



Annual Assessment Report Template: Non-Learning
Academic Year: 2015-2016

Date of Report Submission: July 8, 2016

Name of Department: Office of Student Involvement

Name of Contact Person: Kristin Hagen

Name of Person(s) completing report or contributing to the project: Kristin Hagen, Dave Borgealt, Natalie Stone

Type of Assessment: Benchmarking

I. Abstract

The purpose of this benchmarking study was to investigate best practices for leadership education programs within a student involvement/activities department. As of July 2015, leadership programs were transitioned from a stand-alone department (the Student Leadership Institute) to the Office of Student Involvement (OSI). As OSI incorporates leadership into our programmatic offerings, we understand that leadership programs cultivate and promote students' application of transferrable skills that will help them academically, personally, and in their career development. To do so, we created an initial list of 118 higher education institutions who are nationally and regionally recognized for their leadership education initiatives. We narrowed the list to 34 institutions whose leadership programs originated from their student activities/involvement office. We reviewed the institution's website to uncover researched the types of programs, frequency, targeted populations, and student reach to extrapolate trends and patterns in programmatic offerings. We determined that a comprehensive program should include sequential/developmental experiences for students at beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels. As a result, we need to create a variety of developmentally sequenced offerings: emerging leaders program, developmental experiences for current members of student organizations, and a coaching program.

II. Assessment Question

What are the best practices for leadership development programs hosted by a student activities office?

III. Introduction & Context

University Context

This project is incredibly salient to our department, the division and the university. Our project aligns with the University Goals of Personal and Social Responsibility and Preparation for Career and Beyond.

The entire university seeks to create socially responsible leaders through curricular and co-curricular programs (University Learning Goal: Personal and Social Responsibility; Student Affairs Learning Outcome: Socially Responsible Leadership). Creating socially responsible leaders entails building competencies and self-efficacy around intercultural dialogue, personal integrity, committing to excellence, self-awareness and self-efficacy. This project will help us

uncover what leadership programs we can offer to the general student population. In addition to socially responsible leadership, career preparation is paramount. Leadership education teaches skillsets that are not only attractive to future employers, but ultimately will help them succeed throughout their careers.

OSI seeks to provide experiences that help students learn, develop and impact their community. This project will not only help us realistically determine what programs we can offer, but also what programs and delivery methods are most effective for our student population. Many departments in the Division of Student Affairs incorporate leadership opportunities and training for their particular audiences. However, OSI will be the only department to provide leadership education to the general student population. Our leadership programs will not only provide a theoretical background to leadership, but also practical skills that students can use in their courses, experiences and in their future careers.

Supporting Scholarship

There are a myriad of options when developing a leadership education program. We want to make sure our programs are grounded in theory and include nationally-recognized best practices. Through our literature review, we found the following factors to be incredibly vital to our research: sequential/developmental leadership programs, relevant populations, and program delivery methods.

Leadership capacity is built sequentially and developmentally across the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. This progression organizes all seven values into 4 domains; pre-college leadership capacity, individual leadership, group leadership and societal leadership (Dugan, Kodama, Correia, & Associates, 2013). Developmental sequencing starts with the self (Individual Leadership Domain) and the scope becomes broader to include other people (Group Leadership Domain) and eventually the global community (Societal Leadership Domain). Researchers have also stated that leadership self-efficacy is paramount to developmental leadership education. Developmentally sequenced programs not only help students accurately assess their capacity, but they can be placed in the correct program that meets their needs and potentially advances their development (Dugan & Komives, 2010).

Research points to a few key populations that need to be targeted in leadership development programs. These include emerging leaders, student organization members and positional leaders (Dugan & Komives, 2007).

IV. Data Collection & Methodology

Data Collection

For our benchmarking study we wanted to look at leadership programs offered at peer institutions. We compiled a comprehensive list of 118 institutions based on the following criteria:

- National Clearinghouse of Leadership Programs spotlighted effective models of co-curricular leadership programs
- Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS – a system of interrelated surveys through the National Center for Education – U.S. Department of Education)
- Destination schools (other schools students who applied to DePaul University attend)

- Local institutions not already included as a destination or IPEDS school
- Institutions who have leadership programs recognized in the *Handbook of Student Leadership Programs, Second Edition*, (Komives et al., 2011)
- Institutions identified with model programs in the *2012 MSL Insight Report: Leadership Program Delivery*, (Dugan, et al., 2013)

In the general sample, we wanted a comprehensive list of institutions to investigate which could help us uncover a plan based on unique factors to DePaul. As a result, we chose institutions that were nationally recognized, local, and operated similarly to DePaul. We also looked at institutions used by the Division of Student Affairs for other benchmarking research (based on size, religious affiliation, and location).

From this initial list of 118, we removed all duplicates which resulted in 86 institutions. We did an initial scan of the websites for these 86 institutions, and kept any who met the following criteria:

- Leadership programs offered in a student activities/student involvement department
- Undergraduate enrollment over 10,000 students

These schools offer valuable information because we need to make decisions based on not only best practices, but also programs that could potentially be replicated in a department with limited staff, budget, and resources.

After this scan, we had a list of 34 institutions for further examination (See Appendix B for full list of institutions by category). Three members of the assessment team did an in-depth scan of each college/university's leadership programs website. We searched the websites for the following information:

- Institution
- Location (urban, suburban, rural)
- Leadership programs offered (including frequency, target audience, format and facilitator)
- Number of programs
- Number of total staff in the department
- Number of total staff involved in leadership education initiatives
- Leadership model or philosophy
- Category (local, destination, IPEDS, nationally recognized)

Data Analysis

In order to discover format and type of program, we did a frequency analysis of all these institutions to uncover trends in types of programs (i.e. leadership workshops, overnight retreats, emerging leaders programs, etc) (See Appendix C for Frequency Results).

In addition to program type frequency, we wanted to narrow our institution list even further so we could look deeper at types of programs, delivery method, and structure. Research indicates that successful leadership programs offer developmentally sequenced experiences and peer education opportunities. Based on our literature review, we knew we wanted to only review institutions who offered developmental programming for targeted populations and a peer

education component. For these purposes, we noted whether schools contained beginner (emerging leaders/students new to leadership), intermediate (members of organizations without an official leadership role) or advanced (current/former positional leaders/peer leaders) programming as well as peer-led initiatives. We ranked institutions A-D based on how their programs met this criteria (See Appendix D for Rankings and Appendix E for Rubric). An A ranking meant that the department offered all of the identified initiatives.

Finally, we pulled only A-ranked institutions and this yielded 14 institutions (See Appendix F for Final List of Institutions). We completed a thorough search of their website and online resources to uncover best practices in program delivery methods (conference, retreats, workshops, etc), theoretical models, peer education programs, and developmental programs. We reviewed all these programs to create a strategic plan for the department.

V. Data & Results

From the frequency analysis, we uncovered that the following types of programs were most frequently offered:

- On-going leadership opportunities (lasts longer than one-day, series, etc)
- One-time leadership opportunities (assessments, workshops, etc)
- Emerging leadership programs (for students new to leadership or new students)
- Workshop series
- Leadership retreat, weekend, or two-day conferences
- Leadership award ceremonies
- Certificate programs
- One-day leadership conferences and summits

(See Appendix G for Frequency for A-Ranked Institutions)

VI. Discussion & Interpretation of Results

In our study we uncovered the following themes:

- Emerging leader, peer educator, one-time and on-going programs emerged as best practices not only in the literature, but also within our benchmarking research.
- 44% of the institutions we reviewed had developmentally sequenced programs for all three levels (beginner, intermediate and advanced). This confirms what the literature states about developmental sequencing being a best practice.
- 47% of the institutions we reviewed has peer educators or peer-led initiatives. This confirms what the literature states about peer mentoring as a best practice.

In our study, we had to narrow our research down to institutions that have leadership programs originated from a student involvement/activities department. This can be limiting as there are great programs housed in academic departments, stand-alone leadership offices, and other non-student involvement offices. However, we wanted to make sure our programs were realistic and complement our current programs and services. Searching websites can also be very challenging. Some websites described programs in great detail, others did not. This challenged us to take the information we had and complement it with what we know from the literature. Finally, we narrowed our list to only institutions we listed as A-ranked (they contained programs for beginner, intermediate and advanced leaders and included a peer education component). We

removed any institution that did not have all four of these criteria. It is very possible there was an institution that focused just on emerging leaders and they are very successful. We had to make our list manageable and we want our programs to impact all developmental levels.

There were some barriers we encountered with this project. Some websites had very little information and as a result there are potentially institutions that we left off of our list. The detail of program offerings was also limited at times and it proved difficult to determine exactly what the program was like. As a result, we will discuss the possibility of follow-up interviews with certain institutions to learn more about their programs.

VII. Recommendations and Plans for Action

Recommendations

Our strategic plan will incorporate the following programs over 3 years. Each program description contains a label to note developmental level (B=Beginner, I=Intermediate, A=Advanced)

- Revise comprehensive Schmitt Scholarship Program curriculum (B, I, A)
- Emerging leaders program (B)
- Leadership Lunch and Learn series (I)
- Peer educators for general leadership education (A)
- Leadership retreat for student organization members (I)
- Leadership coaching program (I, A)
- Transferring Your Leadership Skills seminar (I, A)
- Leadership recognition programs
- Lincoln Laureate selection process
- Increased leadership training for student organization executive boards (I, A)

Action Plan

We have broken this plan into three years and the following will be accomplished each year.

2016-2017

- Recruit, train and implement peer educator program (August – November 2016)
- Implement new four-year curriculum for Schmitt Scholarship Program (September 2016)
- Implement 3 Leadership Lunch and Learns (October – November 2016)
- Implement emerging leaders program – Catalyst by LeaderShape (November 2016)
- Implement 3 Leadership Lunch and Learns (January – March 2017)
- Develop curriculum for student organization member leadership retreat (January – March 2017)
- Implement 3 Leadership Lunch and Learns (March - June 2017)
- Develop curriculum for coaching program (March – June 2017)

2017-2018

- Implement student organizational member retreat – January 2018
- Develop curriculum for Transferring your Leadership Skills seminar – February 2018
- Implement leadership coaching program – March 2018

2018-2019

- Implement Transferring Your Leadership Skills Seminar – November 2018

Sharing the results

A formal marketing plan will be devised to premiere these programs for students, faculty, staff and parents. As we develop and implement programs, we will ensure the university knows about programmatic offerings.

Appendices

Appendix A
Literature Review Citations

Dugan, J. P., Kodama, C., Correia, B., & Associates. (2013). *Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership insight report: Leadership program delivery*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (January 01, 2010). Influences on College Students' Capacities for Socially Responsible Leadership. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51, 5, 525-549.

Komives, S. R., Dugan, J., Owen, J. E., Slack, C., & Wagner, W. (Eds). (2011). Handbook for student leadership development (2nd ed.). A publication of the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix B
Institution List (34) for In-Depth Research

Institution	Origin
Boston College	IPEDS Comparison Group
Catholic University of America	IPEDS Comparison Group
College of DuPage	Local
Colorado State University	Recognized/Handbook
Columbia College Chicago	Local
Creighton University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Duquesne University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Fordham University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Georgetown University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Harper College	Local

Indiana University	Destination School
Loyola Marymount University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Marquette University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Michigan State University	Destination School
Northern Illinois University	Destination School
Notre Dame	IPEDS Comparison Group
Roosevelt University	Local
Saint Joseph's University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Saint Louis University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Santa Clara University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Seattle University	IPEDS Comparison Group
Seton Hall University	IPEDS Comparison Group
UCLA	Recognized/Handbook
University of Connecticut	Recognized/Peers
University of Chicago	Local
University of Detroit Mercy	IPEDS Comparison Group
University of Iowa	Destination School
University of Michigan	Destination School
University of Missouri	Destination School
University of San Diego	IPEDS Comparison Group
University of San Francisco	IPEDS Comparison Group
University of South Carolina	Recognized/Handbook
University of Texas at Austin	Recognized/NCLP
University of Wisconsin	Destination School

Appendix C
Frequency Analysis

Programs, Activities, Offerings	Total
On-going leadership opportunities (last longer than one day, series)	28
One-time leadership opportunities	26
Emerging leaders programs (students new to leadership)	16
Workshop series	14
Leadership retreat, weekend or two-day conference	14
Leadership award ceremonies	14

Certificate program	12
One-day leadership conferences/summits	10
Programs designed specifically for student organization leaders	8
Consulting as a leadership program for student leaders	5
Programs designed for advanced leaders	5
LeaderShape; send students to or host five-day institute on their campuses	5
Peer educators (paid position, committee, or student organization) for leadership education	4
Leadership, living and learning, residential community	4
Pre-orientation leadership development programs	4
Gender specific programs for women	4
Programs combining social justice or diversity and leadership	4
Leadership library or designated space for leadership education	4
Outdoor leadership education programs	3
Mentorship program	3
Leadership grants or scholarships	3
Leadership skill tips available in their office or on their website	2
Gender specific programs for men	2
Tracks involvement on a leadership and involvement record	2
Hosts multi-departmental organizing body	2
Leadership weeks	2
StrengthsQuest	1
Programs for divisional, positional student leaders	1

Please note a few considerations we made when completing this frequency analysis.

- Workshops and certificate programs: If a school only had workshops available via a certificate program, it was only identified within the certificate program category. If the school had a certificate program and stand-alone workshops, it was included in both the certificate program and workshops categories.
- Gender-specific programs: If a school offered something like a one-day women's retreat, we marked them for having a gender specific program and a one-day retreat.
- More than one offering of a specific program: If one school offered three separate weekend retreats, the school would be included as a "1" in the retreats category to show they offer that type of program. This approach was to allow for determination of the percentage of schools offering the specific program types.
- Consulting: Some schools listed offerings as coaching or consulting. We defined this category as any dedicated efforts to provide one-on-one leadership support not classified as another program type (e.g. workshops, StrengthsQuest, etc).

Institution	Category	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced	Peer-led	Ranking
Catholic University of America	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Duquesne University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Fordham University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Georgetown University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Indiana University	Destination School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Marquette University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Santa Clara University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Connecticut	Recognized/Peers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Chicago	Local	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Iowa	Destination School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of San Francisco	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of South Carolina	Recognized/Handbook	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Texas at Austin	Recognized/NCLP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Missouri	Destination School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Boston College	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	B
Creighton University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	No	No	B
Northern Illinois University	Destination School	Yes	Yes	No	No	B
Notre Dame	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	No	No	B
Seton Hall University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	B

University of Wisconsin	Destination School	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	B
Loyola Marymount University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	No	No	C
College of DuPage	Local	No	Yes	No	No	D
Colorado State University	Recognized/Handbook	No	Yes	No	No	D
Columbia College Chicago	Local	No	Yes	No	No	D
Harper College	Local	No	Yes	No	No	D
Michigan State University	Destination School	No	Yes	No	No	D
Roosevelt University	Local	No	Yes	No	No	D
Saint Joseph's University	IPEDS Comparison Group	No	No	No	No	D
Saint Louis University	IPEDS Comparison Group	No	Yes	No	No	D
Seattle University	IPEDS Comparison Group	No	No	No	No	D
UCLA	Recognized/Handbook	No	Yes	No	No	D
University of Detroit Mercy	IPEDS Comparison Group	No	No	Yes	No	D
University of Michigan	Destination School	No	Yes	No	No	D
University of San Diego	IPEDS Comparison Group	No	Yes	No	No	D

Appendix E
Rubric for Rankings

Score	A	B	C	D
Rationale	Includes all 4 of the required criteria (beginner, intermediate, advanced and peer-led programs)	Includes 3 of the 4 required criteria (beginner, intermediate, advanced and peer-led programs)	Includes 2 of the 4 required criteria (beginner, intermediate, advanced and peer-led programs)	Includes 0-1 of the 4 required criteria (beginner, intermediate, advanced and peer-led programs)

Appendix F

Final List of Institutions (14) Based on A-Ranking

Institution	Category	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced	Peer-led	Ranking
Catholic University of America	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Duquesne University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Fordham University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Georgetown University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Indiana University	Destination School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Marquette University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
Santa Clara University	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Connecticut	Recognized/Peers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Chicago	Local	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Iowa	Destination School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of San Francisco	IPEDS Comparison Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of South Carolina	Recognized/Handbook	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Texas at Austin	Recognized/NCLP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A
University of Missouri	Destination School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A

Appendix G
Frequency for A Ranked Institutions

Institution	On-Going Leadership Opportunities	One-Time Leadership Opportunities	Emerging Leadership	Workshop Series	Leadership Retreat, Weekend or Two-Day Conference	Leadership Award Ceremonies	Certificate Programs	One-Day Leadership Conferences and Summits
Catholic University of America	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Duquesne University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Fordham University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Georgetown	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No

University								
Indiana University	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Marquette University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Santa Clara University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
University of Connecticut	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
University of Chicago	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
University of Iowa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
University of San Francisco	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
University of South Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
University of Texas at Austin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
University of Missouri	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes