching for the dissatisfaction stage, supporting for the resolution stage, and delegating for the production stage. As discussed earlier, moving from the dissatisfaction stage to the resolution stage will also be the stage of bridging the chasm between the innovators/early adopters and the early majority. A coaching approach relates to the needs of both groups. Because the innovators and early adopters have likely already committed themselves to assessment and building an effective assessment program, they will need more of the supporting side of the coach along with some direction about how to proceed if necessary. On the other hand, the early majority, because of their characteristics, is more likely to seek more of the directive behavior from the administrator along with support in the form of alleviating their fears and addressing their concerns that the process is happening too fast.

Based on these assumptions, then, leaders should ensure that they are knowledgeable about assessment. Without a fairly extensive knowledge of assessment, of tools for assessment, and of models that will help the institution develop its assessment goals, leaders will likely discover that they are less effective in being directive or supportive. Additionally, leaders should participate, if possible, as at least an ex officio member of the assessment committee. That assertion sounds heretical in light of all the literature that emphasizes the need for assessment to be faculty driven. The idea, however, is not to have the administrative leader assume control of the group, and if a level of distrust exists between faculty and administration, this approach would likely do more damage to the process than assist. Yet if trust exists, if faculty recognize the administrative leader as possessing extensive knowledge, and if the faculty know that the administrator is acting in the capacity of a resource person or consultant rather than as the director, the administrator would be in a better position as a coach. Coaches can help bridge the chasm and move the group from the dissatisfaction to the resolution stage. To reach the point, however, at which an administrator can assume this role requires that administrators be perceived as leaders rather than managers, as partners rather than adversaries.
CONCLUSION

Developing a partnership between administrative leaders and faculty will resolve the sorts of problems that inhibit or prevent the institutionalizing assessment of student learning as part of the culture. Moreover, through cooperation and collaboration between administrative leaders and faculty, the institution as a whole will become stronger. The literature on assessment stresses the importance of faculty assuming a leadership role in planning, implementing, and using an assessment plan that will monitor student learning. In turn, the information gathered though this process should aid faculty in adjusting whatever they must to improve learning and should assist the administration in planning and budgeting to support that effort. Far from being just a fad, assessment has evolved as a major component of measuring institutional effectiveness. Therefore, administrative leaders must realize ways in which they can facilitate the faculty in institutionalizing student assessment.

Although some faculty can see the value in assessing student learning, many faculty still fear that the administration will somehow use any negative results against them personally or against their programs. Other faculty view assessment as a process that will yield little information of any value to them, and therefore, they either will reject becoming involved or will wait until they see that advantages to assessment do exist. By becoming aware of the factors that affect the rate of adoption of innovations as well as through recognizing the levels of concern and use that Gray (1997) presents, administrative leaders can better gauge how well the assessment program is becoming institutionalized. More importantly, administrative leaders should become knowledgeable about all aspects of assessment and should develop a variety of leadership traits that will assist them in being viewed as innovative and transformational leaders. In these ways, administrative leaders will be in a better position to embed assessment into the culture and to apply situational leadership techniques to assist the faculty (who are the innovators and early adopters) bridge the chasm that generally exists between them and the early majority, who will have more skepticism and concerns about adopting any innovations.

Specifically, administrative leaders need to possess enough knowledge about assessment as well as the factors that affect adoption of innovations so that they can become a valuable resource to help bridge the chasm and to move assessment from innovation to institutionalization. Lacoursiere’s (1980) five-stage developmental model helps put the process of moving from innovation to
institutionalization in perspective. The critical juncture between the dissatisfaction stage and the resolution stage coincides with the point at which the chasm between the innovators/early adopters and the early majority must be bridged. By applying coaching techniques that provide both a high level of direction and support, administrative leaders can play an active and productive role in helping move the process forward. Through developing and employing the characteristics of innovative and transformational leaders, administrators will develop the trust necessary to make the partnership between administration and faculty a reality and engender assessment into the culture of the institution.
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