

**Texas A&M University-Texarkana
Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Final Report
April 2012**

I. Title and Brief Description of the Texas A&M University-Texarkana QEP as Initially Presented

The Texas A&M University-Texarkana (A&M-Texarkana) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for 2006-2015 is entitled **Student Leadership Development Program (SLDP)**.

The genesis of the university’s choice of student leadership development as its QEP was driven by university faculty in response to feedback provided from internal and external stakeholders, including the Texarkana business community. Employers had consistently reported *strong leadership skills* as a desirable qualification of applicants and employees across a broad spectrum of jobs. In an effort to respond to this need, university leadership chose to offer the “value-added” option of student leadership development to undergraduate students, defined as “a firm grounding in personal and interpersonal effectiveness that results from a combination of effective communication, critical thinking, motivation, and teamwork.” The initial mission of the SLDP was: *To enhance the quality of student learning at A&M-Texarkana by offering opportunities to refine personal and professional leadership skills, a derivative of the university’s mission statement that stressed the development of interpersonal skills to enhance work and personal relations and the abilities to think critically and communicate effectively with others.*

After a thorough review of existing curricula that aligned closely with the university’s leadership definition and a student-centered delivery methodology, the *Stephen Covey 7 Habits of Highly Effective People* book designed for college students and instructor’s guide was chosen as the curriculum for the didactic component of the project. A tenure-track faculty member (with 50% release time to serve as the SLDP coordinator/facilitator) assumed primary responsibilities for leadership and management of all aspects of the program, including delivery of the curriculum. The final SACSCOC approved plan was to serve 15-30 undergraduate students (via an application/selection process) per year. The leadership development curriculum was offered via a free non-credit course (LEAD 410), utilizing both electronic and face-to-face delivery modalities. Eligibility requirements for applicants included good standing at the university, being a degree seeker with ≥ 60 semester credit hours, and submission of two letters of reference. All instructional materials were provided to participants free of charge. Participants completing the program would receive a Leadership Certificate, “leadership” designation posted on their academic transcripts, and be recognized as a member of the *Leadership Scholars Society* at commencement.

Table 1 illustrates the sequencing of the didactic and application components, with links to the four QEP goals (as presented in Section II) of the original plan. The cycle was scheduled to continue with a new student cohort each academic year.

Table 1: Timeline for SLDP Component Delivery

| Year | Phase | Component | Goal |
|-------------------|--------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | 1 | Didactic Instruction in Leadership: Study of the Covey Training Habits 1-7 (25 clock hours/10 classes) | 1 & 2 |
| | 2 | Service Learning Project (15 clock hours, minimum) | 3 |
| 2-4 (Optional) | 3 | Independent leadership roles within university, civic, and/or professional environments | 4 |

As indicated in [Table 1](#), the SLDP incorporated three phases, including optional Phase 3 that allowed students to apply leadership skills beyond the formal program.

II. Succinct List of the Initial Goals and Intended Outcomes for the A&M-Texarkana QEP

QEP Goal 1: To provide students with opportunities to develop an understanding of self (personal effectiveness) as an initial step toward successful leadership

Intended Outcome: SLDP participants will demonstrate and report improved personal effectiveness as defined by an increase in self-confidence, time management skills, and goal setting/prioritization (MOTIVATION) and proactive decision making (CRITICAL THINKING).

Measurements:

- 80% of SLDP participants will report an increase of at least .1 Likert scale points on total score of pre/post personal effectiveness inventory. (See *Attachment A* for inventory statements.)
- The average student evaluation rating on respective SLDP courses will be ≥ 4.25 on the overall course and on the focused item(s) related to learning outcome(s).

QEP Goal 2: To provide students with opportunities to develop an understanding of others (interpersonal effectiveness) as a critical step in becoming a successful leader

Intended Outcome: SLDP participants will demonstrate and self-report improved interpersonal effectiveness as defined by resolving a conflict/negotiating a win-win outcome, functioning successfully on a team (TEAMWORK), and communicating effectively (COMMUNICATION).

Measurements:

- 80% of SLDP participants will report an increase of at least .1 Likert scale points on total score of pre/post interpersonal effectiveness inventory. (See *Attachment B* for inventory statements.)
- The average student evaluation ratings on respective SLDP courses will be ≥ 4.25 on the overall course and on the focused item(s) related to learning outcome(s).

QEP Goal 3: To provide students with opportunities to apply effective leadership skills (as related to personal and interpersonal effectiveness) in a mentored, quasi-real world environment

Intended Outcome: SLDP participants will successfully apply personal and interpersonal effectiveness via a service learning project within the greater Texarkana community.

Measurement:

- 80% of SLDP participants will earn an overall rubric rating of ≥ 80 (out of a possible 100) on Service Learning Project Portfolio/Presentations. (See *Attachment C* for rubric.)

QEP Goal 4: To provide students with opportunities and encouragement to continue practicing/applying effective leadership skills

Intended Outcome: SLDP participants will accept new and/or continue existing leadership roles within the university and/or university-community environment(s).

Measurements:

- 20% of SLDP participants will serve as a university club/association officer during the semester of, or post SLDP participation, based on university reports.
- 20% of SLDP participants will successfully complete a university practicum or internship course during the semester of, or post SLDP participation, based on enrollment and grade reports.
- The average student evaluation rating on internship and practicum courses will be ≥ 4.25 on the overall course and on the focused item(s) related to learning outcome(s).

III. Discussion of Significant Changes Made to the A&M-Texarkana QEP and the Reasons for Making Those Changes

2006-07: During the summer before the 2006-07 academic year, the SLDP coordinator received training and was certified by Franklin Covey, Inc., to deliver the Covey 7 Habits program on campus. Via an application process, 12 students were accepted into the first cohort in the fall of 2006, with 11 students completing the Covey training and related service learning project to complete Phases 1 and 2. Although not included in the outcome measures presented in Section I of this report, reflective journals were kept by all participants to document new learnings and experiences related to leadership. All participants were encouraged to continue their service learning projects into the spring 2007 semester and/or engage in leadership roles within the university. Data from pre- and post-inventories and course evaluations, as well as participants' oral presentations of their service learning experiences and learning outcomes to the SLDP board, fellow students, and guests documented improvement in personal effectiveness and greater improvement in interpersonal effectiveness subsequent to the didactic and application components. (See Section IV for details.) SLDP leadership made the following program changes for 2007-08:

1. *Delivered Phase 1 (didactic instruction) during the fall semester and Phase 2 during the spring semester.* Participants indicated on the course evaluation that they felt the entire fall semester was needed for mastery of the leadership concepts (Phase 1) and that the spring semester was needed to explore, choose, and complete the service learning component (Phase 2).
2. *Utilized the WebCT component as a supplement rather than substitute for face-to-face instruction.* Students wanted more in depth discussions of leadership concepts.
3. *Provided Covey training to a "back-up" faculty or administrator who can co-teach or substitute for the SLDP coordinator when necessary.* Personal or business related absences of the SLDP coordinator resulted in a few minor postponements in delivery of the program as planned.

2007-08: At the beginning of the second year of implementation, the Director of Graduate Studies and Research became the second in-house Covey trainer and assisted the SLDP coordinator in implementing the modified program as per the above recommendations. Offering Phase 1 (didactic instruction) and Phase 2 (the service learning component) over both long semesters was perceived by both instructors and the 15 participants to provide additional time for mastery learning of the personal and interpersonal effectiveness (leadership) concepts as well as an opportunity to add depth and breadth to the service learning project. During the planning stage for the service learning project, the participants recommended conducting team projects (with three to four participants each) instead of individual projects as originally planned, utilizing one of the interpersonal effectiveness outcomes (i.e., successfully working on a team). This programmatic change was assessed by the participants and SLDP coordinator as an improvement. Results of the intended outcomes related to Phase 1 were satisfactory. (See Section IV for details.) SLDP leadership made the following program changes for 2008-09:

1. *Used former SLDP participants as mentors for future program participants, and if at all possible provide a financial stipend for this service.* Both participants and the SLDP coordinator felt that pairing each current participant with a former participant was a value-added program element in that it would provide additional opportunities for one-on-one reflection and discussion of leadership concepts and overall guidance.
2. *Engaged the Student Activities department personnel in encouraging SLDP participants to become actively involved in club and association leadership roles.*
3. *Expanded the SLDP program opportunities to serve additional students.* With 2010-11 downward expansion to serve lower division students on the horizon, the SLDP leadership felt strongly that Phase 1 of the program should be offered to most if not all freshmen and sophomore students.
4. *Expanded the content of the SLDP beyond the Covey curriculum.* Although participants and SLDP leadership regarded the Covey curriculum highly, the consensus was that the curriculum needed to be expanded.

5. *Targeted elected student club leaders/officers as SLDP applicants/participants.* Doing so would promote an increase in the applicant pool and target students who have already been identified as leaders and likely to be interested in and benefit from the program.

2008-09: The third year of the SLDP became the first of a three-year major transformation of the SLDP. The prior-year design was continued, with 15 students accepted into and completing the program, demonstrating positive knowledge and skill growth in personal and interpersonal effectiveness through Phases 1-2 of the program. The number of SLDP participants who elected to participate in Phase 3 increased over the previous year. (See Section IV for details.) Five mentors (prior participants) were selected and paid a \$500 stipend each to work with small groups of four to five current participants. Furthermore, the inclusion of two student club/association officers provided internal role models to the other participants. Concurrent with program delivery, university leadership began to explore implementation of recommendations #2 and #3 above. Several persons in top leadership roles (e.g., Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services, Coordinator of First Year Experience) attended a national First Year Experience conference in Florida to investigate current and best practice in lower-division student leadership development. Attainment of intended outcomes was relatively consistent with prior years. A slight increase in Phase 3 participation was noted. (See Section IV for details.) SLDP leadership made the following program changes for 2009-10:

1. *Expanded the number of practicum, internship, and discipline-specific leadership courses to the inventory as either required or elective courses.* As more SLDP participants choose to pursue the optional Phase 3 of the SLDP, the need for formal leadership study and application courses increased.
2. *Replaced the Covey curriculum with The Student Leadership Challenge (Kouzes and Posner) book and learning materials for Phase 1 (the didactic component) of the program, using the Covey materials as supplemental.* The SLDP leadership team determined that the proposed new curriculum provided a broader approach to student leadership development while providing adequate alignment to the learning outcomes expressed in Goals 1 and 2 of the original plan (i.e., improvement in personal and interpersonal effectiveness).
3. *Expanded opportunities for more students (particularly freshmen and sophomore students at downward expansion) to participate in the SLDP.* By the end of the 2008-09 academic year, the new university president was in the process of leading a revision of the institution's mission statement and strategic plan (in preparation for downward expansion in 2010-11), both reflecting student leadership as a focus and opportunity for all students.

2009-10: 2009-10 proved to be a transition year for the A&M-Texarkana SLDP. In preparation for the participation of a larger number of students at downward expansion in fall 2010, offering the Covey version of the SLDP was discontinued. In fall 2009, efforts were focused on creating a new course (LEAD 400) based on the *The Student Leadership Challenge* curriculum for implementation as a pilot in spring 2010 and full implementation in fall 2010. Seven students volunteered to enroll in the course, and feedback from the instructor and results of student learning validated alignment between the course content and program intended outcomes. The pilot did not include the service learning project. (See Section IV for evaluation details.) In early spring, the SLDP was moved under the management of a new institution unit, a University College (UC), created to address the needs of freshmen and sophomore students. SLDP leadership made the following program changes for 2010-11:

1. *Recreated LEAD 400 as LEAD 1101 Foundations for Leadership and LEAD1201 Leadership Challenge as new for-credit/tuition-based required courses. Acquire internal faculty and administrative approval for the new courses.* The course numbering change was in response to the decision to follow the Lower Division Academic Course Guide Manual (Texas) course title and numbering approach for all lower division courses. The decision to charge tuition was based on the need to generate revenue to support delivery of the SLDP.

2. *Included LEAD 1101 and LEAD 1201 as required general education (core curriculum) courses for all undergraduate students.* This action would increase the number of students participating in the SLDP while not requiring additional semester credit hour (SCH) requirements in all undergraduate degrees.

2010-11: A matured and expanded SLDP was launched as the university expanded downward in fall 2010. Over the academic year, 19 sections of LEAD 1101 were taught to 325 students, and 14 sections of LEAD 1201 were taught to 169 students. Instructors included full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff—all of whom received pre- and in-service training in course content and delivery. During the fall semester, slight modifications were made to the standard course syllabus for both courses, subsequent to feedback from instructors and students. Most of the revisions were related to calibrating the assignments to intended student learning outcomes. LEAD 1101 (a pre-requisite for LEAD 1201) focused on the *personal* effectiveness learning outcomes (in addition to general university orientation content), and LEAD 1201 concentrated on knowledge and application of the *interpersonal* effectiveness outcomes. In support of Phase 3, five new practicum and internship courses and five discipline specific leadership courses were added to the inventory, providing even greater opportunity for SLDP participants, as well as other students, to experience additional leadership development opportunities. To expand the leadership development opportunities for students, the university offered two institution-wide leadership events: In fall 2010, Peter Bergen, a leader in international journalism, spoke to the student body, faculty, and guests regarding his leadership experiences in Afghanistan. SLDP students engaged in one-on-one conversations with Mr. Bergen. In spring 2011, the university sponsored the first annual “Leadership Forum,” in which SLDP participants and other student leaders participated in a moderated conversation with Texarkana native Ross Perot regarding leadership characteristics.

The overall measurement of learning outcomes in the fifth year of SLDP implementation revealed mixed results. (See Section IV for details.) Including the leadership courses in the core curriculum created a challenge for non-core (curriculum) complete upper division transfers who were required to take courses developed for freshmen and sophomores. SLDP leadership made the following program changes for 2011-12:

1. *Eliminated LEAD 1101 and LEAD 1201 as required general education (core curriculum) courses*
2. *Combined the personal effectiveness curriculum (formerly taught in LEAD 1101) with the interpersonal effectiveness curriculum (formerly taught in LEAD 1201) and embedded into a new general education (core curriculum) course.*

IV. Description of the A&M-Texarkana’s QEP Direct Impact on Student Learning, Including the Achievement of Goals and Outcomes and Unanticipated Outcomes of the QEP, if any.

An overview of student participation and the university’s financial support for the SLDP is presented in Table 2:

Table 2: SLDP Participants and Program Financial Support

| Variable | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | TOTAL |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Total Participants | 11 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 325 | 373 |
| Budget Allocation | \$73,118 | \$38,865 | \$38,865 | \$63,609 | \$125,874 | \$340,331 |

As indicated in Table 2, the number of students served in the QEP during the five-year period ranged from 7 to 325, with the number of participants increasing exponentially in 2010-11 when the delivery changed from an optional non-credit to a required for-credit course. The five-year budget allocation for the program was \$340,331, averaging approximately \$912 per participant.

Detailed results related to the four program goals and nested intended outcomes are presented in Tables 3-10, with interpretative comments following each.

Goal 1: Acquisition of Personal Effectiveness

Results of the SLDP participants' growth in personal effectiveness are presented in Tables 3, 4, and 7. Table 3 illustrates growth as measured by a locally developed self-inventory of 11 items:

Table 3: Summary of SLDP Participant Personal Effectiveness Pre- and Post-Inventory Results

| Personal Effectiveness | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | AVE.^ |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|
| Post-Inventory *Summary Rating | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Pre-Inventory *Summary Rating | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.6 |
| Pre- to Post- Change | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| <i>*Average rating of 11 statements of personal effectiveness on a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive)</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>^Calculated on individual ratings</i> | | | | | | |

As indicated in Table 3, over the five-year period, the average participant self-reported change in personal effectiveness ranged from a low of .01 in 2008-09 to a high of 1.0 in 2010-11. The average growth over the five-year period was .9. A review of these data from the perspective of the number and percentage of participants that achieved the intended outcome ($\geq .1$) is provided in Table 4:

Table 4: Individual SLDP Participant Personal Effectiveness Pre- and Post-Inventory Results

| Variable | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11* | TOTAL |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|------------|
| Total Number of Participants | 11 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 325 | 373 |
| Number of Participants with Pre-Post Inventory of $\geq .1$ | 9 | 14 | 12 | 6 | 261 | 302 |
| Percentage of Participants with Pre-Post Inventory of $\geq .1$ | 82% | 93% | 80% | 86% | 80% | 81% |
| <i>*In 2010-11, the didactic components of personal and interpersonal effectiveness were taught in two separate courses--LEAD 1101 and LEAD 1201, respectively. All 325 SLDP participants enrolled in LEAD 1101, a pre-requisite to LEAD 1201.</i> | | | | | | |

As indicated in Table 4, the percentage of participants that achieved the intended outcome of $\geq .1$ in personal effectiveness growth ranged from a low of 80% in 2008-09 and 2010-11 to the high of 93% in 2007-08, all at or above the 80% target. The five-year average of 81% exceeded the 80% target.

Goal 2: Acquisition of Interpersonal Effectiveness

Results of the SLDP participants' growth in interpersonal effectiveness are presented in Tables 5, 6, and 7. Table 5 illustrates growth as measured by a locally developed self-inventory of nine items:

Table 5: Summary of SLDP Participant Interpersonal Effectiveness Pre- and Post-Inventory Results

| Personal Effectiveness | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11* | AVE. |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|------------|
| Post-Inventory ^Summary Rating | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| Pre-Inventory ^Summary Rating | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Pre- to Post- Change | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| <i>^Average rating of 9 statements related to interpersonal effectiveness</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>*In 2010-11, the didactic components of personal and interpersonal effectiveness were taught in two separate courses--LEAD 1101 and LEAD 1201, respectively. Only 169 SLDP participants enrolled in LEAD 1201.</i> | | | | | | |

As indicated in [Table 5](#), over the five-year period, the participant self-reported change in interpersonal effectiveness ranged from a low of .4 in 2007-08 to a high of .8 in 2010-11. The average growth over the five-year period was .7. A review of these data from the perspective of the number and percentage of participants that achieved the intended outcome ($\geq .1$) is provided in [Table 6](#):

Table 6: Individual SLDP Participant Interpersonal Effectiveness Pre- and Post-Inventory Results

| Variable | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11* | TOTAL |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|------------|
| Total Number of Participants | 11 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 169 | 217 |
| Number of Participants with Pre-Post Inventory of $\geq .1$ | 11 | 14 | 13 | 7 | 142 | 187 |
| Percentage of Participants with Pre-Post Inventory of $\geq .1$ | 100% | 93% | 87% | 100% | 84% | 86% |
| <i>*In 2010-11, the didactic components of personal and interpersonal effectiveness were taught in two separate courses--LEAD 1101 and LEAD 1201, respectively. Only 169 SLDP participants enrolled in LEAD 1201.</i> | | | | | | |

As indicated in [Table 6](#), the percentage of participants that achieved the intended outcome of $\geq .1$ in interpersonal effectiveness growth ranged from a low of 84% in 2010-11 to the high of 100% in 2006-07, and 2009-10, all exceeding the 80% target. The five-year average of 86% also exceeded the 80% target.

Perceived growth in personal and interpersonal effectiveness was also measured by participants' evaluation of the quality of the courses in which the didactic instruction was provided. [Table 7](#) provides a summary of the results:

Table 7: Average SLDP Participant Evaluation Ratings of SLDP Courses

| Student Evaluation Rating* | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | | AVE.^ | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| | LEAD 410 | LEAD 410 | LEAD 410 | LEAD 400 | LEAD 1101 | LEAD 1201 | Per. | Inter. |
| Course Average | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 4.1 |
| Focused Item: This course has improved my knowledge and skills [in personal and interpersonal effectiveness]. | 4.2 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 4.0 |
| <i>*Scale of 1 (Negative) to 5 (Positive)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| <i>^Calculated on individual scores</i> | | | | | | | | |
| <i>*In 2010-11, the didactic components of personal and interpersonal effectiveness were taught in two separate courses--LEAD 1101 and LEAD 1201, respectively. Therefore the averages for the two courses are presented.</i> | | | | | | | | |

As indicated in [Table 7](#), the overall ratings for the respective SLDP course taught in each of the five-years ranged from a low of 3.9 in 2009-10 (pilot year) to a high of 4.6 in 2010-11, with three of the five years reaching the intended goal of ≥ 4.25 . Ratings on the specific item within the course evaluation protocol that addressed the level of mastery of the course learning objectives ranged from a low of 3.9 in 2010-11 to a high of 4.7 in 2007-08. The five-year course and focused item averages for personal effectiveness were both above ≥ 4.25 .

Goal 3: Application of Personal and Interpersonal Effectiveness

Results of the quality of SLDP participants' service learning projects demonstrating their successful application of personal and interpersonal effectiveness in a supported environment are provided in [Table](#)

8: These data are based on the application of a locally developed 4 X 4 rubric to assess the overall service learning project.

Table 8: SLDP Participant Quality Rubric Ratings of Applied Leadership Skills (Service Learning Project Portfolio/Presentation)

| Variable | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10~ | 2010-11^ | TOTAL |
|--|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|------------|
| Total Number of Participants | 11 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 169 | 217 |
| Number of Participants with Rubric Rating of ≥80* | 9 | 13 | 12 | ~NA | 141 | 175 |
| Percentage of Participants with Rubric Rating of ≥80* | 82% | 87% | 80% | ~NA | 83% | 81% |
| <i>*Out of a possible 100 points</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>~The service learning project was not included in the pilot.</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>^In 2010-11, the didactic components of personal and interpersonal effectiveness were taught in two separate courses--LEAD 1101 and LEAD 1201, respectively. Only 169 SLDP participants enrolled in LEAD 1201 that included the service learning project.</i> | | | | | | |

As indicated in Table 8, the percentage of students achieving the intended outcome rubric rating of ≥80 ranged from a low of 80% in 2008-09 to a high of 87% in 2007-08. Percentages for the four applicable years equaled or surpassed the target, as did the four-year average of 81%.

Goal 4: Sustained Application of Personal and Interpersonal Effectiveness

The results of Phase 3 of the SLDP, the optional component in which participants were given opportunities and encouragement to continue application of improved personal and interpersonal effectiveness in university and community settings, are provided in Tables 9 and 10:

Table 9: SLDP Participants in University and/or University-Community Leadership Roles

| Environment | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | TOTAL | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-------------|
| | | | | | | # | % |
| *University | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 23 | 6.2% |
| ^University-Community | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 3.5% |
| <i>*University club/association officer/special leadership group</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>^Enrolled in a university practicum or internship course</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Note: Unduplicated counts in each category; participants counted only once each in University and University-Community, but could be counted in both.</i> | | | | | | | |

As indicated in Table 9, only 6.2% of the total number of SLDP participants participated in optional Phase 3 activities that involved assuming leadership roles within the university. Only 3.5% enrolled in a practicum or internship course. These numbers fall well below the original intended outcome of 20%. However, when the 2010-11 data are removed, the percentages become 17% and 19% respectively, closer to the 20% target. Removing the 2010-11 data in this calculation has logical merit since all of the 2010-11 SLDP participants were new to the university, and most of them were freshmen and sophomores. New students are less likely to assume leadership roles within the university, and lower division students would unlikely be enrolled in practicum and internship courses.

Perceived growth in the application of personal and interpersonal effectiveness in a leadership context was measured by participants' evaluation of the quality of their respective practicum and internship courses. Table 10 provides a summary of the results:

Table 10: SLDP Participant Evaluation Ratings of Practicum and Internship Courses

| Student Evaluation Rating* | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | AVE. |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Overall Course | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.4 |
| Focused Item: This course has improved my knowledge and skills [in personal and interpersonal effectiveness] | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 4.3 |
| <i>*Scale of 1 (Negative) to 5 (Positive)</i> | | | | | | |

As indicated in Table 10, the SLDP participants' ratings for their practicum and/or internship courses in each of the five years ranged from a low of 3.97 in 2008-09 to a high of 4.7 in 2010-11, with four of the five years reaching the intended goal of ≥ 4.25 . Ratings on the specific item within the course evaluation protocol that addressed the level of mastery of the course learning objectives tended to be slightly lower in four of the five years, with three of the annual ratings exceeding the intended outcome of ≥ 4.25 . However, the five-year course and focused item averages were both above the target.

V. Summary

Five-year implementation results of the Student Leadership Development Program, A&M-Texarkana's QEP, were mixed, but generally positive. Five-year intended outcome targets were achieved on five of the eight measures. Growth in interpersonal effectiveness, based on inventory results surpassed the ≥ 1 target, but was inconsistent with course evaluations that fell short of the ≥ 4.25 target. This could be the result of lack of calibration between the two standards. The greatest disappointment was the lack of participation in Phase 3, the application of personal and interpersonal effectiveness in a more independent environment. However, university leadership understands the challenges associated with convincing students to accept responsibilities beyond those required in an already rigorous academic environment but anticipates that the 2010-11 participants will be more likely to pursue this option as they become upperclassmen. The peripheral benefits of the QEP accrued by the participating faculty and students (e.g., guest speakers on leadership, portfolio development, curriculum expansion, mentoring, use of technology as a teaching tool) certainly added value to the overall experience and have become an integral part of the SLDP, as it continues to evolve.

Implementation of the SLDP itself was an excellent example of the "plan, do, study, act" cycle, as personnel closely involved in the project created a climate that supported continuous formative assessment. Each lesson led to programmatic improvements for which the students and community benefited. Qualitative and quantitative feedback from a variety of sources was considered and analyzed to refine the process, increase the program richness for students, and promote attainment of intended learning outcomes.

Attachment A
SLDP Participant Inventory of Personal Effectiveness

(Students were asked to respond on a scale of 1 [Strongly Disagree] to 5 [Strongly Agree] to each item.)

1. I focus my efforts on the things I can change rather than on the things beyond my control.
2. I take responsibility for my moods rather than blame others and circumstances.
3. I know what I want to accomplish in my life.
4. I organize and prepare in a way to avoid working in a crisis mode.
5. I begin each week with a clear plan for what I desire to accomplish.
6. I am disciplined in carrying out plans and avoid procrastination.
7. I do not allow the truly important activities of my life to get lost in my busy schedule.
8. The things I do every day are meaningful and contribute to my overall goals in life.
9. I care about the success of others as well as my own.
10. I cooperate with others.
11. When solving conflicts, I strive to find solutions that benefit everyone.

Attachment B
SLDP Participant Inventory of Interpersonal Effectiveness

(Students were asked to respond on a scale of 1 [Strongly Disagree] to 5 [Strongly Agree] to each item.)

1. I am sensitive to the feelings of others.
2. I seek to understand the viewpoints of others.
3. I try to see things from the other person's point of view, not just my own.
4. I value and seek out the insights of others.
5. I encourage others to express their opinions.
6. I strive to build and improve relationships.
7. I care for my physical health and well-being.
8. I take time to find meaning and enjoyment in life.
9. I express my appreciation for the contributions others make the quality of my personal and professional life.

Attachment C
LEAD 1201 Student Leadership Challenge
Group Project Rubric-Final Report Submission

| Criteria | Exceeds Expectations (25 pts) | Meets Expectations (17 pts) | Approaches Expectations (10 pts) | Unacceptable (0 pts) | TOTAL |
|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Meets a community need or improves the quality of life of others | Group determined actual need; researched/ interviewed agency staff or volunteers | Group relied on local media to research community need | Group guessed at what service to provide the community | Project was a consideration of only student needs or desires | |
| Underpins service to the community at a high level of critical thinking | Complex thinking/reasoning as related to project | Some overview and developed thinking and reasoning as related to project | Understands some factors important as related to project | Unclear or poor thought-out factors as related to project | |
| Develops idea of caring for the | Report shows affective growth | Report shows generic growth | Report is restricted to pros and cons of | Report is limited to self-centered | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| identified community in report | regarding self in community and importance of service | regarding importance of community service | particular service project regarding community | pros and cons of service project | |
| Submits final written report | Report is free from grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling errors | Report has minor (1-2) errors related to grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling | Report has errors (3-5) related to grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling | Report has more than 5 errors related to grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling | |
| TOTAL | | | | | /100 points |