



Guiding Questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs

Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 2
<i>Using Guiding Questions</i>	Page 2
Background and History	Page 3
Acknowledgments	Page 5
Overview	Page 8
Section 1: Context	Page 12
Section 2: Conceptual Framework.....	Page 15
Section 3: Content	Page 18
Section 4: Teaching and Learning.....	Page 21
Section 5: Outcomes and Assessment.....	Page 27

Introduction

Guiding Questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs (Guiding Questions) is intended to assist anyone who wishes to develop, reorganize, or evaluate a leadership education program.

Guiding Questions consists of an Overview and five sections of questions that are thought to be essential for curriculum development, instructional effectiveness, and quality enhancement through assessment. These five sections are Context, Conceptual Framework, Content, Teaching and Learning, and Outcomes and Assessment.

First-time users should begin with the Overview given the detailed nature of the sections.

The guiding questions within each section are designed to evoke answers that help leadership educators make important choices about the quality, comprehensiveness, and focus of their programs. Answers can be generated in many ways, whether formally or informally, collectively or individually. Yet, in all cases, answers point the way for development, organization, and evaluation of leadership education programs.

In most cases, the questions include either an introduction or a response. These clarifications are not intended to answer the questions. Rather, they are intended to explain and clarify the significance of the question. They are also intended to provide suggestions for further study and to point to answers in relevant research and best practices. Eventually, as the project evolves and matures, there will be links to research and best practice articles that are relevant to the section or particular questions.

Guiding Questions is the result of a broadly collaborative, multiyear project. It is intended to be a “living document.” That is, it is continually updated through interaction among members of the International Leadership Association’s Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs Learning Community. Moreover, comments and suggestions are encouraged from all users and related research is requested for presentation at annual ILA international conferences. Permanent revisions are made through the conference proposal process and should be directed to the Leadership Education Member Interest Group.

Using *Guiding Questions*

As noted above, the questions are designed to evoke answers that guide program design and assessment. The Overview is far more general and is especially useful for identifying research necessary for program development as well as planning a process that will most likely result in a relevant and comprehensive program that is based in best practices. A simple yet highly effective process is to engage program faculty in discussion of answers to the five overarching questions in the Overview.

For much more detail and to focus on a particular area, answering the questions in appropriate sections allows concentration on specific possibilities to strengthen programs. Field tests are underway; results will suggest creative and innovative ways to use this inquiry method to reveal these enhancement opportunities (Ritch & Mengel, 2009).

Guiding Questions can be used in tandem with other professional standards or guidelines. For example, *Guiding Questions* can be used to supplement or inform accreditation standards and self-studies. Two resources of particular value in this regard are *Student Leadership Programs Self Assessment Guide* (2009, <https://www.cas.edu/catalog/iteminfo.cfm?itemid=40&compid=1>) by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), and the *Handbook for Student Leadership Programs* (Komives, Dugan, Owen, Slack, & Wagner, 2006). While *Guiding Questions* is designed to apply to cocurricular programs as well as academic, for-credit programs, CAS and the Handbook are excellent sources to stimulate imaginative partnerships between academic and cocurricular programs consistent with *Learning Reconsidered* (ACPA, 2004).

Background and History

Guiding Questions and the Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs Learning Community are volunteer projects that are rooted in discussions and presentations dating back to the International Leadership Association's annual conference in Seattle (2002). Two years later at the annual conference in Washington (2004), a formal panel entitled "Emerging Accreditation Issues: Toward Professional Standards for Leadership Programs?" sparked interest in pursuing the issues that were raised (Ritch, Robinson, Riggio, Roberts & Cherrey, 2004).

As a follow-up to these and other discussions regarding the establishment of guidelines and standards for leadership studies programs, six ILA members gathered for a roundtable sponsored by Regent University in early 2005. The roundtable participants agreed on primary directions to move forward, understanding that this was the beginning of a complex process that would require the voices and expertise of many and diverse stakeholders. The following benefits, and therefore aims, were declared:

1. Create frameworks to articulate both the essential nature and distinctiveness of individual leadership programs.
2. Address issues of legitimacy both internal and external to academia.
3. Serve as a resource for new and developing programs.
4. Serve as a reference for programs responding to accrediting processes.
5. Maintain an internal locus of control and creativity for individual programs.

A research agenda was proposed to explore both the content and context of leadership programs. Although this research was originally designed to be more prescriptive through an inclusive process of setting standards, this was later modified due to ILA member input at the annual conference in Amsterdam (2005).

The ILA Board of Directors approved this proposal in April 2005. A voluntary advisory group comprised of representatives from nine colleges and universities was assembled and Regent University faculty began research over that summer. This preliminary research was presented in a panel, “Academic Standards for Leadership Studies Programs: Enlarging the Conversation” (Patterson, King, Hartsfield, Bryant, Martin, Klenke, & Harter, 2005) in Amsterdam. In addition, two related programs, one a roundtable and the other a forum, were presented in Amsterdam. The roundtable, “Tools, Guidelines, and Outcomes for Leadership Studies Programs” (Robinson, 2005), resulted in not only a sharing of experiences but also a first spark of ideas concerning the topics that might be most helpful to address in a document. The forum, “Standards and Guidelines for Leadership Programs: What Shall We Do?” was a deliberative, democratic forum that was designed to inform and expand the conversation among the ILA membership and conference attendees regarding guidelines and standards for leadership programs (Ritch & Roberts, 2005).

The conclusions of this forum were crucial in the evolution of this project:

There was unanimous agreement that this project and process must be kept grounded in the mission of the International Leadership Association. . . . The consensus was that these conversations and the research associated with them should continue. The research should be broadened to include not only the content and context of our field but also “best practices” relating to conceptual framework, mission, assessment, instruction, and other programmatic elements. This research should produce guidelines, endorsed by the ILA that can be used, following a format of essential guiding questions, to create and improve leadership programs. This process should be an important professional imperative that is transparent, iterative, and ongoing. (Ritch & Roberts, 2005)

At the 2006 ILA annual conference in Chicago, participants in the learning lab “Guidelines for Leadership Programs: Enlarging the Conversation” (Ritch, 2006) identified organizing topics/chapters, guiding questions, and recommendations for next steps that were consistent with the consensus reached in Amsterdam.

In April 2007 the ILA board formalized a new structure within the ILA, called Learning Communities, to encourage ILA members to learn from and with one another between conferences. Conceived as temporary, lasting only as long as they serve the members, Learning Communities provide opportunities for groups of members to organize around areas of passion and questions that are most critical to their work in the field of leadership. Steve Ritch was instrumental in creating the first formal ILA Learning Community, the Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs Learning Community (GLEP/LC).

The first face-to-face meeting of the GLEP/LC in Vancouver (Ritch, 2007) resulted in significant refinement of the guiding questions and a proposal to the ILA Board of Directors that was substantially accepted. The second face-to-face meeting of the GLEP/LC in Los Angeles (2008) further refined the final writing and editing tasks. *Guiding Questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs* is the result of this progression of volunteer work.

Acknowledgments

Guiding Questions is intended to be a “living document.” This means that leadership educators, practitioners, and scholars continue an inclusive community of practice that results in revisions and updates as leadership studies develops as a field and, perhaps one day, evolves into a discipline. Thus, if this acknowledgment entry becomes merely the first among many such entries, the success of the project will be validated.

Many people contributed ideas, encouragement, and sometimes a needed reminder that this work is important. Early on, Ron Riggio, Betty Robinson, Denny Roberts, and Cyn Cherrey helped connect this work to its antecedents, contributed to it, and confirmed that it is work that is worth doing. They reminded us all that there is a rich line of dedication that precedes our best work. Karin Klenke and Bruce Winston of Regent University offered more than a place to come together for initial planning, they offered a sense of purpose and a haven so we could dream about something that could help advance our field around the world.

Others joined the journey, made significant contributions and then stepped back while offering continuing encouragement. Alice Murray, Laurie Woodward, Nathan Harter, James Beebe, Kevin Arnold, Teresa Gehman, Betty Robinson, and Mike Hartsfield were steadfast in their support. Debra Orr, Debra DeRuyver, Josh Tarr, David Soleil, Jill Lindsay, Dotti Thomas, Diane Ehrlich, Gerald Peper, Thomas Miles, Tim Bryant, and Vern Ludden also gave generously of their ideas.

Nancy Thomas was the master designer of the deliberative processes that maximized collaboration and the collective wisdom of project participants.

Each section had a leader or leaders who shepherded ideas and often wrote the final questions and narratives. Kathleen Patterson (Section 1), Lisa Ncube (Section 2), Gama Perruci, Sara Thompson, and Craig Slack (Section 3), JoAnn Barbour (Section 4), and Thomas Mengel and Pierre Zundel (Section 5) presided over numerous drafts to produce the first iteration of *Guiding Questions*. Susan Komives, Julie Owen, Carolyn Roper, Dan Tillapaugh, Betty Robinson, Paige Haber, John Baker, and Thomas Matthews contributed essential abstracts to Section 4.

As with all important projects, this journey took many twists and turns. Sometimes the road appeared to be a dead end or the traction slipped or slid. Those were the times when special people stepped up. Without them, nothing would have been accomplished. *Guiding Questions* and all those who benefit from this project have the following stewards to thank. Tony Middlebrooks and Joann Barbour seemed to have a sixth sense when either the path was blocked or needed to be rerouted. Thomas Mengel and Laura Osteen cut through the expected complexity and the resulting document density with remarkable editing skill. Gama Perruci provided expert advice and liaison with the ILA Board of Directors, many of whom conferred encouragement on his or her own. And Shelly Wilsey, in the spirit and practice of collaborative leadership, kept this a broadly inclusive member-driven process while providing a constant source of ILA support and inspiration.

Above all, for us all, it *is* about leadership.

Stephen Ritch
Project Leader
2004–2010

May 2009

References

- ACPA: College Student Educators International and NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2009). Student leadership programs. In *CAS professional standards for higher education* (7th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Komives, S. R., Dugan, J., Owen, J. E., Slack, C., & Wagner, W. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook for student leadership programs*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Patterson, K., King, J., Hartsfield, M., Bryant, S., Martin, S., Klenke, K., & Harter, N. (2005, November). Academic standards for leadership studies programs: Enlarging the conversation. *Proceedings from the 7th Annual Conference of the International Leadership Association: Emergent Models of Global Leadership*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands. [CD]. College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.
- Ritch, S., Robinson, B., Riggio, R., Roberts, D., & Cherrey, C. (2004, November). Emerging accreditation issues: Toward professional standards for leadership programs? *Proceedings from the 6th Annual Conference of the International Leadership Association: Improving Leadership around the World: Challenges, Ideas, Innovations*. Washington DC, USA. [CD]. College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.
- Ritch, S., & Roberts, D. (2005, November). Standards and guidelines for leadership programs: What shall we do? *Proceedings from the 7th Annual Conference of the International Leadership Association: Emergent Models of Global Leadership*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands. [CD]. College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.
- Ritch, S. (2006, November). Guidelines for leadership programs: Enlarging the conversation. *Proceedings from the 8th Annual Conference of the International Leadership Association: Leadership at the Crossroads*. Chicago, USA. [CD]. College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.

- Ritch, S. (2007, October-November). Guidelines for leadership education programs learning community. *Proceedings from the 9th Annual Conference of the International Leadership Association: Leadership: Impact, Culture & Sustainability. Vancouver, BC, Canada.* [CD]. College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.
- Ritch, S., & Mengel, T. (2009). Guiding questions: Guidelines for leadership education programs. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 8(1), 216–227. Retrieved from http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/JOLE_8_1.pdf.
- Robinson, B. (2005, November). Tools, guidelines, and outcomes for leadership studies programs. *Proceedings from the 7th Annual Conference of the International Leadership Association: Emergent Models of Global Leadership. Amsterdam, The Netherlands.* [CD]. College Park, MD: International Leadership Association. (Roundtable, no minutes published).

Overview

Guiding Questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs consists of this Overview, which may be used for basic review, and the following five sections, which are intended for comprehensive explorations:

1. Context
2. Conceptual Framework
3. Content
4. Teaching and Learning
5. Outcomes and Assessment

Each section begins with a brief introduction and provides the context for its particular focus. General guiding questions follow that are designed to assess the relevant section of the leadership program under development or review (e.g., “What is the program’s conceptual framework?”). Additional specific guiding questions relevant for each section allow pursuing and evaluating particular perspectives within that section (e.g., “What are the program’s overarching guiding principles?”). Finally, a brief reference section guides the reader to literature that has informed the crafting of the guiding questions and that may also provide further information regarding the respective topics.

While each section may stand alone guiding the reader interested in a particular focus, ample cross-references are provided to other sections that indicate the interconnectedness and comprehensive, multifaceted approach of this collaborative project and the resulting document (e.g., the question “What theories and beliefs about teaching and learning underlie choices made about pedagogy, assessment, ordering of content and activities?” complements the section on Conceptual Framework).

As a consequence, *Guiding Questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs* can be read in sequence if the reader wants to gain an in-depth overview of all relevant sections pertaining to leadership education programs; alternatively, the reader can start with a section of particular interest or importance.

Each section is introduced below both in its particular perspective as well as in its relationship to the whole document.

Context

Overarching Guiding Question: How does the context of the leadership education program affect the program?

This section describes how leadership programs, their conceptual frameworks, their content, their chosen approaches to teaching and learning, and the respective outcomes and their assessment may be affected by factors and elements within the program’s context. Thus, a systematic

approach to leadership education within a social process is encouraged to help increase the fit of the leadership program within its context.

Additional guiding questions help describe the various contextual categories of identity, sector, academics, place, discipline, organization, field of practice, and field of leadership as well as these categories' impact on leadership education programs. Furthermore, this section focuses on the significance and impact of the program's cultural context particularly from a global and cross-cultural perspective. Finally, this section explores the institutional context of leadership programs.

Conceptual Framework

Overarching Guiding Question: What is the conceptual framework of the leadership education program?

This section is based on the assumption that explicitly describing and communicating values, beliefs, and theoretical frameworks underlying any leadership education program allows assessment of the basis and validity of the program's educational design. Furthermore, explicit frameworks enhance student learning and thus improve the overall quality of the program.

Guiding questions help describe and assess the underlying conceptual framework; its articulation; its theoretical and practical background; its relationship to the program's context as well as to its philosophy, purpose, and goals; and its relationship to pedagogy, content, and assessment.

Content

Overarching Guiding Question: What is the content of the leadership education program and how was it derived?

This section explores topical areas that may serve as foundational curriculum for comprehensive leadership education programs. In particular, this section encourages a balance of declarative, procedural, and affective types of knowledge that may be driven by the context, conceptual framework and outcomes for the program.

Guiding questions link program content to conceptual and contextual elements; to the students' developmental level; and to the program's outcomes, curriculum, and learning resources. Furthermore, specific questions help explore the following areas that may impact leadership education in particular ways: leadership foundations, strategic leadership, personal development, organizational leadership, and ethical leadership.

Teaching and Learning

Overarching Guiding Question: What are the students' developmental levels and what teaching and learning methods are most appropriate to ensure maximum student learning?

This section explores optimal pedagogies that may enhance teaching and learning within the context of the Leadership Identity Development Model's (Komives, Longersbeam, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006) six stages: Awareness, Exploration, Leader identified, Leader differentiated, Generativity, and Integration. Thus the guiding questions can be explored within a developmental approach following each of the six stages of leadership development.

Guiding questions explore—for each of the six stages of leadership development—general issues and concerns of teaching and learning leadership. More specifically, they discuss the role of the instructor; the teaching methodology; the approaches to teaching; expected learning outcomes; the roles and responsibilities of the learner; and the learning activities, projects, and experiences. Finally, two questions link this section and the six stages of leadership development back to supporting philosophical and conceptual frameworks as well as to elements of the social and cultural context relevant to issues of teaching and learning.

Outcomes and Assessment

Overarching Guiding Question: What are the intended outcomes of the leadership education program and how are they assessed and used to ensure continuous quality improvement?

This section focuses on formative and summative program evaluation in the context of institutional evaluation and the assessment of student learning outcomes. Furthermore, the section explores the links between the assessment and evaluation processes and results at each level ... to each other and to other underlying contextual frameworks, leadership content, teaching and learning. The main assumptions of this section are the crucial role of learning outcomes and their assessment for transparency and accountability of institutions and programs toward students and society at large as well as for a consistent institutional, program, and personal / professional development of students, faculty, and staff; student learning is considered to be at the core of educational programs.

Generic guiding questions explore—on the institutional, program, and student level—the identified leadership competencies and proficiencies and their relationship to the program's philosophical and theoretical perspectives; the desired (learning) outcomes; their relationship to conceptual, contextual, content and delivery related elements; indicators for the assessment of learning outcomes and elements of a comprehensive assessment system; and potential criteria of excellence. Furthermore, specific questions on the institutional level investigate how assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation feed into institutional decision making and how external sources inform institutional evaluation and assessment.

On the program level, questions explore how conceptual frameworks inform the assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation, how formative assessment and evaluation is incorporated into the ongoing assessment of outcomes, what the identified fields of practice are and how they might inform the evaluation of program outcomes, how summative and formative assessment of student learning might inform the evaluation of program outcomes, what evidence might exist for organizational learning on the program level, and how the chosen outcomes might inform the implementation of the leadership education program.

Finally, student level questions explore how competency and growth of students might be assessed.

Section 1: Context

Overarching Guiding Question: *How does the context of the leadership education program affect the program?*

The context of the leadership program affects the conceptual framework, which, in turn, determines in large measure program content, teaching and learning approaches, and outcomes and assessment. This section poses questions that guide the collection of relevant expertise and experience on how context impacts leadership programs.

This section seeks to understand the context aspects of leadership programs, in a larger effort to understand how contextual factors affect the overall development of leadership programs. Along with this effort, the aim is to assist those who develop leadership programs in making wise choices concerning context. Johnson and Fauske (2005) advocate that contextual understandings lend themselves to the overall experience, specifically with teaching, learning, counseling, and coaching; while they advocate the experience directly in the organizational context, one cannot overlook the imperative they reach—that context matters. This is consistent with Taylor, de Guerre, Gavin, and Kass (2002), who promote a systematic approach to leadership education within a social process, including “the collaborative development of productive organization contexts, the effective use of theory-in-practice, expertise for learning-in-action, and requisite self-knowledge” (p. 349); in fact, they adamantly acknowledge that context is a priority.

Specific Questions on Contextual Categories: *What specific contextual categories impact the leadership education program?*

This subsection looks specifically at the various contextual categories in leadership programs, including the inquiry into what contextual categories might even exist—such as (though not limited to) identity, sector, the concept of place, the idea of narratives and stories in the evolution of a program, the varied fields of practice served by programs, and the connection of the field of leadership with the field of practice. According to Taylor et al. (2002), there are wide-ranging implications for the intersection of leadership practice and theory—specifically in the area of context. Consistent with this is Huber (2003) who advocates leadership education must include some development in the ideas of tolerance for ambiguity (engaging ideas such as gender, race, etc.), and further who advocates teachers and professors move beyond the traditional methods and seek further challenges.

*How have the following contextual categories been considered and addressed: Identity (Gender, Culture, Socioeconomic, Regional, National); Sector (For-profit, Not-for-profit, Education, Government, Community, NGO); Academic (Graduate, Undergraduate, Cocurricular, Curricular, Practice and experience, On-line, On-ground, Distributive)? How has place as defined by physical, professional, political and/or cultural identity been considered in the program?
What are the narratives (stories) behind the development or evolution of the program?
How does disciplinary or organizational context impact the leadership program?
What are the fields of practice your program serves?*

How does the field of leadership get translated into and connect with that field of practice?

Specific Questions on Cultural Contexts: *What cultural contexts impact the leadership education program?*

This subsection looks specifically at the cultural components in leadership programs, including the inquiry of a global setting, current issues and trends, foundations of culture, as well as how programs deal with the intersection of different cultures, traditions, and values. We see from the work of Taylor et al. (2002) that the global context influences leadership education, as they advocate a strong consideration of the global flux facing leaders today. This shift to a more globally focused leadership education includes nuances in shifting that include a shift from theory to practice, from parts to systems, from states and roles to processes, from knowledge to learning, from individual action to partnerships, and from detached analysis to reflexive understanding. This global context includes a thorough understanding of current trends and issues. McNally, Gerras, and Bullis (1996) show, with their analysis of their leadership programs, that the “ability to understand the subtleties and ambiguities they will face in complex leadership situations in the future” (p. 177)—in other words, the cultural context—influences the leadership educational process.

How does the institution’s global setting impact leadership programming?

How are current issues and trends (e.g., diversity, globalization, security, and technology) addressed?

How does the program recognize and build upon cultural foundations?

How does the program recognize the intersection of different cultures, traditions, and values?

Specific Questions on Institutional Context: *How does the specific institutional context impact the leadership education program?*

This subsection looks specifically at the institutional components in leadership programs, including the inquiry of the institution’s and program’s vision for the future, the mission of both institution and program—along with the connection between mission and vision—and finally the potential for alternative guidelines in leadership programs, including (though not limited to) professional, government, and corporate guidelines of excellence in the development of leadership programs. Nirenberg (2003) poses a valid inquiry with his stance on the institution and asking if institutions are the barrier in addressing change in leadership programs that might be necessary—while this might seem unrelated, the larger question is obvious—institutional context matters a great deal, specifically when one looks at the larger implications that institutions place on programs—not to mention that specific schools might also do so. For example, most change in programs come from outside the program, as well the placement of the leadership program—as some leadership programs are stand-alone schools, some are within another discipline, and some are tracks or majors versus minors. Leadership programs do, and will, have to consider the larger implications that institutional context places on the programs themselves, such as does the leadership program fit into the larger context, or does the leadership

program fit the vision for the institutions. Large questions like these need to be addressed, and potentially answered, by those considering leadership development programs.

What is the institution's and program's vision for the future?

What is the institution's and program's mission?

How do the program and institutional visions and missions relate?

What professional, government, institutional, or other guidelines of excellence are used to develop programs?

References

Huber, N. (2003). An experiential leadership approach for teaching tolerance for ambiguity. *Journal of Education for Business*, 79(1), 52–55.

Johnson, B. L., Jr., & Fauske, J. R. (2005). Introduction: Organization theory, educational leadership and educational research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(1), 5–8.

McNally, J. A., Gerras, S., & Bullis, R. C. (1996). Teaching leadership at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 32(2), 175.

Nirenberg, J. (2003). Toward leadership education that matters. *Journal of Education for Business*, 79(1), 6–10.

Taylor, M., de Guerre, D., Gavin, J., & Kass, R. (2002). Graduate leadership education for dynamic human systems. *Management Learning*, 33(3), 349–369.

Section 2: Conceptual Framework

Overarching Guiding Question: *What is the conceptual framework of the leadership program?*

The purpose of this section is to offer an opportunity for leadership program developers to provide a comprehensive conceptual focus tailored to their specific leadership program. This section contains questions that will help program developers make explicit the underlying conceptual framework, beliefs, theories, and philosophies that guide their work. This explicitness is a key means to clearly communicating program values, checking for congruity between these frameworks and the pedagogical choices actually made, and, finally, making it possible to challenge the validity and basis of educational design choices. Ultimately, clearly describing conceptual frameworks will lead to better programs and more student learning.

Popper and Lipshitz (1993) define institutional leadership development as a planned and systematic effort to improve the quality of leadership. Therefore, when education leadership programs are conceptualized they should have framework for development. A conceptual framework which relates to leadership development should include: the development of self-efficacy in the domain of leadership (leading of self), understanding and developing relationships with others (leading others), and the context of leadership (organizational leadership). Understanding the role of globalization and technology are important facets to include in a conceptual framework. One effective way of communicating the conceptual framework to stakeholders and the public at large is through a conceptual model. The conceptual model graphically represents the framework. Listed below are questions that should be asked in articulating a conceptual framework for leadership programs.

Has the conceptual framework been articulated in a way that makes it possible to derive program content, pedagogy, and learning outcomes?

What theories, research, and wisdom of practice underpin the program's belief that its purposes/goals are worthwhile and of value?

How does the program's context (see Section 1) relate to its conceptual framework?

How does the program's conceptual framework align with the institution's mission, vision, values, and strategic plan?

Specific Questions on Philosophy, Purpose, and Goals: *What are the theoretical foundations and historical perspectives underpinning the leadership program?*

It is important to recognize the historical foundations of the program and its philosophical underpinnings. Philosophical perspectives are based on the program's values. Values are enduring beliefs about the kinds of behaviors or end-states preferable to others (Buchko, 2007). Values form the shared conceptions of what is most desirable in a program and holds the organization together. Effective leadership programs should provide guidance that ensures a clear and shared sense of the organizational mission and vision for the future (Ruben, Russ, Smulowitz, & Connaughton, 2007). Leadership with vision as a core component is recommended for organizations to remain relevant in a global environment (Kantabutra & Avery, 2007). Clear measurable goals and objectives are derived from the program's mission,

vision, and values. Critical to the development of leadership programs is the question of ethics and how the program addresses questions of ethics.

What is the mission/purpose of the program?

What is the program's vision for the future?

What are the overarching guiding principles of the leadership program?

What are the broad goals, objectives, and outcomes of the leadership program?

How are these connected to philosophy and mission?

How does the program engage ethical issues?

Specific Questions related to Teaching and Learning: *What theories and beliefs about teaching and learning underlie choices made about pedagogy, assessment, ordering of content, and activities?*

The learning of leadership allows students to develop realistic perspectives and understandings based on contemporary leadership theories and observed behaviors. Leadership programs should draw on relevant leadership theories that promote such intellectual development in students (Allio, 2005). Effective leadership programs should be conducive to student-centered learning where contemporary theories are linked to actual experiences (Allio, 2005). The design of the program in terms of teaching and learning should consist of five elements:

What are the knowledge, skills, and attitudes considered essential in developing leadership (outcomes)?

How does the program identify the learners' abilities (selection)?

How does the program identify the criteria of successful performance (assessment)?

What factors have been identified that lead to success (evaluation)?

How does the program design learning situations with a high likelihood of success (curriculum)? (Popper & Lipshitz, 1993)

References

- Allio, R. J. (2005). Leadership development: Teaching versus learning. *Management Decision*, 43, 1071–1077.
- Buchko, A. A. (2007). The effect of leadership on values-based management. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28, 36–50.
- Densten, I. L., & Gray, J. H. (2001). Leadership development and reflection: What is the connection? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(3), 119–124.
- Kantabutra, S., & Avery, G. C. (2007). Vision effects in customer and staff satisfaction: An empirical investigation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28, 209–229.

Popper, M., & Lipshitz, R. (1993). Putting leadership theory to work: A conceptual framework for theory-based leadership development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 14(7), 23–27.

Ruben, B. R., Russ, T., Smulowitz, S. M., & Connaughton, S. L. (2007). Evaluating the impact of organizational self-assessment in higher education: The Malcolm Baldrige/Excellence in Higher Education framework. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28, 230–250.

Section 3: Content

Overarching Guiding Question: *What is the content of the leadership education program and how was it derived?*

The third section seeks to provide leadership program developers with a set of topical areas and respective questions to use as they begin to conceptualize the content of their specific programs. These topical areas are meant as potential foundational curricula to include when developing a comprehensive program. While the diversity of academic programs precludes the development of an exhaustive set of topical areas, the ones listed below are meant to help educators create the foundations of their programs. The bulleted questions included in each area represent broad points for consideration within each topic.

The content may include formal declarative knowledge (facts, theories) as well as procedural (skills) and affective (attitudinal) knowledge. The choice of these will be a balance of these three types of knowledge driven by the context, conceptual framework, and outcomes for the program.

How do conceptual and contextual elements (see previous sections) influence the program content?

How does the level of development of the program's students (e.g., first year undergraduate students versus graduate students) in your program influence the course content?

How does the choice of program outcomes (see Section 5) impact the course content?

How is the content of the program sequenced and connected?

What materials (e.g., textbooks, articles, etc.) will support student learning in the course?

Specific Questions on Foundations of Leadership (Wren, 1995; Wren, Riggio, & Genovese, 2009):

What are the theories and definitions of leadership being taught in the program?

What are the philosophical approaches taught in the program?

What are the historical perspectives presented in the program?

What are the disciplines that inform the study of leadership in your program?

What is the theoretical and empirical basis of the content taught?

Specific Questions on Strategic Leadership (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007; Northouse, 2009):

The following are content areas that each program should include in its teaching. The content areas ensure that students understand the way leadership works. Key terms should help students understand their key content areas.

How does the program help students understand leadership concepts and terms?

How does the program help students master key concepts in strategic leadership such as (vision, purpose/mission, needs assessment, planning, change management, problem solving, conflict, decision making, motivation, building a culture, cultural analysis)?

Specific Questions on Personal Development (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1999):

How does the program promote personal development in way that leads to increased capacities for individual and collective leadership?

How does the program help students explore the following areas of individual and collective leadership: self-awareness (inside-out), personal growth/change, renewal, spirituality, self in relation to others?

Specific Questions on Organizational Leadership (Hickman, 1998; Morgan, 2006):

How does the program advance a student's understanding of organizational context and structures of leadership?

How does the program include aspects of interpersonal skill development necessary in a leadership context?

How does the program help students comprehend the following organizational context and structure for action and results: organizational design and structure, interpersonal skills, communication, resource allocation and management, technology, group dynamics, and law and policy?

Specific Questions on Ethical Leadership (Ciulla, 2003; Price, 2008):

How does the program define "ethical leadership"?

What concepts underlie the notion of ethical leadership in this program (e.g., virtue, justice, efficiency, moral reasoning, and constitutional rights)?

References

Ciulla, J. (2003). *The ethics of leadership*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Hickman, G. R. (Ed.). (1998). *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. (1999). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience* (3rd ed.). Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Komives, S., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2007). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Northouse, P. (2009). *Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Price, T. (2008). *Leadership ethics: An introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ritch, S. (2004, November). Draft standards/assessment model and standards implications. From panel: Emerging accreditation issues: Toward professional standards for leadership programs? *Proceedings from the 6th Annual Conference of the International Leadership Association: Improving Leadership around the World: Challenges, Ideas, Innovations*. Washington DC, USA. [CD]. College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.
- Wren, J. T., Riggio, R., & Genovese, M. (2009). *Leadership and the liberal arts: Achieving the promise of a liberal education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wren, J. T. (Ed.). (1995). *Leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages*. New York: The Free Press.

Section 4: Teaching and Learning

Overarching Guiding Question: *What are the students' developmental levels and what teaching and learning methods are most appropriate to ensure maximum student learning?*

This section presents questions focused on developing optimal pedagogies to enhance teaching and learning. The questions below will provide a focus for teaching and learning leadership. The questions can be placed onto a Teaching/Learning Grid.

Vertical Axis: Leadership Identity Development Model: Since student levels and learner state is directly related to choice of optimal methods, guiding questions have been framed within the Leadership Identity Development (LID) research (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005; Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006). The LID stage model was chosen because leadership educators work with various levels of students and learner states. Use of the LID stage model provides a systematic way to delineate the “who” —that is, who are the learners we teach, who are the leaders we are developing? For more information on the LID model link here: <http://www.nclp.umd.edu/members/lid.asp>. The LID model forms the vertical axis on the matrix. The general question posed down the vertical axis is: *What are the students' developmental levels and what teaching and learning methods are most appropriate to ensure maximum student learning?* Down the vertical axis, the six LID stages include:

- Stage One: Awareness
- Stage Two: Exploration
- Stage Three: Leader Identified
- Stage Four: Leader Differentiated
- Stage Five: Generativity
- Stage Six: Integration

Horizontal Axis: Guiding Questions: On the horizontal axis of the grid, a set of guiding questions is posed. Each question below represents a row on the horizontal axis.

1. What are the concerns and issues of teaching and learning at each LID stage?
2. What is the role of the instructor, the teaching methodology, and approaches to teaching at each LID stage?
3. What are the expected learning outcomes at each LID stage?
4. What are the roles and responsibilities of the learners at each LID stage?
5. What are possible learning activities, projects, and/or experiences appropriate for each LID stage?
6. What are the key philosophical and/or theoretical concepts and/or beliefs that provide support in each LID stage?
7. What are the social and cultural contexts/issues/concerns in which teaching and learning take place across the guiding questions? This seventh guiding question can be posed as a second row under and across the previous six guiding questions to form a second horizontal axis that runs as a thread through the six questions above it on the horizontal axis.

The specific questions below focus educators on identification of appropriate teaching and learning methods to ensure maximum student learning. The LID model of Komives and colleagues (2005) provides a framework for specific questions, while the final questions focus across the LID stages on learners' individual social and cultural contexts.

Specific Questions on Teaching and Learning posed on the horizontal axis of the Teaching/Learning Grid are discussed below

What are the concerns and issues of teaching and learning at each LID stage?

Because the Leadership Identity Development (LID) model presupposes a developmental process it is tempting to want to “teach” students more complex ways of being. It must be clarified that, as with any developmental process, educators cannot make students change. We can only facilitate the creation of conditions and communities where change might occur. This is especially tempting, for example, when looking at the stage three (leader identified) to stage four (leadership differentiated) transition. It is only natural that leadership educators want students to learn to move beyond leader-centric thinking to viewing leadership as a collaborative, relational process that can occur from anywhere in an organization.

Though we may not be able to “teach” students into stage four thinking, the development of the LID model did allow for the identification of several elements that might be useful as educators develop environments that spark students to transition from thinking of leadership as the province of the privileged few to thinking about it as a relational process among any group of involved people. Some of these elements include: providing opportunities for students to intentionally learn theories and models of leadership; intentionally designing group processes in ways that encourage interdependence; encouraging both depth and breadth of organizational commitment; and assuring access to caring adults or older peer mentors. Other curricular and cocurricular pedagogies may be found in Komives, Longerbeam, Mainella, Osteen, Owen, and Wagner (2009) and Komives et al. (2006; also available from www.nclp.umd.edu).

What is the role of the instructor, the teaching methodology, and approach to teaching at each LID stage?

The 2009 Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) standard on *Student Leadership Programs* describes three approaches to leadership instruction as training, education, or development adopted from early pedagogical writing from the Inter-associational Task Force on Leadership (Roberts & Ullom, 1989). The LID model offers a bridge from traditional theories of leadership to today's understanding of the leadership construct vis-à-vis the transformational, relationship, and related models. While long-standing methods and approaches to instruction may complement the first two CAS approaches and the first three LID stages, didactic methods may fail in the higher aims of developing leaders.

Thus, leadership instructors must ponder the question of how one develops leaders and the perspective of those engaging in leadership; in what roles, by which methods, and with what

approaches? This specific question engages educators in a dialogue to select methods appropriate for each stage, such as: lecture and storytelling, discussion, modeling, role-play, observing, guiding with reflection, coaching with practice inside and outside the classroom, group projects, action research, mentoring, service learning, and internships.

What are the expected learning outcomes at each LID stage? (reference also Section 5)

In 2004, ACPA: College Student Educators International and NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education came together to produce *Learning Reconsidered*, a powerful document that argues for the integrated use of all of higher education's resources in the education and preparation of the whole student. This document introduces new ways of understanding and supporting student learning that are especially congruent with the developmental processes outlined in the LID model. *Learning Reconsidered* presents learning and development as intertwined, inseparable elements of the student experience. It advocates for transformative education—a holistic process of learning that places the student at the center of the learning experience. Since many leadership education efforts include both curricular and cocurricular elements, the integrative nature of this document is especially useful in identifying and classifying expected learning outcomes at each stage of the LID model.

The core processes of the LID model show how one's developing self interacts with others in increasingly complex ways which results in broadening views of leadership.

Individual learning outcomes such as self-awareness, self-confidence, and leadership self-efficacy interact with group-level outcomes such as collective efficacy, collaboration, and organizational citizenship. Clear learning outcomes can be identified that document this shift from dependence to independence, and then to interdependence.

What are the roles and responsibilities of the learners at each LID stage?

This Guidelines document examines the intersections of psychosocial and cognitive development and leadership identity development as it relates to learners' self-responsibility for growth and change. As collaborators in their education, educators want their students to grow and develop, but ultimately it is the responsibility of the learner to do so. Educators must be aware that the LID model intersects student development theory and post-industrial leadership theory (Komives et al., 2009).

Cognitive and psychosocial development plays a significant role in a student's ability to identify him- or herself as a leader. The more complex one's cognitive or psychosocial development is, the higher the capacity for the learner to be in a more advanced stage of leadership identity development. As educators, we cannot "teach" our students to reach more complex stages of leadership identity, but we can provide opportunities for learners to take that on themselves.

The LID model represents a movement from passive awareness of leadership to an active, participatory role for the learner to a "big picture" understanding of leadership. While

educators can offer opportunities for students, it is the learner's obligation to open him- or herself to the necessary exploratory work to grow. Some examples of this work include involving one's self in a team or group, taking on a positional leadership role, assisting in the organization from a positional or non-positional role, developing others within the organization, and attempting to be congruent in action and beliefs.

What are possible learning activities, projects, and/or experiences appropriate for each LID stage?

The Guidelines examines ways in which leadership educators can intentionally promote environments and opportunities to facilitate more complex levels of leadership identity development. This will include practical and concrete activities, projects, and experiences as well as overall concepts such as facilitation and reflection.

With a focus on LID it is only natural to ask how leadership educators can help facilitate students' leadership identity development (Roper, 2009). What activities and experiences will facilitate students' understanding of their present stage and progress to more complex stages of LID? A key component is an intentional focus on reflection, allowing students to apply insights from these activities to how they view themselves and other people in the leadership process.

It is tempting to focus on the key LID transition between stages three and four of the model (which appears on the vertical axis). This transition focuses on a shift from a leader-centric view to a more relational view of leadership. While this is certainly an important transition, educators should provide learning opportunities at many different stages and recognize that each stage has an important role in the developmental process.

What are the key philosophical and/or theoretical concepts and/or beliefs that provide support in each LID stage? (reference also Guiding Questions Section 1)

Which philosophical or theoretical focus would be most appropriate for the leader-learners in this teaching environment, age group, and experience level?

Should teaching be based on traditional pedagogy or on nontraditional andragogy or pedagogy? Which philosophers or theorists should provide grounding to the needed approach?

How does the choice of student audience impact the choice of teaching pedagogy? Does the program target undergraduates in a degree program, a minor program, or a certificate program? Does the program target working or nonworking individuals: in leadership positions, seeking certification, seeking graduate degrees, seeking continuing education or career advancement development, or career changes?

Underlying the various differences and contexts in which leaders are developed and leadership is taught are theories of teaching and learning. However one teaches and for whatever purposes one teaches, one ought to have an underlying philosophy and theory of learning and teaching. Additionally, whatever one's philosophy of teaching and learning, one ought to know the traditions from which this philosophy derives its strengths. Thus, when developing a leadership program, one ought to consider the key theories and philosophies of

teaching and learning that would seem to provide a scaffold for the groups of leaders and future leaders taught, whether traditional or nontraditional programs of leadership education or development.

Specific Questions regarding Individual Students (across the horizontal axis of the Teaching/Learning Grid):

What are the social and cultural contexts/issues/concerns (SCC) in which teaching and learning take place across the guiding questions? (reference also Guiding Questions Section 2)

How might the SCC impact students' and instructors' understanding of the processes of teaching and learning and their possible roles in these processes? What methods might be employed to increase their abilities to utilize a wider array of teaching/learning processes?

How might the SCC impact students' and instructors' understanding of leadership (as a process)? What methods will increase their knowledge, various dispositions, and/or skills of leadership?

An understanding of social and cultural context is relevant to all areas of these guidelines and particularly important to teaching and learning. For this reason, on the Teaching and Learning Grid the social and cultural context appears on the horizontal axis beneath the set of guiding questions above.

References

- ACPA: College Student Educators International and NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Barbour, J., Komives, S. R., Roper, C. D., Owen, J. E., Tillapaugh, D., Baker, J., & Matthews, T. (2008, November). Teaching and learning: The art and craft of portraits to visions. *Proceedings from the 10th Annual Conference of the International Leadership Association: Global Leadership: Portraits of the Past, Visions for the Future*. [CD]. College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2009). Student leadership programs. In *CAS professional standards for higher education* (7th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46, 593–611. [Available at www.nclp.umd.edu]

- Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S., Owen, J. E., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2006). A leadership identity development model: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47, 401–420. [Available at www.nclp.umd.edu]
- Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S., Mainella, F. C., Osteen, L., Owen, J. E., & Wagner, W. (2009). Leadership identity development: Challenges in applying a developmental model. *Journal of Leadership Education*. Forthcoming.
- Owen, J. (2004). From ‘me’ to ‘we’: Facilitating relational leadership identity development. *Concepts & Connections*, 12(3), 9–11.
- Roberts, D., & Ullom, C. (1989). Student leadership program model. *NASPA Journal*, 27, 67–74.
- Roper, C. D. (2009). Guiding students as they learn to lead. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 13(2). [Available at <http://www.rapidintellect.com/AEQweb/>]

Section 5: Outcomes and Assessment

Overarching Guiding Question: *What are the intended outcomes of the leadership education program and how are they assessed and used to ensure continuous quality improvement?*

This section includes the evaluation of outcomes at an institutional, program, and student level. However, we suggest this topic's focus is on program evaluation, both formative and summative; institutional and program evaluation will be informed by assessment of student learning outcomes. Institutional evaluation informs organizational decision making about a program at the institutional level. Program evaluation focuses on the decision making related to program delivery, curriculum, and content related to a degree program, certificate program, and major or minor within another program. Learning outcomes assessment relates to gathering evidence and making judgments about the attitudes, knowledge, and skills students develop during the program. The assessment and evaluation processes and results at each level are linked to each other and to other underlying contextual frameworks, leadership content, teaching, and learning.

The above overarching guiding question is explored through five broad sections and then broken down further with specific questions in the context of institutional, program, and student levels. Specific questions within this section intentionally overlap to ensure that the relevant aspects and elements are comprehensively addressed. As a consequence, some repetition within these questions is unavoidable; however, it is more important that the questions are discussed than where they are addressed.

General Question 1: *What are the desired outcomes of the program at the institutional, program, and student levels?*

Outcomes (and their assessment) are core components of any educational program that claims to be accountable for its results and to do so applying transparent processes and structures. Assessable outcomes will spell out what graduates of a program will be able to do as a result of the program. To achieve these outcomes in a coherent and consistent way, program outcomes need to be aligned with the outcomes of the institution hosting the program as well as with the respective learning outcomes of students taking the program. Furthermore, the outcomes need to be clearly described conceptually as well as operationally. These descriptions also need to identify the connection between the individual outcomes and the expected way these outcomes will contribute to growth and competency in leadership.

The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

Does your institution identify outcomes to be achieved by its students? What are they (conceptual and operational descriptions)?

Does your program have program related outcomes that graduates will have achieved upon graduation from the program? What are they (conceptual and operational descriptions)?

Do the program outcomes support and/or complement your institutional outcomes?

Does your program specify learning outcomes for its students? What are they (conceptual and operational descriptions)?
Do student learning outcomes support and/or complement your program outcomes?
How do student learning and program outcomes connect to and support each other?
How do they contribute to growth and competency in leadership (conceptual and operational descriptions)?

General Question 2: *What are the identified leadership competencies and proficiencies and how do they relate to the program's philosophical and theoretical perspectives?*

Outcomes of a leadership program ought to clearly identify competencies and proficiencies of both leaders and followers. The choice of these competencies and proficiencies will likely be influenced by the theoretical and philosophical frameworks underlying the leadership program. To increase transparency for and accountability toward all stakeholders (particularly students and faculty) these frameworks (see previous sections of these guidelines) as well as their links to the chosen outcomes need to be explicitly named and sufficiently described. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

What competencies and proficiencies of leaders and followers are identified in your program and student learning outcomes?
Are the underlying theoretical and philosophical frameworks explicitly named?
What are they?
How are they linked to the outcomes?

General Question 3: *How do the desired outcomes relate to conceptual, contextual, content and delivery related elements (see previous sections)?*

Outcomes on an institutional, program, and student level need to be linked to the conceptual choices made as well as to the contextual environment of the institution, program, and the students. Furthermore, the courses need to be intentionally designed such that the chosen course content as well as the way of their delivery to the students will most likely lead to a high success rate in achieving the desired outcomes. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

How are your institutional, program, and student learning outcomes linked to the respective contextual environment? (reference Guiding Questions Section 1)
How are your institutional, program, and student learning outcomes linked to the respective conceptual frameworks? (reference Guiding Questions Section 2)
How does the course design process ensure the selection of course content that is supportive of intended learning outcomes and their assessment? (reference Guiding Questions Section 3)
How does the program's approach to teaching and learning ensure that the selected course delivery methods support the student learning and program outcomes? (reference Guiding Questions Section 4)

General Question 4: *How will you know when you have achieved those outcomes? What are your essential indicators? What is the assessment system?*

Accountability and transparency, as required of today's educational programs, call for outcomes assessment. Given the central focus of outcomes—significant results of the program—they should be designed having their assessment in mind. Criteria and indicators of successful achievement (including the level of success) will provide meaningful feedback to the learner as well as to the program and institution. This feedback will allow intervening on an institutional, program, and learner level on a continuous basis. Thus, outcomes and their assessment become integral to the institution, to the program, and to the learning process. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

*Do your outcome descriptions include assessable criteria and indicators of success?
How are these criteria and indicators measured and/or assessed?
How is this assessment meaningfully fed back to students, to the program, and to the institution?
How does the program support the application of the feedback on an institutional, program, and student level?*

General Question 5: *How are the criteria for excellence incorporated into assessment?*

Given that excellence is an intended feature for many educational programs, those areas and characteristics of excellence for the given program need to be clearly spelled out. For the chosen areas and characteristics, the benchmarking process as well as quantitative and qualitative indicators and measures need to be identified. These benchmarking and measuring processes need to be an integral part of the overall assessment system. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

*What are the areas and characteristics of excellence for your program?
What is the benchmarking process for the chosen areas and characteristics?
What are quantitative and qualitative indicators and measures?
How are these benchmarking and measuring processes integrated in your assessment system?*

Specific Questions on the Institutional Level:

How do institutional governance processes use your assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation to inform decisions about your program?

Being embedded in a responsive feedback and program development process as well as in a respective strategy development process will most likely increase the success rate of a leadership education program and of learners enrolled in such a program. Furthermore, implementing such an institutional governance program does indicate that the institution is walking the talk of comprehensive and consistent leadership and governance processes. Feeding back the results of learning outcome assessment and program evaluation into these processes of program and strategy development on an institutional level may play a major

role in ensuring that these processes are based on indicators of learning (and learners') successes and needs. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

What are the feedback and program development processes for your program?
What is the strategy development process for your program?
How is your program embedded in these processes? What are the interfaces? What information flows through these interfaces?
How are the results of learning outcome assessment and program evaluation fed back into these processes?
What indicators of learning (and learners') successes and needs are these processes based on?

What sources external to your institution inform your assessment and evaluation?

Leadership education programs educate for fields of practice and for communities outside of the program and institution. As a consequence, requirements coming from these fields and communities need to be taken into account when describing the intended learning and program outcomes as well as when designing the respective assessment and evaluation system. Furthermore, criteria and indicators of successful application of newly acquired knowledge and skills into practice after returning to or entering into the respective fields or communities may play a significant role for program and strategy development within the educational institution; to allow for this to happen, appropriate mechanisms and indicators of assessment need to be built into program assessment and evaluation. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

What are the relevant fields of practice for your program?
What are the relevant communities outside of the program and institution that your program caters to?
What are the requirements coming from these fields and communities?
How are these taken into account when describing the intended learning and program outcomes?
How are these taken into account when designing the respective assessment and evaluation system?
What are the criteria and indicators of successful application of newly acquired knowledge and skills into practice?
What are the appropriate mechanisms and indicators of assessment?
How are they built into program assessment and evaluation?

Specific Questions on the Program Level:

What conceptual frameworks (see Sections 2 and 4) inform your assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation?

Assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation is built upon conceptual assumptions around values and objectives as well as knowledge and learning. Explicit discussion of those links will allow for informed decision making of the various stakeholders (particularly students and faculty) and for their meaningful input into the processes. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

What are the relevant conceptual assumptions around values and objectives underlying your program's assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation?

What are the relevant conceptual assumptions regarding knowledge and learning underlying your program's assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation?

How does the discussion and development of these connections inform the decision-making processes within your program and institution?

How are students and faculty involved in these decision-making processes around assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation?

How do you incorporate formative assessment and evaluation as a process into your ongoing assessment of outcomes?

This question tries to identify how the existing frameworks around values and objectives as well as knowledge and learning underlying the program do inform formative assessment, what role formative assessment and evaluation do play within the overall assessment processes, and how is it built into these processes. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

How do the existing frameworks around values and objectives inform formative assessment within your program?

What are the values and objectives underlying formative assessment within your program?

How do the existing frameworks around knowledge and learning inform formative assessment within your program?

What are the concepts of knowledge and learning underlying formative assessment within your program?

What role does formative assessment and evaluation play within the overall assessment processes of your program?

How are formative assessment and evaluation built into the overall assessment processes within your program?

What are the fields of practice your program serves (see Guiding Questions Section 1)? How do they influence the design and assessment of your program (outcomes)?

Leadership education programs educate for fields of practice and for communities outside of the program and institution. As a consequence, these fields and communities should significantly inform the design and assessment of the program (outcomes). Clearly naming and describing the chosen focus for the program in terms of the fields and communities that the program is intended to educate for will help the stakeholders to make informed decisions. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

What are the relevant fields of practice for your program?

What are the relevant communities your program caters to outside of the program and institution?

How do these fields of practice and communities inform the design of program outcomes?

How do these fields of practice and communities inform the assessment of program outcomes?

What is the chosen focus for the program in regards to the chosen fields of practice?

What is the chosen focus for the program in regards to the chosen communities?

How does the chosen focus inform the decision-making processes of stakeholders on program design and outcomes assessment within your program?

How do you use the summative and formative assessment of student learning outcomes to inform your evaluation of your program outcomes (organizational learning)?

Assessment of student learning may be an invaluable source of both organizational learning as well as learner centered program development. However, consistent and systematic feedback cycle interface processes need to be in place that facilitate mutual information exchange. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

How does assessment of student learning inform organizational learning within your program and institution?

What feedback cycles are in place?

How does assessment of student learning inform learner centered program development within your program and institution?

What feedback cycles are in place?

What is the evidence of organizational learning at the program level?

Assessment of organizational learning will allow for evaluation of the effectiveness of comprehensive feedback cycles connecting student learning and organizational learning on an institutional level. For example, existing evidence will be a powerful means of attracting both high caliber students and faculty. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

How do you benchmark organizational learning within your program and institution?

How is the effectiveness of organizational learning based on the evaluation of student learning assessed within your program and institution?

What are relevant criteria and indicators within your program and institution?

What evidence is captured within your program and institution for organizational learning in this regard?

How do the chosen outcomes inform the implementation of your program?

Learning outcomes and the various elements of program implementation (e.g., location, space, faculty and staff, delivery modes, etc.) are not separate. They should be intentionally designed to mutually support each other. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

How do the elements of your program (e.g., location, space, faculty and staff, delivery modes, etc.) support the successful achievement of your program's learning outcomes?
How is the implementation of these elements designed within your program and institution?
How does the design of the implementation of these elements ensure that they are supportive of your program's outcomes?

Specific Questions on the Student Level:

How do you assess competency and growth in your students (in other words, what value-added to the student results from participation in your program)?

Student learning should be at the core of educational programs. Student learning can be measured in terms of their competency at any given level as well as of their growth as a result of any given program intervention (e.g., a learning opportunity, a course, a section, etc.). Assessing those two dimensions becomes paramount for meaningful student feedback, for ongoing assessment of learning and teaching effectiveness, and for course and program development. The following questions will help you respond to this particular guiding question:

How does your program measure student competency in regard to your program's and institution's outcomes?
How does your program measure student growth in regard to your program's and institution's outcomes?
How does this assessment happen on a course level?
How does this assessment happen on the level of an individual assignment?
How are the assessments on these various levels connected and integrated?
How is this assessment on these various levels fed back to the students?
How does your program and institution support students in the application of the feedback received?
How is the students' application of this feedback assessed?
How is this feedback applied within program and organizational development?

References

Loacker, G., & Rogers, G. (2005). *Assessment at Alverno College: Student, program, institutional*. Milwaukee, WI: Alverno College Institute.

- Mengel, T. (2008). Outcome-based project management education for emerging leaders – A case study of teaching and learning project management. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26(3), 275–285.
- Mentkowski, M. (2000). *Learning that lasts: Integrating learning, development, and performance in college and beyond* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Renaissance College. (2005). *Learning outcomes guide*. Fredericton, NB: University of New Brunswick.
- Roderick, C., Reeves, V., Zundel, P. E, Bishop, M., Mengel, T., Valk, J., et al. (2006). *Outcomes-based learning at a whole program level: Renaissance College, University of New Brunswick*. Retrieved from Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, Previous recipients of the Alan Blizzard Award:
<http://www.mcmaster.ca/stlhe/awards/2006%20Blizzard%20UNB.pdf>
- Wehlburg, C. (2006). *Meaningful course revision: Enhancing academic engagement using student learning data*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (Eds.). (1999). *Leadership in the making: Impact and insights from leadership development programs in U.S. colleges and universities*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Zundel, P., & Mengel, T. (2007). The University of New Brunswick's Renaissance College: Curricular evolution and assessment at the faculty level. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 112, 69–82.