

# FY2013 DEPARTMENTAL ANNUAL REPORT OF CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

## Department of Leadership Studies Fort Hays State University

### I. DEPARTMENTAL OVERVIEW

The Department of Leadership Studies is one of 16 departments in the College of Arts and Sciences. The department consists of ten full-time and numerous part-time (adjunct) faculty members who serve approximately 1500 undergraduate (including international, domestic, and virtual programs) and 80 graduate majors. The Leadership Studies faculty members are dedicated to providing students with a comprehensive educational experience that is based on both classroom theory and the practical application of leadership knowledge, skills and behaviors. The Department of Leadership Studies is one of only approximately twenty undergraduate leadership degree programs in the United States.

The Department of Leadership Studies offers several academic programs for interested students. At the undergraduate level, students can participate in the Leadership Certificate Program (9 hours), the Global Leadership Certificate Program (12 hours) a Minor in Leadership Studies (21 hours), or a Bachelor of Arts/Science in Organizational Leadership. At the graduate level, the department offers an Organizational Leadership concentration in the University's Masters of Liberal Studies degree program. A graduate certificate is also offered through the FHSU MBA program.

#### A. Departmental Mission and Vision Statements

Our mission is to educate and nurture citizens to lead our organizations, communities, state, nation and beyond.

Our vision is to be the best academic leadership program in the world; equipping on campus, virtual, and international students with transferable leadership skills and abilities.

#### B. Departmental Goals, Objectives, and Strategic Priorities

##### *Basic Assumptions*

##### Need for Leadership

With the complex problems and challenges of our changing world, the need for leadership is greater than ever before.

##### Teaching Leadership

Leadership can be taught. It is possible to develop and provide students with a learning environment that will foster critical leadership skills and capabilities.

### Leadership for All

Leadership education is not just for a select few, but rather, all individuals can and should benefit from leadership development activities.

### Theoretical Foundation

This academic program is based on an extensive theoretical foundation in the field of Organizational Behavior and Leadership Studies.

### ***Organizing Themes***

Fort Hays State University's Organizational Leadership degree program integrates three major themes in its curriculum: *creating change*, *collaboration*, and *collective/common purposes*. These themes provide the foundation and purpose for all leadership development activities.

### Creating Change

First and foremost, leadership is about creating change. There are several important elements to our creating change theme. First, leadership is about "purposefully" seeking change. Second, leadership refers to transformational or fundamental changes rather than small incremental adjustments. Third, the purpose of change is "positive" movement. Therefore, leadership is about making "improvement" or "correcting discrepancies" between what is and what ought to be for the collective good.

### Collaboration

It is critically important that our methods of practicing leadership reflect the new post-industrial paradigm of leadership if we hope to be successful. These approaches are characterized by cooperation, power sharing, and empowerment. When individuals are engaged constructively and effectively with others around issues that affect them or that they care about, they can achieve positive results.

### Collective and Common Purposes

If leadership is an influence relationship for change, and collaborative approaches are the preferred method, then the final step in the cycle is to encourage change that makes things better for all. The collective/common purpose theme represents a shift from the purpose of leadership that emphasized goal attainment for individual good (the leader) to collective and common good (organizations and communities). Finally, this theme encourages students to take action on behalf of the larger good. Each person has a responsibility to carry change forward for themselves and their collective units.

### ***Domains of Student Learning***

Organizational Leadership learning activities are designed to encourage students to develop leadership potential and to engage in "productive" leadership behavior. This program enhances the current FHSU curriculum by instilling new thinking, attitudes and behaviors in our graduates. The curriculum concentrates on all domains of student learning (cognitive, behavioral, and affective) by focusing on both *understanding* and *action* and has adopted the following learning objectives:

Understanding Leadership (Cognitive Domain)

Students will understand the processes and purposes of organizational leadership. The learners will be knowledgeable regarding the role leaders and followers play in making changes for the collective good.

Competencies in Leadership (Behavioral Domain)

Students will be able to demonstrate and perform both personal and collaborative leadership skills. This includes the ability to think critically, make decisions, solve problems, communicate, and successfully work in teams and organizational settings.

Commitment to Leadership (Affective Domain)

As leaders and followers, students will assume responsibility by actively engaging in service as agents of change for the purpose of making their organizations and communities a better place.

**Goals and Strategic Priorities**

To fulfill the department's mission and graduate characteristics (found in Appendix A), the following three goals serve as a basis for strategic decisions and priorities in the Department of Leadership Studies. More emphasis will be made this year on further development of the strategic priorities under each goal.

1. Provide high quality instruction and advising at the undergraduate and graduate level through the on campus, virtual, and international modalities.
2. Create and maintain culture of service to students, the University, and greater communities.
3. Advance the leadership discipline by actively participating in scholarship and creative activities.

**C. Department Productivity and Distinctive Accomplishments****Teaching:**

*Arensdorf, J.*

-2013 Pilot Award Nominee

-Coordinated L3-Live. Learn. Lead. Freshmen Learning Community

*Blanton, P.*

-Re-developed LDRS 677: Internship in Leadership Studies for delivery in China

*Brown, L.*

-2013 Pilot Award Nominee

-Consistently recognized by cooperating teachers as top leadership faculty member

*Brungardt, C.*

-Taught cross-listed (LDRS/POLS) Model UN course to 25 FHSU students resulting in a successful Model UN experience in St. Louis, MO in February 2013

*Brungardt, C.J.*

-Incorporated career prep activities into LDRS 670 course

*Goertzen, B.*

-Utilized new assessment rubrics in LDRS 677: Internship in Leadership Studies to include more reflection and intentional alignment to the program's learning goals/objectives

- Taught new graduate level research seminar
- Attended multiple CTELT workshop to enhance on-line teaching using Web 2.0 tools

*Greenleaf, J.*

- National Honor Society Top Professor Award
- Taught LDRS 300 as a dedicated section to L3- Live. Learn. Lead. learning community
- FHSU Next Generation Faculty Member
- Attended multiple CTELT workshop to enhance on-line teaching using Web 2.0 tools

*Whitaker, B.*

- Led the effort to incorporate IDS 407: Global Challenges into the General Education Program as an Upper Division Integrative course
- Co-advised Washburn Leadership Challenge student team

#### **Service:**

*Arensdorf, J.*

- Volunteer, Youth Friends
- Co-chairing FHSU Civic Learning and Community Engagement Task Force
- Advisory Board Member, Kansas Campus Compact
- Served on FHSU IEMG Committee

*Brown, L.*

- Co-advise Global Leadership Project with Brett Whitaker (received EOF funds and Tilford Grant)
- University Service-Learning Committee Member
- Volunteer with Trego Co. KAYS Organization

*Brungardt, C.*

- Conducted a record-setting year of programs in the Center for Civic Leadership (number of participants)
- Co-Chair of the Domestic Violence Batterers Intervention Program Advisory Committee
- President, Jana's Campaign to Stop Domestic Violence
- Co-chairing FHSU Civic Learning and Community Engagement Task Force

*Brungardt, C.J.*

- Served on University Promotion Committee
- Served on Faculty Senate
- Director of Women's Leadership Project, CCL
- Co-Chair of the Domestic Violence Batterers Intervention Program Advisory Board
- Coordinator of FHSU AAUW Organization

*Goertzen, B.*

- Past Chair, Leadership Education Member Interest Group, ILA
- Served on COAS Promotion Committee
- Served on Faculty Senate

*Greenleaf, J.*

- Served on Kansas Leadership Center Vision Team
- Faculty Advisor, Leadership Studies Association
- Chaired Department of Leadership Studies Faculty Search Committee

*Kastle, S.*

- Faculty Advisor, Student Veterans Association
- Coordinated Leadership Studies Speaker's Series
- Chair, Leadership Studies Immersion Weekend Planning Committee

*Whitaker, B.*

- Faculty Advisor, Leadership Studies Association
- Member, Internationalization Team
- Treasurer, United Methodist Student Center Board of Directors

**Research:**

*Arensdorf, J.*

- Co-presented at International Leadership Association
- Member of Kansas Leadership Center Research Consortium
- Began research project on The Flipped Classroom
- Co-wrote funded Union Pacific Grant for LDRS 310 projects

*Brown, L.*

- Co-presented poster at International Leadership Association
- Co-wrote article published in Journal of Leadership Education
- Successfully completed Ph.D.

*Brungardt, C.*

- Co-presented at International Leadership Association
- Co-wrote article published in Journal of Leadership Education
- Conducted five keynote addresses

*Brungardt, C.J.*

- Co-presented at Association of Leadership Educators Conference
- Conducted multiple local presentations

*Blanton, P.*

- Attended International Leadership Association Conference
- Continued progress on Ph.D. (ABD)
- Conducted one local presentation

*Goertzen, B.*

- Nominated for President's Distinguished Scholar Award
- Presented at International Leadership Association Conference
- Conducted one local presentation

*Greenleaf, J.*

- Began research project on The Flipped Classroom
- Successfully completed Ph.D.

*Kastle, S.*

- Attended International Leadership Association Conference

*Kriley, H.*

- Wrote and published a blog about LDRS 310 in China on Bright Impact blog

*Whitaker, B.*

- Co-presented poster at International Leadership Association
- Co-authored ebook with Global Scholars for Global Challenges national initiatives
- Co-wrote article published in Journal of Leadership Education
- Continued progress on Ph.D. (now ABD)

### **Department**

- Met with Leadership Studies Advisory Board made up of former students, employers, and community volunteers
- Faculty members are active in Association of Leadership Educators, Kansas Leadership Center, and International Leadership Association, as well as local organizations
- Implemented new on-boarding plan for LDRS new students
- Assisted with Colorado Bus recruiting Trip in December 2012
- Reviewed courses for the YUM and Diebold Corporate Partnerships
- Revised tenure, promotion, and merit departmental criteria
- Hired three faculty members in May 2013
- Hosted visiting faculty member (Jenny Mao) from Shenyang Normal University
- Hosted one speaker as part of the rejuvenated Leadership Studies Speaker Series – Colonel Frank Curtis on April 22, 2013
- Worked with College of Health and Life Sciences to propose a leadership concentration in new Bachelor of Science in Health Studies program
- Faculty members attended both Assessment and Retention/Persistence Mini-Conferences

### **Students**

- Tyler Hayes, Seth Bailey and Jacob Kessler received delegate awards at Model UN
- Recognized one international, on campus, and on-line student each month through departmental student of the month program.
- The FHSU Organizational Leadership team placed 2nd in the Undergraduate Student Case Study Competition at the International Leadership Association conference in October 2012.
- One Organizational Leadership major was chosen to serve as FHSU VIP Ambassadors for 2013-14.
- Two Organizational Leadership majors were selected to travel to Guatemala for the Spring 2013 Alternative Break Service Trip.
- Two Organizational Leadership majors and one Leadership Studies faculty member were selected as 2013 Men of Merit.
- Leadership Studies Association hosted an Etiquette Dinner and Employer Meet and Greet in collaboration with Career Services.
- Two Organizational Leadership majors served as SGA Student Senators.
- Multiple teams worked in the Hays and Ellis communities on service-learning projects through the Fieldwork in Leadership Studies course. Below is a list of a few projects:
  - Relay Field Day-American Cancer Society
  - The Ellis Mission Project
  - 4-H Turkey Trot 5K Run/Walk
  - Neon Hope-Up 'til Dawn, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital

Healthy Lifestyle Promotion-Ellis Alliance  
J.T. VonLintel Outdoor Mentoring Program  
Paws For A Cause-Western Plains Animal Refuge  
American Cancer Society Bark for Life  
Red Cross Sporting Clay Classic  
Change for Literacy – Ethiopia Reads  
Drive for Bryan Nichols – Fundraiser for Bryan Nichols Memorial Highway  
MS Walkers -  
College Brothers and Sisters-Big Brothers Big Sisters of Ellis County

## II. DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE METRICS

### A. Department Performance Indicators

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
<b>Freshmen</b> [20 <sup>TH</sup> DAY FALL SEMESTER, HEADCOUNT]	8	5	2	10	19
<b>Transfer Students</b> [20 <sup>TH</sup> DAY FALL SEMESTER, HEADCOUNT]	221	312	291	375	658
<b>Undergraduate (first majors/second majors)</b> [20 <sup>TH</sup> DAY FALL SEMESTER, HEADCOUNT OF FIRST MAJORS, HEADCOUNT OF SECOND MAJORS]	310/4	616/2	860/1	1062/1	1423/6
<b>MLS Majors</b> [20 <sup>TH</sup> DAY FALL SEMESTER, HEADCOUNT OF ADVISEES WITH 120-4901]	49	40	42	43	73
<b>Major Retention</b> [20 <sup>TH</sup> DAY FALL SEMESTER, PERCENT OF FR MAJORS RETURNING TO UNIVERSITY]	75.00%	71.43%	75.00%	100.00%	66.67%
<b>Undergraduate Student Credit Hours</b> [TOTAL UNDERGRAD SCH]	4882	6496	9691	10959	10121
<b>Graduate Student Credit Hours</b> [TOTAL GRAD SCH]	513	415	450	578	663
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track Faculty (Headcount)</b> [FTE OCCUPIED FROM POSITION CONTROL]	3	3	3	3	4
<b>Non Tenure-Track Faculty (Headcount)</b> [FTE OCCUPIED FROM POSITION CONTROL]	2	5	4	5	6
<b>Undergraduate Degrees</b> [ UNDERGRAD DEGREES AWARDED]	23	26	176	324	348
<b>MLS Degrees</b> [MLS DEGREES AWARDED BASED ON 120-4901 ADVISEES IN DEPT]	17	18	11	18	17

Undergraduate degrees conferred increased again this past year. This is as a result of the second class of students in the international partner program, but also a growing virtual and domestic program.

The major retention is a cause for concern in the Department of Leadership Studies. The Department has worked to create an onboarding program for virtual and domestic students to aid in the retention of those students. This program began in the Fall of 2012. Our department also hired a full-time advisor (shared with Justice Studies) for virtual students. This initiative will also aid in the retention of our majors.

The Department of Leadership Studies is particularly proud of the increase in incoming freshmen in FY2013. This increase can be attributed to enhanced recruiting efforts. Special efforts are also being implemented at the departmental level to retain these students through to their sophomore year and then persist on to graduation.

The Department of Leadership Studies has also experienced exponential growth in the MLS concentration over the past year. This increase has prompted a graduate program self-study/review which will result in changes in the graduate program to better serve students.

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
Number of books, book chapters, and <b>refereed</b> articles published [TOTAL NUMBER PUBLISHED]	2	4	5	3	4
Percent of faculty publishing <b>refereed</b> books, chapters, or articles [PERCENT OF FACULTY PUBLISHING FOR FY2008 (FACULTY PUBLISHING/TOTAL FACULTY)]	40%	43%	38%	47%	50%
Number of <b>non-refereed</b> articles and presentations [TOTAL NUMBER COMPLETED]	8	11	16	20	16
Percent of faculty publishing <b>non-refereed</b> articles or presentations [PERCENT OF FACULTY COMPLETING (FACULTY PUBLISHING/TOTAL FACULTY)]	80%	86%	100%	100%	80%
Number of scholarly performances and other creative activities [TOTAL NUMBER OF CREATIVE PERFORMANCES]	18	20	20	34	30
Percent of faculty in scholarly performances or other creative activities [PERCENT OF FACULTY IN CREATIVE SCHOLARSHIP (FACULTY PERFORMING CREATIVE ACTIVITY/ TOTAL FACULTY)]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total number of external grant applications submitted/percent of faculty submitting [TOTAL NUMBER OF EXTERNAL GRANT APPLICATIONS/PERCENT FUNDED]	4/60%	3/43%	0/0%	1/12%	3/30%
Total number of funded external grants/percent of faculty funded [DOLLAR AMOUNT OF EXTERNAL GRANT APPLICATIONS, PERCENT OF FACULTY FUNDED]	3/60%	2/29% \$13,000	0/0%	1/12% \$4000- Tilford	2/20% Tilford- \$4000 Union Pacific - \$2500
Total number students successfully completing an undergraduate research/creative project [TOTAL NUMBER OF UNDERGRAD STUDENTS COMPLETING, CONTRIBUTING TO, OR PRESENTING A CREATIVE OR SCHOLARLY PROJECT]				0/0%	3/0.2%
<p>The Department of Leadership Studies remains active in scholarly and other creative activities. Five faculty members (50%) published in a peer reviewed journal this year.</p> <p>One faculty member completed her Ph.D. in May 2013, while two other faculty members are ABD with May 2014 as a targeted completion date for both. One additional faculty member will be starting his Ph.D. in January 2014.</p> <p>Eight of the ten faculty members in the Department of Leadership Studies attended and/or presented at the International Leadership Association conference in October 2012. The FHSU undergraduate student team placed 2<sup>nd</sup> in the scholarly project/case study competition at the conference.</p>					
[NOTE: Each department MUST report at least two direct measures of student learning outcomes and two indirect measures. Examples of direct measures include: first-time pass rate or average scores on standard exit					

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
exam, number of students successfully completing reviewed portfolios. Indirect measures would include student satisfaction, alumni and employer data, or any other perception based data.]					
<b>Direct Outcome 1</b> LO 1- Understand and demonstrate the capacity of leadership theories and concepts in multiple contexts (Percentage of students who complete LDRS 650 capstone with a B or better average on their final organizational audit papers)				<b>Domestic</b> 69.1% of students {n=85} <b>International</b> 75.1% of students {n=287}	<b>Domestic</b> 78.7% of students {n=75} <b>International</b> 54.2% of students {n=297}
<b>Direct Outcome 2</b> LO 8 – Selects, develops, and delivers appropriate messages utilizing suitable communication channels in a given context (LDRS 670 Elevator Speech Rubric)				<b>Meta-Dimensional Summary</b> 86.4% ≥ 4 (5 pt scale) {n=103}	<b>Meta-Dimensional Summary</b> 85.2% ≥ 4 (5 pt scale) {n=62}
<b>Indirect Indicator 1</b> LO 1 – Understand and demonstrated the capacity of leadership theories and concepts in multiple contexts (Social Change Leadership Inventory)	<b>Pretest (LDRS 300)</b> Understanding Leadership 3.65* (5 pt scale) {n=51} Practicing Leadership 3.71 (5 pt scale) {n=51}  <b>Posttest (LDRS 310)</b> Understanding Leadership 4.25* (5 pt scale) {n=33} Practicing Leadership 3.75 (5 pt scale) {n=33}  *Statistically significant difference between pretest and post-test	<b>Pretest (LDRS 300)</b> Understanding Leadership 3.51* (5 pt scale) {n=88} Practicing Leadership 3.56 (5 pt scale) {n=88}  <b>Posttest (LDRS 310)</b> Understanding Leadership 4.25* (5 pt scale) {n=33} Practicing Leadership 3.75 (5 pt scale) {n=33}  *Statistically significant difference between pretest and post-test	<b>Pretest (LDRS 300)</b> Understanding Leadership 3.42* (5 pt scale) {n=45} Practicing Leadership 3.54* (5 pt scale) {n=45}  <b>Posttest (LDRS 310)</b> Understanding Leadership 4.42* (5 pt scale) {n=31} Practicing Leadership 4.03* (5 pt scale) {n=31}  *Statistically significant difference between pretest and post-test	<b>Pretest (LDRS 300)</b> Understanding Leadership 3.77*(5 pt scale) {n=136} Practicing Leadership 3.61* (5 pt scale) {n=136}  <b>Posttest (LDRS 310)</b> Understanding Leadership 4.33*(5 pt scale) {n=50} Practicing Leadership 3.94*(5 pt scale) {n=50}  *Statistically significant difference between pretest and post-test	<b>Pretest (LDRS 300)</b> Understanding Leadership 3.40*(5 pt scale) {n=117} Practicing Leadership 3.52* (5 pt scale) {n=117}  <b>Posttest (LDRS 310)</b> Understanding Leadership 4.37*(5 pt scale) {n=80} Practicing Leadership 3.98*(5 pt scale) {n=80}  *Statistically significant difference between pretest and post-test
<b>Indirect Indicator 2</b> Demonstrates ability to effectively work across factions with multiple stakeholders (Student Peer Evaluation)	<b>Meta-Dimensional Summary</b> 87.9% ≥ 3 (4 pt scale) {n=99}	<b>Meta-Dimensional Summary</b> 89.4% ≥ 3 (4pt scale) {n=140}	<b>Meta-Dimensional Summary</b> 93.1% ≥ 3 (4 pt scale) {n=36}	<b>Meta-Dimensional Summary</b> 82.4% ≥ 3 (4 pt scale) {n=153}	<b>Meta-Dimensional Summary</b> Domestic 84.6% ≥ 3 (4 pt scale) {n=415} International (SIAS only) 65.0% ≥ 3 (4 pt scale) {n=143}
Dept senior students' Level of Academic Challenge [FHSU LAC SCORE, DEPT LAC SCORE]	54.65 57.14	55.9 56.75	57.6 58.89	56.2 59.02	58.5 57.48

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
Dept senior students' Active and Collaborative Learning [FHSU ACL SCORE, DEPT ACL SCORE]	45.34 55.78	46.1 51.56	51.4 55.87	44.5 58.50	45.1 50.60
Dept senior students' Student-Faculty Interaction [FHSU SFI SCORE, DEPT SFI SCORE, N, %]	45.34 34.29	41.0 43.33	42.5 36.74	38.4 48.10	38.6 41.19
Dept senior students' Enriching Educational Experiences [FHSU EEE SCORE, DEPT EEE SCORE, N, %]	34.72 37.07	34.0 40.38	40.5 45.21	32.7 36.85	34.0 40.20
Dept senior students' Supportive Campus Environment [FHSU SCE SCORE, DEPT SCE SCORE, N, %]	59.57 59.33	60.3 63.10	57.6 58.89	59.8 58.93	61.9 61.5
Number of NSSE participants [NUMBER OF DEPT SR STUDENTS, PERCENT]	14 29.2%	15 35.7%	15 33.3%	14 28.57%	29 44.6%
<p>Briefly note 2-3 improvements over the last year prompted from the above student learning/engagement indicators.</p> <p>Over the past year we have implemented our newly revised assessment plan. Both direct measures reported were new in 2011-12. The LDRS 670 rubric was utilized by all faculty members in a joint grading session of these final speeches. We understand that multiple years of data will need to be collected prior to making data driven decisions. It will be important to maintain consistent assessment methods to do so. This is certainly a goal of the department.</p> <p>Although it is an indirect measure, faculty members have made intentional efforts to reflect on leadership theory in LDRS 310 as part of students' service-learning experience. These reflections are reflected in the assessment results. We attempted to collect data using this measure on our international students; however, were not successful. Next year we must assess our international population as well using this indirect measure.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the Department of Leadership Studies scores above the average FHSU scores on all five of the NSSE constructs. One item to note is that enriching educational experiences was up considerably from last year. This could be due to two additional faculty members incorporating service-learning into their courses, as well as more intentionality put on the capstone internship experience. The department is concerned about the lower scores in active and collaborative learning and student-faculty interaction from the previous year. We know that many of students are virtual; however, we must give all students opportunities to collaborate with one another, as well as faculty members. This will be an on-going conversation in the department over the next year.</p> <p>[NOTE: Departments may pick up to three key performance indicators they currently measure but are not captured above. These measures could be used to track departmental results on specific yearly goals. Examples might include: number of SRPs attended, number of new freshmen contacted. (These will vary by department based on goals.)]</p>					
Outcome/Indicator 1 Number of Completed 3 credit hour Internships (undergraduate and graduate; on campus and virtual, excludes international program)	66	55	67	46	56
Outcome/Indicator 2 Number of Successful 310 Community Project Teams	10/15	10/16	11/16	73/77*	78/86
Outcome/Indicator 3 Number of undergraduate Leadership Studies/Global Leadership Certificates Awarded	118	140	156	141/8**	142/7
Briefly note 2-3 improvements over the last year prompted from the above indicators.					

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
<p>One item to note is that the number of completed three credit hour internships has grown in the last year. This growth reflects both the increase in the number of LDRS majors, but also the increased intentionality the department has placed on the internship course. We now have a faculty member dedicated to this integral capstone experience for both undergraduate and graduate students.</p> <p>*LDRS 310 projects include both on campus and virtual projects during the 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic year. Seventeen on campus teams worked on projects in Hays, while the remainder of the students are spread across the country working on innovative, creative service-learning projects in their home communities. Successful projects reported received a grade of C or better.</p> <p>**2011-12 was the first year for the Global Leadership Certificate to be offered. This relatively new certificate enhances students' global leadership skills and abilities.</p>					

## B. Department Quality Initiatives and Results

FY2013 Quality Initiatives	Results
Full implementation of new assessment plan	Upon completion of our August 2012 faculty retreat, the department fully implemented our revised undergraduate program assessment plan. This included two direct and two indirect measures for each of our ten student learning outcomes. New rubrics were created to align with our defined student learning outcomes. Data was collected in 2012-13 for seventeen direct measures and 18 indirect measures. Work needs to be completed for three new direct measures and two new indirect measures during the 2013-14 academic year.
Focus on recruitment, retention and persistence	The chair and student marketing coordinator were responsible for the overall retention and persistence plan in Leadership Studies. Buy-in from all faculty members was received in August 2013 at the departmental annual retreat. Measurable results are as follows: Hired and trained Mr. Troy Terry, SEAC Advisor for Leadership Studies and Justice Studies; Full implementation of new student on-boarding plan (retention data for this Fall 2013 is the measure that will be used for this initiative); nineteen incoming freshmen began their program in Leadership Studies during the Fall of 2013; 27 students were part of the 2012-13 L3 learning community. More data needs to be collected on the persistence rate of our virtual college majors. This quality initiative will be carried over to 2013-14, focusing on the University goal of increased retention and persistence.
Updated SNU and SIAS International Curriculum	The international coordinator and department chair spent this past year updating all curriculum guides and course sequencing documents for both the SNU and SIAS Organizational Leadership dual degree programs. These documents will assist in maintaining high quality partnerships.
IDS 407: Global Challenges	Formerly IDS 111 (Sustainability and the Future: The 7 Revolutions) was accepted with a new number as an Upper Division Integrative course in the University General Education program. This is the first course in the general education program for which Leadership Studies is responsible for staffing and assessment.

FY2014 Quality Initiatives	Responsible Party, Resources, and Plan
Completion of Graduate Program Review and Implementation of Recommendations	Graduate faculty and the chair in the Department of Leadership Studies will be responsible for completing the comprehensive review of our current MLS concentration in the Fall of 2013. Implementation of recommendations will begin in Spring/Fall of 2014. Resources requested will be a new full time faculty member in the Department of Leadership Studies for the 2014-15 academic year. Specific measurement of this initiative will be conducted by the number of graduate students recruited into a new program, as well as through a new assessment plan that will be created as part of the program review.
LDRS Virtual Course Re-developments	The Department of Leadership Studies has a number of virtual courses (LDRS 302, LDRS 306, LDRS 640, LDRS 670 - international, and numerous graduate level courses) that will need to be re-developed over the course of the next year. Faculty members will be identified for these re-developments during the August 2014 departmental retreat. Resources required will be the assistance of CTELT staff, which is part of the new virtual course re-development process. Financial resources through the course development process will also be utilized. Specific measures will include the completion of each course, focusing specifically on the quality assurance measures incorporated through the development process by both the department and CTELT. All courses should be ready for delivery in August 2014.

### C. Institutional Quality Results

FY2013 University Initiatives	Department Activities/Results
Align Programs and Services with North Central Kansas Technical College (NCKTC)	The department did not formally work with NCKTC; however, we are open to partnership opportunities in the future.
Increase Enrollment	The department grew both its incoming freshmen class, MLS graduate student numbers, as well as number of Organizational Leadership graduates this past year. Efforts to continue marketing the program to on campus, international, and virtual students will be a priority.
Improve Persistence and Retention	The department chair will serve on the newly developed Institutional College Completion Team, chairing the communications sub-committee. The department also had a representative on the IDS 101 curriculum team. The department participated in the Persistence and Retention mini conference in February, which resulted in a number of initiatives that the department will be facilitating next year. These include continuation of the on-boarding program for new students, participating in the learning community initiative with L3- Live. Learn. Lead., utilizing a SEAC virtual advisor to connect students to their academic program, and the possible creation of an introduction to leadership course through a MOOC.
Improve Student Learning	Full implementation of the departmental undergraduate assessment plan occurred this past year. Departmental faculty members have also created and utilized rubrics for individual course assignments, resulting in better feedback processes. As results continue to be known, improvements will be made to content and teaching methods, which we hope result in improved student learning.

### III. FY2013 STRATEGY AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

#### A. Departmental Reflection of Strengths, Needs, Opportunities, and Threats

Environments both internal and external to the Department of Leadership Studies are in a state of constant change. Below is an assessment of internal strengths and weaknesses, as well as evaluation of opportunities and threats that impact departmental activities. The department's strategic direction/plan is evaluated each year in August at the annual departmental retreat. Information from the departmental advisory board is incorporated into the plan as well.

Current Strengths	Current Needs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outstanding faculty instruction</li> <li>• Commitment to personal advising relationship</li> <li>• Commitment to continual improvement by way of program review</li> <li>• Faculty commitment to the education of the 'whole student'</li> <li>• High interest in the MLS in Organizational Leadership program</li> <li>• Extreme growth in on-line program</li> <li>• Synergistic relationship with the Center for Civic Leadership</li> <li>• Collaborative culture within the Department of Leadership Studies</li> <li>• Administrative support</li> <li>• Reputation with the local community</li> <li>• International partner program growth</li> <li>• Administrative position and support for international program growth</li> <li>• More focused career and internship opportunities and preparedness programs for LDRS students</li> <li>• Established departmental advisory board</li> <li>• Established SEAC Virtual Advisor Position</li> <li>• Faculty members participating in NextGeneration Faculty program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention of majors to the University</li> <li>• Need to continue to work to increase enrollment for on-campus certificate and degree programs</li> <li>• Faculty over-extended with quantity of work</li> <li>• Reliance on adjunct faculty to teach many core courses (52% of courses are taught by adjunct faculty)</li> <li>• More focus on documentation of research and creative activities</li> <li>• More buy-in of assessment from all faculty members</li> <li>• Increase in student labor funds to assist with departmental growth</li> <li>• Additional on campus teaching position to fill undergraduate and graduate program needs</li> <li>• Funds to support student study abroad opportunities</li> </ul>
Future Opportunities	Future Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest in leadership development in high schools and business</li> <li>• Re-visit discussion about FHSU Leadership Institute to facilitate intentional leadership education opportunities to more FHSU students</li> <li>• Possible movement from MLS to MPS concentration</li> <li>• Potential growth with domestic partnerships (e.g. FCCLA, Hays High, TMP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing number of both on-campus and on-line graduate programs in leadership offered by competing institutions</li> <li>• Unfamiliarity of leadership as an undergraduate degree program</li> <li>• Lack of new resources/funding as programs grow</li> <li>• Extreme disproportionate growth in the international program</li> <li>• Faculty burn out</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Potential business/corporate partnerships for internship opportunities (e.g. ABBB, WalMart)</li><li>• Working collaboratively with other departments –new MLS concentration in Global Forces which includes graduate level Global Challenges course; Emergency Services program with GSCI; other study abroad experiences</li><li>• New onboarding and immersion weekend programs to facilitate retention and persistence of on campus and virtual students</li><li>• Limited number of undergraduate degree programs across the country</li><li>• Collaboration with CCL and CSI to incorporate leadership development into FHSU student experiences</li><li>• Expansion of the Global Leadership Certificate Program</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of LDRS full time faculty if programs continue to grow</li></ul>
--	---

## B. Opportunities for Improvement

Below is a summary of departmental initiatives intended to address a few areas that emerged from both the regular strategic planning and program review processes. Several of the items remain as ongoing initiatives while new opportunities will be created to improve the department and its programs.

Opportunity for Improvement	Resources Required	Expected Result and Completion Date
Full-time LDRS on campus faculty position (possible Global focus) – This faculty member would help meet the demand of undergraduate and graduate courses in Leadership Studies and assist students with undergraduate research. This will increase the number of courses taught by full time faculty, as well as enhance collaborative opportunities for research in the department.	Full time faculty line with fringes	This position will be requested through the action planning process. We hope to have the position fully funded and filled for 2014-15.
Increase retention of on campus and virtual majors	May require funds from Academic Marketing and the Virtual College.	The plans for onboarding and immersion weekend were started in May 2012. There is no completion date as this is a strategic goal that we must continue each year.
Continue to increase number of on campus certificate and majors	May require funds from Academic Marketing.	We expect that the number of on campus certificate recipients and majors will continue to grow in an upward trend during the 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of our plan.
Re-visit opportunities to facilitate more intentional curricular and co-curricular leadership experiences for students at FHSU	No new resources in the next year. Time will be the largest resource utilized in the next year as brainstorming and stakeholder gatherings will occur.	Continue conversations with Memorial Union Director, CSI Director, and CCL Director with a full plan created by December 2013. Implementation would begin in August 2014.

## IV. SUPPORTING MATERIALS

### A. Department Degree Program Affinity Diagram(s)

See Appendix A.

### B. Department Staffing Plan

See Appendix B.

### C. Bibliography of Departmental Scholarly Activity

See Appendix C.

### D. Department Program Assessment Results

See Appendix D.

**Appendix A**

**Department of Leadership Studies**

**Affinity Diagram for Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science in Organizational Leadership**

Characteristics of Organizational Leadership Graduates	Expected Learner Outcomes (LO)	Major Curriculum 48 Total Hours	Assessment Methods	Assessment Results	Curricular/ Pedagogical Changes
<p><b>Knowledgeable</b> Leadership is a set of learned capacities, rather than a set of inherited traits. Students possess knowledge of leadership theories and skills and can transfer them to organizational, community and global contexts.</p> <p><b>Self-Reflective</b> Students have the capacity to be self-aware and identify their own strengths and challenges. Self-reflective students accept and utilize constructive criticism for continual personal development. Students possess the capacity to demonstrate emotional intelligence to impact others and the world in a positive way.</p> <p><b>Improvement-Oriented</b> Students take initiative to address the challenges of the organization or community. In an effort to improve effectiveness, they courageously and strategically challenge policies, laws, and practices that are ineffective. Students take the role of change agent by envisioning 'what ought to be' and persist throughout the change process, resulting in transformational change for the collective good in any context.</p> <p><b>Engaged Collaborator</b> Students possess the ability to create and nurture relationships with various stakeholders to foster a team environment. These influence-based relationships result in creativity, transformational change, and lasting results.</p> <p><b>Living with Integrity</b> Students accept responsibility for their own decisions and actions and demonstrate concern for how their choices impact the local and global world. Students are champions of principle.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Understand and demonstrate the capacity of leadership theories and concepts in multiple contexts (e.g. civic, government, global, corporate)</li> <li>2. Demonstrates empathy and cross cultural competency</li> <li>3. Evaluate others' personal strengths and limitations and provides constructive feedback for others'</li> <li>4. Examines personal strengths and limitations and demonstrates ability to integrate feedback for improvement</li> <li>5. Identify the leadership challenges of a given context and design plans for 'what ought to be'</li> <li>6. Demonstrate initiative to both introduce change and persist to see change through to its completion</li> <li>7. Demonstrates ability to effectively work across factions with multiple stakeholders</li> <li>8. Selects, develops, and delivers appropriate messages utilizing suitable communication channels in a given context</li> <li>9. Deploys appropriate influence and conflict resolution techniques for collaborative efforts</li> <li>10. Demonstrate capacity to accept consequences and understand the impact of one's own decisions on others</li> </ol>	<p><b>CORE (27 hours)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LDRS 300: Introduction to Leadership Concepts (3 hrs)</li> <li>• LDRS 302: Introduction to Leadership Behaviors (3 hrs)</li> <li>• LDRS 306: Leadership and Team Dynamics (3 hrs) (formerly LDRS 480)</li> <li>• LDRS 310: Fieldwork in Leadership Studies (3 hrs)</li> <li>• LDRS 450: Advanced Leadership Behaviors (3 hrs)</li> <li>• LDRS 640: Principles of Civic Leadership (3 hrs)</li> <li>• LDRS 650: Principles of Organizational Leadership (3 hrs)</li> <li>• LDRS 670: Leadership and Personal Development (3 hrs)</li> <li>• LDRS 677: Internship in Leadership Studies (3 hrs)</li> </ul> <p><b>MAJOR ELECTIVES (9 hours)</b> See full curriculum for list</p> <p><b>COGNATES (12 hours)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACCT 203: Principles of Accounting I</li> <li>• MATH 250: Elements of Statistics</li> <li>• IDS 350: Multiculturalism or IDS 360: Social Justice or POLS 105: Current Pol. Issues</li> <li>• IDS 401: Ethics in the Professions and Business or PHIL 340 : Intro to Ethics</li> </ul>	<p><b>LO 1:</b> <i>Direct Measure:</i> Leadership Knowledge Test (Pre-300/Post-650) Percentage of students who complete LDRS 650 capstone with a B or better average on their final organizational audit papers <i>Indirect Measure:</i> Internship Supervisor Rubric (transfer of knowledge item) Social Change Leadership Inventory (Pre-300/Post-310)</p> <p><b>LO 2:</b> <i>Direct Measure:</i> LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric <i>Indirect Measure:</i> Student Peer Evaluations (empathy item) Internship Supervisor Rubric (empathy item)</p> <p><b>LO 3:</b> <i>Direct Measure:</i> LDRS 302 360 Feedback Process LDRS 310 Student Peer Evaluation Qualitative Comments versus Only Quantitative Score <i>Indirect Measure:</i> Student Peer Evaluations (completion)</p> <p><b>LO 4:</b> <i>Direct Measure:</i> LDRS 450 Journal Reflection Rubric (leader and follower perspectives items) LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (learning outcomes item) <i>Indirect Measure:</i> Internship Supervisor Rubric (flexibility and adaptability; feedback; and growth/risk items) Student Peer Evaluations (feedback from instructor)</p> <p><b>LO 5:</b> <i>Direct Measure:</i> LDRS 310 Strategic Plan Rubric LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (vision and plan formation items) <i>Indirect Measure:</i> Internship Supervisor Rubric (vision and change plan items) Student Peer Evaluations (vision item)</p> <p><b>LO 6:</b> <i>Direct Measure:</i> LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (assessment and</p>	<p>See Appendix D for report</p>	<p>We recently completed a 1 ½ year curriculum review that included focus groups of multiple stakeholders, departmental brainstorming and retreat sessions, and an evaluation of academic and co-curricular leadership programs around the world. While many of the characteristics and expected learner outcomes are similar, many of the courses are being rejuvenated with new technology, theory, and assessment activities. The assessment methods section reflects those changes with a few final decisions still yet to be made on where assessment will take place. The formal changes will be forthcoming through the appropriate forms and processes.</p> <p>Most of the assessment methods/activities will be added as part of the new curricular changes to be introduced in Fall 2012 courses.</p>

			<p>project outcomes items)  <i>Indirect Measure:</i>                      Internship Supervisor Rubric (persistence item)</p> <p><b>LO 7:</b>  <i>Direct Measure:</i>                      LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric                      LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (working across                      factions item)  <i>Indirect Measure:</i>                      Internship Supervisor Rubric (working across                      factions item)                      Student Peer Evaluations (cohesion/synergy item)</p> <p><b>LO 8:</b>  <i>Direct Measure:</i>                      LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric                      LDRS 670 Elevator Speech Rubric (team graded)  <i>Indirect Measure:</i>                      Internship Supervisor Rubric (communication-oral                      and communication-written items)                      Student Peer Evaluations (active listening and                      actively contributes items)</p> <p><b>LO 9:</b>  <i>Direct Measure:</i>                      LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric  <i>Indirect Measure:</i>                      Internship Supervisor Rubric (addresses                      interpersonal conflict appropriately item)                      Student Peer Evaluations (conflict item)</p> <p><b>LO 10:</b>  <i>Direct Measure:</i>                      LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric                      LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (decisions and                      consequences item)  <i>Indirect Measure:</i>                      Internship Supervisor Rubric (decisions and                      consequences item)                      Student Peer Evaluations (takes personal                      responsibility and establishes trust items)</p> <p>Other: NSSE, CLA, Student Portfolios, Course                      Evaluations, Graduate Exit Interviews and Focus                      Groups (670), Advising Survey, Employer Focus                      Groups, Advisory Board</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

*The mission of the Department of Leadership Studies is to educate and nurture citizens to lead our organizations, communities, state, nation, and beyond.*

**Appendix B**  
**Department of Leadership Studies Staffing Plan (2013-14)**

(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Current Department Needs	Faculty Member	Current Faculty Expertise	Assigned Instructional FTE's	Rank Current Date	Degree Completed	Track	Current Salary In Line
Organizational Leadership, Social Change Leadership	C Brungardt	Organizational Leadership, Social Change Leadership, Civic Leadership Development	.5 (Adm.) .5 (Instructor)	Associate Professor 2001	Ph.D.	Tenured	
Service Learning, Personal Development, Women and Leadership	CJ Brungardt	Service Learning, Personal Development, Women and Leadership	1.0	Assistant Professor 2001	Ph.D.	Tenured	
Service Learning, Leadership Theories and Behaviors	J Arensdorf	Service Learning, Leadership Theories, Behaviors	.5 (Adm.) .5 (Instructor)	Assistant Professor 2002	Ph.D.	Tenured	
Contemporary Theories, Research Methods, Teaming	B Goertzen	Leadership Theory, Research Methods, Ethics, Assessment	1.0	Associate Professor 2003	Ph.D.	Tenured	
Leadership Theories, Organizational Theory, Team Dynamics	J. Greenleaf	Organizational Leadership, Community Leadership, Leadership Theory	1.0	Assistant Professor	Ph.D.	Tenure Track	
Leadership Theory, Behaviors, Teams (International Programs)	B. Whitaker	Leadership Theory, Leadership Behaviors, Global Leadership	1.0	Instructor 2008	M.L.S., Ph.D. in progress	Temporary	
Social Change Leadership, Team Dynamics, Leadership Theory (International)	P. Blanton	Service-learning, Social Change, Leadership Theory	1.0	Instructor 2009	M.A., Ph.D. in progress	Temporary	
Organizational Leadership, Leadership Theory (International), Civic Leadership	H. Kriley	Service-Learning, Leadership Theory	1.0	Instructor 2012	M.B.A.	Temporary	
Personal Development, Teams, (International)	V. (Jeni) McRay	Teams, Leadership Theory, Organizational Leadership	1.0	Assistant Professor 2013	Ph.D.	Temporary	
Leadership Theory, Behaviors, Organizational Leadership (International)	S. Kastle	Organizational Behavior and Leadership Theory	1.0	Instructor 2012	M.S.	Temporary	
Service-Learning and Leadership Theory, Civic Leadership (International)	P. Rupert	Civic Leadership and Service-Learning,	1.0	Instructor 2013	M.L.S.	Temporary	
Teams, Leadership Theory and Behaviors, Personal Development (International)	M.Maxwell	Leadership Theory and Behaviors, Personal Development	1.0	Instructor 2013	M.L.S. Ph.D. in progress	Temporary	

## Appendix C

### Bibliography of Departmental Scholarly Activity

#### **Referred Articles/Books:**

- AASCU Global Engagement Scholars (Whitaker, B.L. et al.). 2013. *Global Challenges: Promise & Peril in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, e-book*.
- Brown, L.M. (July 2012). Two dimensional model of leadership: Integrating transformational leadership and learning culture to generate innovation in organizations. *Nonprofit Digest: The Journal of Innovation for Nonprofit Leaders and Scholars*, 2(2), 23-42.
- Brown, L., Whitaker, B., & Brungardt, C. (2012). A proposed framework for global leadership education: Learning objectives and curricula. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 11(2), 214-225.
- Goertzen, B.J. (2013). Assessment adrift: A review of the current stated of assessment of academically based leadership education programs. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(3), 55-60.

#### **Non-referred Articles:**

##### **Conference Presentations:**

- Arensdorf, J., Brungardt, C., Chrislip, D., Tolar, M., & Larson, C. (October 2012). *Bridging the divide: Where is civic leadership?*, International Leadership Association Conference. Denver, CO.
- Brungardt, C.L., Arensdorf, J., Brungardt, C.J., Bruner, B. & Ochs, R. (June 2013). *Improving, expanding, and institutionalizing civic learning and community engagement*, NASPA CLDE Conference. Philadelphia, PA.
- Brungardt, C.L., Nuckolls, K., Mills, S., & Drees, A. (March 2013). *From harvest to hungry: What is the moral obligation our agriculture region has to feed the starving*, Universities Fighting World Hunger Summit. Overland Park, KS.
- Brungardt, C.L. & Brungardt, C.J. (July 2012). *Walking the talk of leadership education: Faculty modeling behaviors for students*, Association of Leadership Educators. Key West, FL.
- Sowcik, M., Goertzen, B.J., & McManus, R. (2012). *Formalized leadership program review: The research, the opinions, and ultimately the recommendations*. International Leadership Association Conference. Denver, CO.
- Nordyke, K. & Brungardt, C.J. (June 2012). *Designing and implementing programs for actively engaged citizens*. Presented at American Democracy Project annual meeting, San Antonio, TX.

Stone, K.B. & Brown, L.M. (September 2012). *Organizational assessment: An integrated qualitative and quantitative approach to defining the current state of organizational health*. Business and Leadership Symposium. Hays, KS.

Whitaker, B., et al (2013). *Global Challenges Workshop: Educating globally competent citizens*. American Democracy Project Annual Meeting. Denver, CO.

Whitaker, B.L. & Brown, L.M. (October 2012). *A proposed set of learning outcomes for global leadership education*. International Leadership Association Poster Session. Denver, CO.

Whitaker, B. L. (2012). *Addressing Global Challenges workshop and working lunch: Teaching from a 7 Revolutions perspective*. Teaching and pedagogy workshop presented at the annual meeting of the American Democracy Project, San Antonio, TX.

Whitaker, B. L. (2012). *Integrating course redesign principles into civic engagement curriculum: Teaching large sections of Global Challenges students*. Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Democracy Project, San Antonio, TX.

Whitaker, B. L. (2012). *ADP beyond borders: How FHSU is developing globally engaged citizens*. Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Democracy Project, San Antonio, TX

**Local Consulting:**

Arendsdorf, J., (June 2013). FHSU Alumni Board Presenter, Leadership and Forming, Hays, KS.

Arendsdorf, J. (December 2012). VSR Financial Services, Inc. Consulting and Training, Discovering your Leadership Style, Hays, KS.

Arendsdorf, J. (September 2012). FHSU Distinguished Scholars Program Presentation, Leadership Styles, FHSU, Hays, KS.

Arendsdorf, J. & Heinrichs, J. (September 2012). Department of Geosciences Travelogue Series, Study Abroad in Ireland, FHSU, Hays, KS.

Arendsdorf, J. (August 2012). Hays High School Leadership Class, What is Leadership?, Hays, KS.

Arendsdorf, J. (August 2012). Peer Mentor Institute Leadership Training, FHSU, Hays, KS.

Arendsdorf, J. (August 2012). LLC Large Group Orientation and L3 Learning Community Small Group Training, FHSU, Hays, KS.

Blanton, P. (2013). Service-learning in China. Presented to East Valley Rotary Club. Phoenix, AZ.

Brown, L.M. (October 2012). Women only: Leadership and management skills. FHSU Management Development Center, Hays, KS.

Brown, L.M. (September 2012). Leadership styles for leadership situations. Hays Medical Center, Hays, KS.

Brungardt, C.J. (October 2012). Could it happen to you? Teen dating violence. Regional FCCLA Fall Conference.

Brungardt, C.J. (September 2012). Understanding and preventing gender-based violence on college campuses. New York Times Talk, FHSU, Hays, KS.

Brungardt, C.J. (September 2012). Teen dating and sexual assault. Could it happen to you? Hays High School Life Management Class, Hays, KS.

Brungardt, C.J. & Arensdorf, J. (April 2013). Start Smart Salary Negotiation Workshop, FHSU, Hays, KS.

Brungardt, C.J. & Arensdorf, J. (November 2012). Start Smart Salary Workshop, FHSU, Hays, KS.

Crawford, C.B. & Goertzen, B.J. (2012). Managing meetings and motivating others. Tiger Leaders, FHSU, Hays, KS.

Goertzen, B.J. & Crawford, C.B. (2012). Thriving as the Lone Nut: Leading without power. Tiger Leaders, FHSU, Hays, KS.

**External Grants Funded:**

Arensdorf, J. & Bannister, M. (2013). Union Pacific Foundation Grant for LDRS 310 Projects. \$2500.

Brown, L. & Whitaker, B. (2012). Tilford Diversity Grant Awarded for Global Leadership Project Summit. \$4000.

**Other:**

Brown, L.M. (2013). *The experience and perceptions of leader-managers: A human resources study on leadership-management selection, development, and practices in state-owned enterprises in China*. Doctoral Dissertation.

Brungardt, C.L. & Arensdorf, J. (In progress). *FHSU's Civic Investment Plan: Civic Learning and Community Engagement*, lead authors and task force chairs, to be submitted to the President, Provost and the University community. (This is a continuous improvement document that outlines proposed improvements to our citizenship development program.)

Brungardt, C.L., Brungardt, C.J., & Byron, P., (April 2013). *Victim activism: Two stories of courage, persistence, and social change*. Keynote Address. Kansas Victims' Rights Conference, Wichita, KS.

Brungardt, C.L. & Chapman, T. (April 2013). *Voss Professorship Enhancement Proposal*, Submitted to the Omer G. Voss Family Fund. Resources received for FY2013, \$30,000. (Additional financial resources to advance the Voss Distinguished Professorship program.)

Brungardt, C.L. & Brungardt, C.J. (January 2013). Recognized as Kansas State University College of Education Alumni Fellows.

Foster, D. & Goertzen, B.J. (2012). Leadership and EMS Education webcast.

Foster, D., Goertzen, B.J., & Nollette, C. (2012). *Emergency services leadership: A contemporary approach*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett. Test bank.

Greenleaf, J.P. (July 2012). *Leadership and persuasion through social media to generate positive community change*. Doctoral Dissertation.

**Reviewer/Editor Roles:**

**Arendsdorf, J.**

Reviewer, Journal of Leadership Education  
Reviewer, Journal of Business and Leadership  
Reviewer, Association of Leadership Educators Conference Papers

**Brungardt, C.**

Reviewer, eJournal of Public Affairs  
Reviewer, Journal of Leadership Education

**Brungardt, C.J.**

Reviewer, eJournal of Public Affairs

**Goertzen, B.J.**

Reviewer, Journal of Leadership Education  
Reviewer, Association of Leadership Educators Conference Papers  
Reviewer, International Leadership Association Conference Papers

**Whitaker, B.**

Reviewer, Journal of Leadership Education  
Reviewer, eJournal of Public Affairs

## Appendix D

### Department of Leadership Program Assessment Results

The following pages contain summaries of assessment results for 2012-13.

#### LO 1:

##### Direct Measure:

- Leadership Knowledge Test (Pre-300/Post-650)
  - Pre-300 Average Raw Score {10.64/25.00, n=25}
  - Post-650 Average Raw Score {17.53/25.00, n=19}\*
    - \*Statistically significant difference between pre/post scores at  $p < .01$
- Percentage of students who complete LDRS 650 capstone with a B or better average on their final organizational audit papers
  - Reported in annual report

##### Indirect Measure:

- Internship Supervisor Rubric (transfer of knowledge item)- Began using in Spring 2013
  - Proficient {n=3}; Distinguished {n=6}
- Social Change Leadership Inventory (Pre-300/Post-310)
  - Reported in annual report

#### LO 2:

##### Direct Measure:

- LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric – see rubric below
  - Empathy: 2012-13:  $m=3.07$
  - Cross-cultural competence: 2012-13:  $m=3.59$
- The department is working to create a second direct measure for this learning outcome.

##### Indirect Measure:

- Student Peer Evaluations (empathy item) – see rubric below
  - 2011-12:  $m=3.58$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.54$  (domestic),  $m=2.82$  (intl)
- Internship Supervisor Rubric (empathy item) – Began using in Spring 2013
  - Proficient {n=4}; Distinguished {n=5}

#### LO 3:

##### Direct Measure:

- LDRS 302 360 Feedback Process – The department needs to facilitate this process earlier in LDRS 302 next year. No usable data was collected for assessment purposes.
- LDRS 310 Student Peer Evaluation Qualitative Comments versus Only Quantitative Score 35.7% {n=148, domestic} of student peer evaluations {N=415, domestic} collected included qualitative comments vs. only a quantitative score. No international peer evaluations included peer to peer qualitative comments (n=143).

##### Indirect Measure:

- Student Peer Evaluations (completion) – see rubric below
  - Students in LDRS 302 (on campus) and LDRS 310 (on campus and international) completed at least one student peer evaluation on their strategic change plan team.

**LO 4:**Direct Measure:

- LDRS 450 Journal Reflection Rubric (leader and follower perspectives items) – only implemented in one on campus course (n=27); see rubric below
  - Leader Perspective: Novice {n=3}; Apprentice {n=7}; Proficient {n=8}; Distinguished {n=9}
  - Follower Perspective: Novice {n=3}; Apprentice {n=5}; Proficient {n=9}; Distinguished {n=10}
- LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (learning outcomes item)
  - 2011-12: m=3.09; 2012-13: m=3.44

Indirect Measure:

- Internship Supervisor Rubric (flexibility and adaptability; feedback; and growth/risk items)- Began using in Spring 2013; see rubric below
  - Flexibility and Adaptability: Proficient {n=3}; Distinguished {n=6}; Feedback: Proficient {n=4}; Distinguished {n=5}; Growth/Risk: Proficient {n=4}; Distinguished {n=5}
- Student Peer Evaluations (feedback from instructor) – see rubric below
  - Only 6-8 students took advantage of getting feedback from their instructor using a 360 degree feedback process. The department is aware that work needs to be done on encouraging the use of feedback in a continuous improvement process.

**LO 5:**Direct Measure:

- LDRS 310 Strategic Plan Rubric – see rubric below
  - The department has the rubric developed; however, it was not utilized in LDRS 310. The rubric will be utilized next year in on campus, virtual, and international 310 courses.
- LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (vision and plan formation items)
  - Vision: 2011-12: m=3.09; 2012-13: m=3.68
  - Plan Formation (Objectives): 2011-12: m=3.09; 2012-13: m=3.68
  - Plan Formation (Action Steps): 2011-12: m=3.09; 2012-13: m=3.24

Indirect Measure:

- Internship Supervisor Rubric (vision and change plan items) - Began using in Spring 2013; see below
  - Apprentice {n=1}; Proficient {n=5}; Distinguished {n=3}
- Student Peer Evaluations (vision item) – see rubric below
  - 2011-12: m=3.40; 2012-13: m=3.34 (domestic), m=2.71 (intl)

**LO 6:**Direct Measure:

- LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric – see rubric below
  - Persistence: 2012-13: m=2.92
- LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (assessment and project outcomes items)
  - Assessment: 2011-12: m=3.09; 2012-13: m=3.60
  - Project Outcomes: 2011-12: m=3.09; 2012-13: m=3.36

Indirect Measure:

- Internship Supervisor Rubric (persistence item) - Began using in Spring 2013; see rubric below
  - Proficient {n=6}; Distinguished {n=3}

**LO 7:**Direct Measure:

- LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric – see rubric below  
-Working Across Factions: 2012-13:  $m=3.08$
- LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (working across factions item) – see rubric below  
-No data

Indirect Measure:

- Internship Supervisor Rubric (working across factions item) - Began using in Spring 2013; see below  
-Apprentice { $n=1$ }; Proficient { $n=4$ }; Distinguished { $n=4$ }
- Student Peer Evaluations (cohesion/synergy item) – see rubric below  
-2011-12:  $m=3.53$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.35$  (domestic),  $m=2.93$  (intl)

**LO 8:**Direct Measure:

- LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric – see rubric below  
-Communication (written): 2012-13:  $m=2.85$   
-Communication (oral): 2012-13:  $m=2.79$
- LDRS 670 Elevator Speech Rubric (faculty team graded)  
-Reported in annual report
- Extra item- LDRS 450 Journal Reflection Rubric (writing quality item) – see rubric below  
-Writing Quality: Novice { $n=1$ }; Apprentice { $n=6$ }; Proficient { $n=10$ }; Distinguished { $n=10$ }
- Extra item – LDRS 677 Final Internship Paper Rubric (writing quality item) – see rubric below  
-Writing Quality: 2011-12:  $m=3.09$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.76$

Indirect Measure:

- Internship Supervisor Rubric (communication-oral and communication-written items) - Began using in Spring 2013; see rubric below  
-Communication-Oral: Proficient { $n=4$ }; Distinguished { $n=5$ };  
-Communication-Written: Proficient { $n=2$ }; Distinguished { $n=7$ }
- Student Peer Evaluations (active listening and actively contributes items) – see rubric below  
-Active Listening: 2011-12:  $m=3.56$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.56$  (domestic),  $m=3.13$  (intl)  
-Actively Contributes: 2011-12:  $m=3.49$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.47$  (domestic),  $m=3.08$  (intl)

**LO 9:**Direct Measure:

- LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric – see rubric below  
-Addresses Interpersonal Conflict Appropriately: 2012-13:  $m=2.33$
- The department is working to create a second direct measure for this learning outcome.

Indirect Measure:

- Internship Supervisor Rubric (addresses interpersonal conflict appropriately item) - Began using in Spring 2013  
-Proficient { $n=5$ }; Distinguished { $n=4$ }
- Student Peer Evaluations (conflict item) – see rubric below  
-2011-12:  $m=3.48$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.45$  (domestic),  $m=2.99$  (intl)

**LO 10:**Direct Measure:

- LDRS 310 Final Project Overview Rubric – see rubric below  
Decisions and Consequence: 2012-13:  $m=2.87$
- LDRS 677 Final Paper Rubric (decisions and consequences item) – see rubric below  
-No data

Indirect Measure:

- Internship Supervisor Rubric (decisions and consequences item) - Began using in Spring 2013- see rubric below  
-Proficient { $n=5$ }; Distinguished { $n=4$ }
- Student Peer Evaluations (takes personal responsibility and establishes trust items) – see rubric below  
-Takes Personal Responsibility: 2011-12:  $m=3.40$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.29$  (domestic),  $m=2.94$  (intl)  
-Establishes Trust: 2011-12:  $m=3.55$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.56$  (domestic),  $m=3.57$  (intl)

**PARTICIPATION/COLLABORATION SURVEY: PEER EVALUATION**

*Student being evaluated: 2011-12 n=153 (domestic on campus only); 2012-13, n=415 (on campus), n=148 (intl-SIAS)*  
*Scoring: Identify which description most accurately reflects the team member's participation and contribution to the overall team effort.*  
*All means reported out of 4 pt scale*

**Multiple Stakeholders (Active Listening)**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Does not listen to others; Not considerate of others' feelings and ideas;	Listens to others sometimes; Considers other people's feelings and ideas sometimes;	Listens to others consistently; Considers other people's feelings and ideas;	Listens attentively to others; Empathetic to other people's feelings and ideas;

2011-12: *m=3.56*; 2012-13: *m=3.56* (domestic), *m=3.13* (intl)

**Multiple Stakeholders (Addresses Interpersonal Conflict Appropriately)**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Needs assistance to identify and use positive strategies to resolve conflicts; fails to address issues of conflict or makes passing mention of the need for conflict resolution	Sometimes seeks positive solutions to conflicts; Discusses conflict in negative terms, preferring to avoid conflict	Usually seeks positive solutions to conflicts; Usually advises on appropriate responses for generating positive outcomes from conflict.	Consistently seeks positive solutions to conflicts; Always describes and applies a collaborative (win/win) conflict resolution process as called for by the circumstances; encourages conflict as a source of positive outcomes.

2011-12: *m=3.48*; 2012-13: *m=3.45* (domestic), *m=2.99* (intl)

**Multiple Stakeholders (Cohesion/Synergy)**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Promotes fragmentation of the team; Discourages sharing of ideas	Demonstrates effort sometimes to help the team work together; Allows sharing by all other team members	Demonstrates effort to help the team work together; Usually encourages all team members to share ideas	Actively participates in helping the team work together better. Involves the whole team in activities; Always encourages all team members to share ideas

Comments:

2011-12: *m=3.53*; 2012-13: *m=3.35* (domestic), *m=2.93* (intl)

**Empathy (Open to Ideas of Others)**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Fails to respect speakers who offer views that are different or challenging from his/her own	Inconsistently shows tolerance and understanding of differing or challenging spoken viewpoints	Consistently shows tolerance for and understanding of differing, unfamiliar and/or challenging viewpoints	Always shows tolerance for and understanding of differing, unfamiliar and/or challenging spoken viewpoints

Comments:

2011-12: *m=3.58*; 2012-13: *m=3.54* (domestic), *m=2.82* (intl)

***Credible (Takes Personal Responsibility)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Is often late or misses team activities; Most concerned about their personal agenda or always relies on others to do the work	Is sometimes late or misses team activities; Somewhat concerned with the team’s success; Makes a half-hearted contribution to the team, rarely does the assigned work—often needs reminding	Is rarely late or misses team activities; Places a priority on team’s success but still desires to make themselves ‘look good’; Usually does the assigned work—rarely needs reminding	Is on time to all team activities; Gives positive and forward-focused comments; Accepts a role and is open to rotation of roles; Places highest priority on team success rather than on personal benefits; Always does the assigned work without having to be reminded

2011-12: *m*=3.40; 2012-13: *m*=3.29 (domestic), *m*=2.94 (intl)

***Credible (Establishes Trust among Team Members)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Has difficulty telling the truth or dealing honestly with people	Usually tells the truth or dealing honestly with people; Sometimes treats people unfairly; Occasionally fails to follow through on promises	Nearly always tells the truth and deals honestly with people; Almost never treats people unfairly; Rarely fails to follow through on promises made	Always tells the truth and deals honestly with people; Always treats people fairly and on an equal basis; Does everything s/he promises to do

Comments:

2011-12: *m*=3.55; 2012-13: *m*=3.56 (domestic), *m*=3.57 (intl)

***Communication (Actively Contributes)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Regularly spouts out ‘killer phrases’ (negative, cynical, or derogatory comments); Points out problems with other’s viewpoints and without giving forward-focused recommendations; Dominates discussion or fails to voice their point-of-view	Occasionally spouts ‘killer phrases’; Sometimes dominates discussion; Points out problems with other’s viewpoints and gives some ideas for improvement	Rarely spouts out ‘killer phrases’; Points out problems with other’s viewpoints and offers alternative ideas for improvement	Gives positive and forward-focused comments; Appropriately voices viewpoint; Accepts a role and is open to rotation of roles

2011-12: *m*=3.49; 2012-13: *m*=3.47 (domestic), *m*=3.08 (intl)

***Vision (Multiple Idea Generating)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Rushes to solution without defining problems or seeking alternatives; Fails to mention importance of generating multiple ideas	May mention importance of supporting creativity, but provides little in the way of specific guidance	Usually suggests ways to facilitate creativity in team problem solving	Always suggests ways to facilitate creativity in team problem solving using brainstorming and other creative problem solving techniques.

2011-12: *m*=3.40; 2012-13: *m*=3.34 (domestic), *m*=2.71 (intl)

**LDRS 450: ADVANCED LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS  
RUBRIC TO ASSESS INTEGRATIVE JOURNALING ASSIGNMENT**

**SEE RESULTS ABOVE**

***Knowledgeable (Connect Theory and Practice: Leader Perspective)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Demonstrates some basic comprehension of texts but does not make connections with the bigger picture; Does not provide many personal examples at all; Little or no understanding of connections between theory and practice; Student is not developing their ability to express arguments or opinions	Comprehends the surface level meaning of texts and begins to relate issues to general knowledge and experience; Personal examples provided are minimal; Does not describe new insight. Basic understanding of the connections between theory and practice; Student is learning to develop and express arguments, opinions and responses in his/her writing.	Is able to make inferences and comprehends deeper meaning on most occasions. Provides personal examples consistently throughout the journal; Making connections with implications for self or students. Some sense of complexity. Most of the journal describes the connections between theory and practice; Student is consistently expressing arguments, opinions and responses in his/her writing.	Is able to make inferences well and comprehends deeper meaning consistently. Provides personal examples throughout the journal; Aware of increased complexity of issues and situations. Describes new insight(s) not considered before. Clear understanding of the connections between theory and practice; Student is clearly expressing arguments, opinions and responses in his/her writing.

***Knowledgeable (Connect Theory and Practice: Follower Perspective)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Demonstrates some basic comprehension of texts but does not make connections with the bigger picture; Does not provide many personal examples at all; Little or no understanding of connections between theory and practice; Student is not developing their ability to express arguments or opinions	Comprehends the surface level meaning of texts and begins to relate issues to general knowledge and experience; Personal examples provided are minimal; Does not describe new insight. Basic understanding of the connections between theory and practice; Student is learning to develop and express arguments, opinions and responses in his/her writing.	Is able to make inferences and comprehends deeper meaning on most occasions. Provides personal examples consistently throughout the journal; Making connections with implications for self or students. Some sense of complexity. Most of the journal describes the connections between theory and practice; Student is consistently expressing arguments, opinions and responses in his/her writing.	Is able to make inferences well and comprehends deeper meaning consistently. Provides personal examples throughout the journal; Aware of increased complexity of issues and situations. Describes new insight(s) not considered before. Clear understanding of the connections between theory and practice; Student is clearly expressing arguments, opinions and responses in his/her writing.

***Writing Quality***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Considerable difficulty expressing ideas or descriptions clearly. Many grammatical, syntactical, and spelling errors.	Difficulty expressing ideas, feelings or descriptions. Needs to work on grammar, spelling, etc	Good writing style with solid ability to convey meaning. Few grammar, syntax and spelling errors	Strong style with clear ability to express thoughts and point of view. Excellent grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Possible Pts</b>	<b>Your Pts</b>
<b><i>Knowledgeable (Connect Theory and Practice: Leader Perspective)</i></b>		
<b><i>Knowledgeable (Connect Theory and Practice: Follower Perspective)</i></b>		
<b><i>Writing Quality</i></b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	

**LDRS 310: FIELDWORK IN LEADERSHIP STUDIES  
STRATEGIC PLAN RUBRIC**

2011-12 N=12; 2012-13 – NO DATA COLLECTED

***Problem Solvers (Identifying Root Causes)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Fails to analyze the problem and/or simply restates the facts of the situation without using appropriate concepts or theories. Jumps immediately to solutions without analyzing the current situation; Fails to elaborate on any of the elements of a S.W.O.T. analysis.	Identifies and describes some of the salient problems in the current situation, but misses several critical points. Does not analyze the problem in depth, or articulate their interrelatedness and complexity. Problem statements are not presented in a clear, concise fashion; Elements of the S.W.O.T analysis are present but not developed	Identifies and describes many of the salient problems in the current situation, but misses a few minor points. Analyzes the problem, but does not clearly articulate their interrelatedness and complexity. Elements of a S.W.O.T. analysis are clearly present but could be developed a bit further.	Identifies and describes a reasonable complete set of problems present in the current situation. Articulates a degree of interrelatedness and complexity in describing elements of the problem. Carries out problem analysis before recommending solutions; Elements of a S.W.O.T analysis are well developed and clearly describe the complexity of the issue/need.

2011-12:  $m=3.25$  out of 4 point scale

***Vision Statement***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Statement is unclear and too long; Does not express ideals or values, commitments or aspirations; Essentially no link between the vision and the problem of the current situation.	Statement is either unclear or too long; Expresses ideals or values in general terms but does not express specific commitments or aspirations that manifest a vision; Limited connection between the vision and the current problem.	Statement is reasonably clear and not obviously too long; Expresses ideals or values and aspirations that suggest a vision; Some connection between the vision which aims to resolve the problem of the current situation.	Statement defines clarity of purpose; Explicitly states vision and values that are realistic and achievable; Clearly defined connection between the vision to resolve the problem of the current situation

2011-12:  $m=3.08$  out of 4 point scale

***Plan Formation (Developing Objectives)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Unable to articulate objectives clearly; Essentially no link between the objectives, the vision and the current situation/problem.	Sets objectives that are vague, unattainable, or irrelevant; Limited connection between the objectives and the current problem.	Sets attainable goals. Some connection between the objectives which aim to resolve the problem of the current situation.	Sets challenging goals with clear priorities and realistic expectations; Clear connection between objectives that, when achieved, will resolve the current situation.

2011-12:  $m=2.75$  out of 4 point scale

***Plan Formation (Action Steps)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Unable to break objectives into an action plan with manageable tasks. Unable to establish a criteria for success. Specific responsibilities are not clearly defined in the Who, What, How and When. Essentially no link between the action steps, the objectives, the vision and the current situation/problem.	Breaks objectives down but action plan is not specific and/or tasks are not manageable. Criteria for success is not clearly defined. Who, what, how and when is not clearly developed; Limited connection between the action steps, objectives, vision and the current problem.	Breaks objectives down into action plan with most tasks manageable. Establishes criteria for success. Identifies nearly all elements of Who, What, How and When criteria for every action step. Some connection between the action steps, objectives, vision and the problem of the current situation.	Breaks objectives down into specific action plan with manageable tasks. Establishes clear criteria for success before beginning to implement the plan. Fully addresses Who, What, How, and When? Clear connection between action steps that, when accomplished, will resolve the current situation.

2011-12:  $m=2.50$  out of 4 point scale

**Writing Quality**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Considerable difficulty expressing ideas or descriptions clearly. Many grammatical, syntactical, and spelling errors.	Difficulty expressing ideas, feelings or descriptions. Needs to work on grammar, spelling, etc	Good writing style with solid ability to convey meaning. Few grammar, syntax and spelling errors	Strong style with clear ability to express thoughts and point of view. Excellent grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.

2011-12:  $m=3.42$  out of 4 point scale

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Possible Pts</b>	<b>Your Pts</b>
<b><i>Problem Solvers (Identifying Root Causes)</i></b>		
<b><i>Vision Statement</i></b>		
<b><i>Plan Formation (Developing Objectives)</i></b>		
<b><i>Plan Formation (Action Steps)</i></b>		
<b><i>Writing Quality</i></b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>XXX</b>	

**LDRS 310: Fieldwork in Leadership Studies****Project Effectiveness Evaluation****All means reported out of 4 point scale****2012-13 n=87 (domestic); Still collecting international data from SNU and SIAS for 2012-13**

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

	Novice	Apprentice	Proficient	Distinguish ed	Not Applicable
<b>Transfer of Knowledge – LO1:</b> Strong ability to reflect on learning experiences and connect them to future leadership situations. 2012-13: <i>m</i> =3.08	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<b>Empathy – LO2:</b> Demonstrates ability to work with people who are different from them; Empathetic to other people’s feelings and ideas 2012-13: <i>m</i> =3.07	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<b>Cross-Cultural Competence – LO2:</b> The student is able understand multiple cultural frames. He/she is able to engage culturally diverse interdependent relationships and grounds relationships in appreciation of cultural differences. 2012-13: <i>m</i> =3.59	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<b>Flexibility and Adaptability – LO4:</b> The student is able to see multiple ways of reacting to changes in conditions. He/she can independently monitor and adjust his/her own positions in response to change. 2012-13: <i>m</i> =2.78	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<b>Feedback – LO4:</b> Seeks extra help when needed, & willingly accepts constructive criticism as part of the learning process. 2012-13: <i>m</i> =2.64	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<b>Growth and risk – LO4:</b> The student sees mistakes as learning opportunities. He/she at times advocates unconventional or unpopular positions, and is willing to tackle extremely challenging problems without obvious solutions, despite the high potential for failure. 2012-13: <i>m</i> =2.80	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<b>Vision and Change Plan–LO5:</b> Established exemplary vision and change plan for project; Clearly defined connection between the vision to resolve the problem and the current situation; Shows persistence of effort despite setbacks. 2012-13: <i>m</i> =2.90	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<b>Persistence–LO6:</b> Shows persistence of effort despite setbacks; Goes above and beyond to see a project through to completion. 2012-13: <i>m</i> =2.92	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<b>Working Across Factions – LO7:</b> Engages others in ways that facilitate their contributions by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others; Listens attentively to others; Invites others to engage 2012-13: <i>m</i> =2.82	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A

<p><b>Communication (Written) – LO8:</b> Strong style with clear ability to express thoughts and point of view. Excellent grammar, syntax, spelling, etc. 2012-13: <i>m</i>=2.85</p>	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<p><b>Communication (Oral) – LO8:</b> Strong style with clear ability to express thoughts and point of view. Excellent grammar, syntax, etc. Student maintains eye contact with ‘audience.’ Content and/or style are consistently appropriate and targeted to audience and context. 2012-13: <i>m</i>=2.79</p>	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<p><b>Addresses Interpersonal Conflict Appropriately – LO9:</b> Consistently seeks positive solutions to conflicts; Always describes and applies a collaborative (win/win) conflict resolution process as called for by the circumstances; encourages conflict as a source of positive outcomes. 2012-13: <i>m</i>=2.33</p>	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<p><b>Decisions and Consequences – LO 10:</b> Considers all ramifications of decisions (personal, ethical, professional, social, environment, etc.). Effectively uses logical arguments to thoroughly explain why certain decisions were made. 2012-13: <i>m</i>=2.87</p>	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<p><b>Creativity: Unique Ideas - extra:</b> The student frequently sees links between seemingly unrelated ideas. He/she is able to independently produce results that are fresh, unique, original, and well developed. 2012-13: <i>m</i>=2.86</p>	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<p><b>Ambiguity: Tolerance of and Response to- extra:</b> The student enjoys operating in open-ended or ill-defined situations, responding with spontaneity and ingenuity that leads him/her to discovery and exploration of new ideas. 2012-13: <i>m</i>=2.59</p>	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A
<p><b>Credible (Takes Personal Responsibility) - extra:</b> Is on time to all team activities; Gives positive and forward-focused comments; Accepts a role and is open to rotation of roles; Places highest priority on team success rather than on personal benefits; Always does the assigned work without having to be reminded. 2012-13: <i>m</i>=2.90</p>	_____	_____	_____	_____	N/A

**LDRS 677: INTERNSHIP IN LEADERSHIP STUDIES**  
**RUBRIC TO ASSESS FINAL INTERNSHIP REPORT**  
**ALL SCALES OUT OF 4 POINTS**  
**2011-12 N=10; 2012-13 N=25**

***Assessment of Need – LO6***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Unclear or absent description of the need; Few or no supporting details—vague content	Identifiable description of the need; Some supporting details – needs to be more specific; Little reader interest	Clear, description of the need; Adequate supporting details; Some reader interest	Clear description of the need; Rich with specific details; Strong reader interest

2011-12:  $m=3.09$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.60$

***Vision Statement – LO5***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Statement is unclear and too long; Does not express ideals or values, commitments or aspirations; Essentially no link between the vision and the problem of the current situation.	Statement is either unclear or too long; Expresses ideals or values in general terms but does not express specific commitments or aspirations that manifest a vision; Limited connection between the vision and the current problem.	Statement is reasonably clear and not obviously too long; Expresses ideals or values and aspirations that suggest a vision; Some connection between the vision which aims to resolve the problem of the current situation.	Statement defines clarity of purpose; Explicitly states vision and values that are realistic and achievable; Clearly defined connection between the vision to resolve the problem of the current situation

2011-12:  $m=3.09$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.68$

***Plan/Methodology(Developing Objectives) – LO5***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Unable to articulate connection between objectives and action strategies clearly; Essentially no link between the objectives, the vision and the current situation/problem.	Sets objectives that are vague, unattainable, or irrelevant; Limited connection between the objectives and the current problem.	Sets attainable goals. Some connection between the objectives which aim to resolve the problem of the current situation.	Sets challenging goals with clear priorities and realistic expectations; Clear connection between objectives that, when achieved, will resolve the current situation.

2011-12:  $m=3.09$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.68$

***Plan/Methodology (Action Steps) – LO5***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Unable to break objectives into an action plan with manageable tasks. Unable to establish a criteria for success. Specific responsibilities are not clearly defined in the Who, What, How, and When. Essentially no link between the action steps, the objectives, the vision, and the current situation/problem.	Breaks objectives down but action plan is not specific and/or tasks are not manageable. Criteria for success is not clearly defined. Who, what, how and when is not clearly developed; Limited connection between the action steps, objectives, vision and the current problem.	Breaks objectives down into action plan with most tasks manageable. Establishes criteria for success. Identifies nearly all elements of Who, What, How, and When criteria for every action step. Some connection between the action steps, objectives, vision and the problem of the current situation.	Breaks objectives down into specific action plan with manageable tasks. Establishes clear criteria for success before beginning to implement the plan. Fully addresses Who, What, How, and When. Clear connection between action steps that, when accomplished, will resolve the current situation.

2011-12:  $m=3.09$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.24$

**Timeline - extra**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Unclear or absent timeline; Few or no supporting details for the timeline—vague benchmark dates to accomplish major elements of the project.	Identifiable timeline; Some supporting details—needs to be more specific in defining key benchmark dates	Clear, well-chosen timeline with several identified dates for benchmark goals; Adequate supporting details in the timeline	Clear, well-chosen timeline with well-defined dates for key benchmarks; Rich with specific and relevant details that support the timeline

2011-12: *m*=3.09; 2012-13: *m*=3.20**Project Outcomes and Measurement – LO6**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Proposal is missing and/or does not address specific and measurable goals or indicators of achievement; Lack of connection between data collected (quantitative and/or qualitative) and the goals/indicators. Unrealistic goals described for the leadership initiative.	Less than complete identification of specific and measurable goals or indicators achievement; Somewhat unclear at identifying the connection between data collected (quantitative and/or qualitative) and the goals/indicators; Many unrealistic goals described for the leadership initiative.	Proposal identifies specific and measurable goals or indicators of achievement; Some connection between data collected and goals/indicators; Mostly realistic goals described for the leadership initiative.	Proposal clearly identifies specific and measurable goals or indicators of achievement; Clearly identifies data collected for effective evaluation (quantitative and/or qualitative); Realistic accomplishments to the leadership initiative.

2011-12: *m*=3.09; 2012-13: *m*=3.36**Learning Outcomes – LO4**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Unable to articulate learning outcomes clearly; Essentially no link between the learning outcomes and the current situation/problem and the leadership initiative.	Sets learning outcomes that are vague, unattainable, or irrelevant; Limited connection between the learning outcomes and the current problem and leadership initiative.	Sets attainable learning outcomes. Some connection between the learning outcomes and the current problem and leadership initiative.	Sets challenging learning outcomes with clear priorities and realistic expectations; Clear connection between learning outcomes and the current situation and leadership initiative.

2011-12: *m*=3.09; 2012-13: *m*=3.44**Transfer of Knowledge – LO1 (extra)**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
No ability to reflect on learning experiences and connect them to future leadership situations.	Little ability to reflect on learning experiences and connect them to future leadership situations.	Suitable ability to reflect on learning experiences and connect them to future leadership situations.	Strong ability to reflect on learning experiences and connect them to future leadership situations.

No data

***Empathy – LO2***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Demonstrates no ability to work with and understand people who are different from them.	Demonstrates little ability to work with and understand people who are different from them.	Demonstrates ability to work with and understand people who are different from them.	Demonstrates a keen ability to work with and understand people who are different from them.

No data

***Working Across Factions – LO7***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Shows little evidence of engaging others in the conversation and /or project; Does not listen to others; Never invites others to engage	Shows evidence of engaging others in ways that facilitate their contribution by restating the views of others and/or asking questions for clarification; Listens to others sometimes; Rarely invites others to engage	Shows evidence of engaging others in ways that facilitate their contributions by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others; Listens to others consistently; Sometimes invites others to engage	Shows evidence of engaging others in ways that facilitate their contributions by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others; Listens attentively to others; Invites others to engage

No data

***Decisions and Consequences – LO 10***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Rarely thinks about the consequences of decisions made. Cannot explain why a decision was made.	At times, thinks about the consequences of decisions. Has difficulty explaining reasons for decisions.	Carefully considered the ramifications of decisions on self and others. Explains decisions in a logical manner.	Considers all ramifications of decisions (personal, ethical, professional, social, environment, etc.). Effectively uses logical arguments to thoroughly explain why certain decisions were made.

No data

***Writing Quality – LO8 (extra)***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Considerable difficulty expressing ideas or descriptions clearly. Many grammatical, syntactical, and spelling errors.	Difficulty expressing ideas, feelings, or descriptions. Needs to work on grammar, spelling, etc.	Good writing style with solid ability to convey meaning. Few grammar, syntax, and spelling errors.	Strong style with clear ability to express thoughts and point of view. Excellent grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.

2011-12:  $m=3.09$ ; 2012-13:  $m=3.76$ 

Comments:

**LDRS 677: INTERNSHIP IN LEADERSHIP STUDIES**  
**SUPERVISOR EVALUATION OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE**  
**SUPERVISOR INTERNSHIP EVALUATION REPORT**

Name of Student \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address of Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Date Beginning Internship \_\_\_\_\_ Date Ending \_\_\_\_\_

Approximate hours worked \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate on the scale below, your evaluation of the intern on the questions/traits listed. For each item mark either novice, apprentice, proficient, or distinguished with an X based on their performance in that area. All evaluations are confidential and will not be shared with the student.

**Data reported above**

***Transfer of Knowledge – LO1***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
No ability to reflect on learning experiences and connect them to future leadership situations.	Little ability to reflect on learning experiences and connect them to future leadership situations.	Suitable ability to reflect on learning experiences and connect them to future leadership situations.	Strong ability to reflect on learning experiences and connect them to future leadership situations.

***Empathy – LO2***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Demonstrates no ability in working with people who are different from them; Not considerate of others' feelings and ideas	Demonstrates little ability in working with people who are different from them; Considers other people's feelings and ideas sometimes	Demonstrates ability to work with people who are different from them; Considers other people's feelings and ideas	Demonstrates ability to work with people who are different from them; Empathetic to other people's feelings and ideas

***Flexibility and Adaptability – LO4***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
The student lacks flexibility, stubbornly maintaining positions and points of view in spite of new information and changing conditions.	While still fairly inflexible, the student can be guided to reconsider some positions and points of view.	The student is often able to independently envision new responses to varying situations. When supported or encouraged, he/she is able to easily adapt responses to fit the situation.	The student is able to see multiple ways of reacting to changes in conditions. He/she can independently monitor and adjust his/her own positions in response to change.

***Feedback – LO4***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Refuses to utilize extra help & constructive criticism as part of the learning process.	Accepts extra help and constructive criticism as part of the learning process.	Seeks extra help when needed, & accepts constructive criticism as part of the learning process.	Seeks extra help when needed, & willingly accepts constructive criticism as part of the learning process.

***Growth and risk – LO4***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
The student sees mistakes as serious personal deficiencies rather than as learning opportunities. As a result, he/she is not willing to take risks that might result in mistakes—especially ones that might be public.	The student conceptually understands that mistakes are learning opportunities, but emotionally still views them as personal failures. He/she weighs the odds of failure carefully before taking on challenging problems or publicly sharing ideas or concepts.	The student has enough confidence in his/her abilities to see that mistakes are not personal failures. With encouragement, he/she does take on challenging work. Once invested in such work, the inherent risks become intrinsically motivational to the student.	The student sees mistakes as learning opportunities. He/she at times advocates unconventional or unpopular positions, and is willing to tackle extremely challenging problems without obvious solutions, despite the high potential for failure.

***Vision and Change Plan–LO5***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Established no vision and change plan for project; No connection between the vision to resolve the problem and current situation; Shuts down when faced with setbacks	Established some vision and a change plan for project; Little connection between the vision to resolve the problem and current situation; Shows some persistence of effort despite setbacks	Established vision and change plan for project; Some connection between the vision to resolve the problem and current situation; Shows persistence of effort despite setbacks	Established exemplary vision and change plan for project; Clearly defined connection between the vision to resolve the problem and the current situation; Shows persistence of effort despite setbacks

***Persistence–LO6***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Shuts down when faced with setbacks; Does not complete the project	Shows some persistence of effort despite setbacks; Shows little effort to see a project through to completion	Shows persistence of effort despite setbacks; Sees a project through to completion	Shows persistence of effort despite setbacks; Goes above and beyond to see a project through to completion

***Working Across Factions – LO7***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Does little to engage others in the conversation and /or project; Does not listen to others; Never invites others to engage	Engages others in ways that facilitate their contribution by restating the views of others and/or asking questions for clarification; Listens to others sometimes; Rarely invites others to engage	Engages others in ways that facilitate their contributions by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others; Listens to others consistently; Sometimes invites others to engage	Engages others in ways that facilitate their contributions by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others; Listens attentively to others; Invites others to engage

***Communication (Written) – LO8***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Considerable difficulty expressing ideas or descriptions clearly. Many grammatical, syntactical, and spelling errors.	Difficulty expressing ideas, feelings or descriptions. Needs to work on grammar, spelling, etc	Good writing style with solid ability to convey meaning. Few grammar, syntax and spelling errors	Strong style with clear ability to express thoughts and point of view. Excellent grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.

**Communication (Oral) – LO8**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Considerable difficulty expressing ideas or descriptions clearly. Many grammatical and syntactical errors. No eye contact. Tension and nervousness is obvious; has trouble recovering from mistakes. Content and/or style are frequently inappropriate to the 'audience' and/or context.	Difficulty expressing ideas, feelings or descriptions. Needs to work on grammar, etc. Occasionally uses eye contact. Displays mild tension; has trouble recovering from mistakes. Content and/or style are occasionally inappropriate to the 'audience' and/or context.	Good writing style with solid ability to convey meaning. Few grammar and syntax errors. Student maintains eye contact most of the time. Makes minor mistakes, but quickly recovers from them; displays little or no tension. Content and/or style are consistently appropriate to the 'audience', and/or context.	Strong style with clear ability to express thoughts and point of view. Excellent grammar, syntax, etc. Student maintains eye contact with 'audience.' Content and/or style are consistently appropriate and targeted to audience and context.

**Addresses Interpersonal Conflict Appropriately – LO9**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Needs assistance to identify and use positive strategies to resolve conflicts; fails to address issues of conflict or makes passing mention of the need for conflict resolution	Sometimes seeks positive solutions to conflicts; Discusses conflict in negative terms, preferring to avoid conflict	Usually seeks positive solutions to conflicts; Usually advises on appropriate responses for generating positive outcomes from conflict.	Consistently seeks positive solutions to conflicts; Always describes and applies a collaborative (win/win) conflict resolution process as called for by the circumstances; encourages conflict as a source of positive outcomes.

**Decisions and Consequences – LO 10**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Rarely thinks about the consequences of decisions made. Cannot explain why a decision was made.	At times, thinks about the consequences of decisions. Has difficulty explaining reasons for decisions.	Carefully considered the ramifications of decisions on self and others. Explains decisions in a logical manner.	Considers all ramifications of decisions (personal, ethical, professional, social, environment, etc.). Effectively uses logical arguments to thoroughly explain why certain decisions were made.

**Creativity: Unique Ideas - extra**

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
The student does not produce unique and cogent ideas. Most ideas and products are mundane and predictable.	The student occasionally produces unique and cogent ideas or products, but only with significant guidance and encouragement.	The student often produces unique and cogent ideas and products with a minimum of support.	The student frequently sees links between seemingly unrelated ideas. He/she is able to independently produce results that are fresh, unique, original, and well developed.

***Ambiguity: Tolerance of and Response to- extra***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
The student is not comfortable with open-ended tasks or situations.	The student tolerates ill-defined situations, and at times responds with spontaneity and ingenuity.	The student is sometimes comfortable with open-ended situations, and with encouragement is willing and able to let discovery, exploration, and spontaneity take him/her in new directions.	The student enjoys operating in open-ended or ill-defined situations, responding with spontaneity and ingenuity that leads him/her to discovery and exploration of new ideas.

***Credible (Takes Personal Responsibility) - extra***

<b>Novice</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Is often late or misses team activities; Most concerned about their personal agenda or always relies on others to do the work.	Is sometimes late or misses team activities; Somewhat concerned with the team's success; Makes a half-hearted contribution to the team, rarely does the assigned work-often needs reminding.	Is rarely late or misses team activities; Places a priority on team's success but still desires to make themselves 'look good'. Usually does the assigned work—rarely needs reminding.	Is on time to all team activities; Gives positive and forward-focused comments; Accepts a role and is open to rotation of roles; Places highest priority on team success rather than on personal benefits; Always does the assigned work without having to be reminded

1. What do you consider to be this intern's greatest asset as a team player and collaborator?
  
2. What do you consider to be this intern's greatest need for improvement as a team member?

Evaluator's name

Title

Date

Please mail or fax this form to:

Department of Leadership Studies  
 Fort Hays State University  
 Rarick Hall 235  
 600 Park Street  
 Hays, KS 67601  
 FAX: 785.628.4057

**General Parameters**

1. No more than 20 pages, excluding appendix information.
2. Report submitted electronically to Dean, Assistant Provost for Quality Management, and Provost.
3. Note deadlines attached below.

**Annual Timeline for Department Annual Report**

April 1	Final template and Directions distributed to Department Chairs. Selected enrollment data (fall 20 <sup>th</sup> day counts) distributed to Chairs and Deans in the departmental template.
June 1	Student system information (graduates, SCH) delivered to Chairs. Final cutoff date for elements to be considered in the Department's Annual Report.
June 30	Complete Department Annual Report due to Deans, Assistant Provost for Quality Management, and Provost. Submit electronically.
August 15	Completed College Annual Report due to Assistant Provost for Quality Management and Provost.