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Purpose
The Leadership Program was established at Andrews University in 1994 as a non-traditional, competency-based, adult-oriented doctoral program. The purpose of this case study was to relate the story of the creation and development of the Leadership Program from 1994 through 2002 by examining the concepts incorporated into the program and the experiences of participants, faculty, and staff involved in the program during those years.

Method
Using a case-study approach, I have examined the conceptual development and procedural evolution of the Leadership Program at Andrews University from 1994 through 2002; that is, from the year of the program’s
inception through the latest cohort-year of the participants whom I interviewed. In order to provide a comprehensive account, I used (a) program documents and artifacts, (b) interviews with participants, faculty, and staff, and (c) personal experience. Forty Leadership Program participants representing each of the annual cohorts from 1994 through 2002 and 12 full-time faculty and staff members who served the program during those years responded to semi-structured interview questions. They addressed such program elements as the orientation, the Individual Development Plan, the annual conferences, regional study-groups, and the dissertation. Participants responded to 30 questions; faculty- and staff-members, to 20. No respondent made any attempt to influence the conclusions of this study.

Results

This study generated an extensive amount of data that indicated that the Leadership Program at Andrews University was able, to varying degrees, to fulfill the claims described in promotional material. The majority of the respondents perceived that individualized instruction, collaboration, one-on-one interaction, competency-based rather than course driven curriculum and quality of the faculty were positive aspects of the program. At the two extremes, the data suggested that the program fulfilled the expectations, as stated in the design, of some respondents but not for others. Responses fell along a continuum from very satisfied to very unsatisfied. In general, respondents who were self-directed and self-motivated reported that they were satisfied with and benefited from the program. Respondents who preferred more direction, however, reported that
they often were frustrated. Faculty and staff respondents expressed similar views of the program.

Conclusions

The Leadership Program at Andrews University was created and implemented in 1994. By 2002, oversights and omissions had become apparent and a number of changes seem to have restricted some of the participant-driven aspects of the program. Generally, however, the Leadership Program appears to have been well-designed and well-received, and according to participants, faculty, and staff alike, the resulting experiences and outcomes were positive demonstrations of higher education in general and appropriate experiences for adult learners in particular. The Leadership Program, as originally designed, may serve as a model for other higher-education institutions.
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INTRODUCTION

Program Context

In February 1994, the Andrews University School of Education faced the challenge of having to cut from its budget $164,000, the amount equal to the cost of three full-time faculty members (Minutes, Meeting of the School of Education Faculty, February 3, 1994). In search of a solution, the dean of the school appointed an ad hoc committee to consider the problem.

How is such a problem typically managed? According to Annette Kolodny (1998), the majority of higher-education institutions are likely to compensate for budget cuts by dissolving programs, cutting staff and faculty, and eliminating services. Few if any institutions, she notes, implement new ways in which to deliver education as a way of meeting expenses. The ad hoc committee at Andrews University, however, did just that: They recommended increasing revenue by creating a non-traditional doctoral program. The result was the Leadership Program, or, simply, Leadership.

In 1997, four years after the establishment of the Leadership Program, Eugene Sullivan, David W. Stewart, and Henry A. Spille published *External Degrees in the Information Age: Legitimate Choices*. Their inventory of 139 non-traditional college and university programs seems to be the only work of its
kind—one that provides data about non-traditional higher-education programs at about the time of the inception of Leadership.

*External Degrees* (Sullivan et al., 1997) reports the responses from two sources. The first source is the compilation of institutions listed in Sullivan’s earlier book about learning programs or adults, *The Adult Learner’s Guide to Alternative and External Degree Programs* (1993). The second is “other external degree programs that became known through sources such as references in magazine articles and education journals” (Sullivan et al., 1997, p. 40). Most of the data “were collected in 1996, and the information is based on programs offered in the 1995–96 academic year . . . [and is assumed to be] factual and accurate” (Sullivan et al., 1997, p. 40). According to that information, in the 1995–1996 academic year, 62 programs offered undergraduate external degrees in the following combinations: associate degree only, 20; bachelor’s degree only, 29; associate and bachelor’s degrees, 13. Sixty-six programs offered master’s degrees in the following combinations: master’s degree only, 30; bachelor’s and master’s degrees, 10; associate’s, bachelor’s, and master’s degrees, 7; and master’s degrees and doctorate, 8. Ten programs offered doctorates only, and 1 program offered a professional degree. It is noteworthy that of the 139 non-traditional programs, only 18 were at the doctoral level.

Co-authors John W. Harris, William E. Troutt, and Grover J. Andrews (1980) contend, “Nothing suggests that the Ph.D. should be uniquely reserved for traditional institutions and programs” (p. 57). In other words, there is no reason why doctoral education cannot and should not be non-traditionally designed and delivered. Indeed, in 1983, in its *Handbook of Accreditation*, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education endorses—even encourages—the
development of such programs as “innovative and imaginative approaches to providing quality education” (as cited in Sullivan et al., 1997, p. 39). The Leadership Program at Andrews University was, then, timely as well as innovative.

**Purpose of the Study**

This is a case study of the creation and development of the Andrews University graduate program in Leadership from 1994 through 2002; that is, from the year of the program’s inception through the latest cohort-year of the participants whom I interviewed. Indeed, this document is a *historical organizational case study*, the term that Robert C. Bogdan and Sari Knopp Biklen (2003) use to describe a document that “[traces] the historical development of an organization or a certain innovation” (as cited in Wiersma & Jurs, 2005, p. 210).

The purpose of this case study was to relate the story of the creation and development of the Leadership Program from 1994 through 2002 by examining the concepts incorporated into the program and the experiences of participants, faculty, and staff involved in the program during those years.

**Significance of the Study**

The orientation for the initial cohort of the Leadership Program at Andrews University took place in September 1994. Data collected from 1996 (Sullivan, 1993) and for the 1995–1996 academic year (Sullivan et al., 1997) indicate that only 18 of 139 non-traditional post-secondary degree programs were at the doctoral level. The researchers provided no explanation for the relative lack of non-traditional doctoral programs, however. In addition, their reports do not include the reasons for the establishment of the programs that did
exist. My study of the Leadership Program relates the reason for the creation and development of the program through documentation, interviews with 40 participants and 12 full-time faculty and staff members, and my own involvement as a participant-observer. No respondent made any attempt to influence the conclusions of this study.

The Leadership Program at Andrews University has demonstrated an innovative way in which to deliver graduate education specifically to an adult population (Andrews University, 1996a, 1996b). Additionally, the practical design of the program is also a lucrative one, providing needed revenue for the University. The concepts embodied in the program, as well as the experiences of participants, faculty, and staff, could serve as guidelines for the development of other non-traditional graduate programs at Andrews University as well as at other institutions of higher learning.

**Research Design**

Of the two research platforms—quantitative and qualitative—qualitative research is the better fit for this study. To reiterate, the purpose of the study is to relate the story of the creation and development of the Leadership Program from 1994 through 2002 by examining the concepts incorporated into the program and the experiences of participants, faculty, and staff involved in the program from 1994 through 2002. As a result, the study is, in William W. Wiersma and Stephen G. Jurs’s (2005) terms, field-focused; uses the self as an instrument; considers the why and how of the data, not just the what; uses expressive language; incorporates the details of situations and people; and uses a variety of sources.
First, documents and relics, such as minutes of meetings, promotional material, and conference keepsakes, serve as tangible representations of the creation and design of the program. Second, oral testimonies, in the form of interviews with 12 full-time faculty and staff members, relate why and how the program was designed and implemented. Interviews with 40 students provide information about the degree to which the program has met the expectations and fulfilled the needs of the program participants. Third, I was the first graduate assistant for the program as well as a member of the initial cohort, making me what Harry F. Wolcott (1988) designates as an “active participant” (p. 194).

Note: Although I used several other sources, in addition to Wolcott, I relied primarily on the expertise of two other leaders in qualitative research: Elliott W. Eisner and James P. Spradley. A great deal of redundancy occurs among the many individuals who write about conducting and reporting qualitative research. Wolcott, Eisner, and Spradley, however, come from professionally divergent backgrounds. As a result, I believe, their perspectives are complementary. Wolcott combined his background in anthropology with his career as an educator in order to conduct qualitative inquiries that serve as valuable examples of participant-observation. Eisner turned his artistic eye to the subject of critical inquiry as a means of enhancing educational practice. And Spradley used his training as an anthropologist to introduce undergraduate students to that subject and, in the process, developed a systematic approach to conducting and analyzing ethnographic interviews.
Organization of the Study

The chapters in this dissertation are arranged as follows:

Chapter 1, “Introduction,” begins with a statement about the financial dilemma that the Andrews University School of Education faced in 1994. Data from a study of non-traditional graduate programs that existed during the 1995–1996 academic year supply general contextual information. The chapter continues with sections describing the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, and the research design.

Chapter 2, “Crisis as a Catalyst for Change: Why and How a Program Is Created,” contains a description of why and how the Leadership Program at Andrews University was established. Using the minutes of School of Education faculty and special-committee meetings as well as comments from the faculty members who created the program, the chapter traces Leadership from conception to implementation. Details recorded in the minutes and in faculty interviews are supplemented with my own recollections.

Chapter 3, “Qualitative Research and This Study,” contains a discussion of why a qualitative approach was, for my purposes, the better choice for this study.

Chapter 4, “Research Procedure,” describes how I used three sources of information—program and artifacts, interviews and artifacts, and personal experience in order to provide a comprehensive picture of the creation, implementation, and early development of the Leadership Program.

Chapters 5 through 10 contain analyses of participant responses to 30 open-ended interview questions. Forty participants responded to the questions,
generating a wealth of data. I organized the responses into six major categories, which are reflected in the chapter titles.

Chapter 5, “Participant Interviews, Part 1: Attraction, Preparation, and Satisfaction,” contains an analysis of the following six questions or groups of questions: (a) How did you find out about the Leadership Program? (b) What made you decide to apply? (c) Did the fact that the Leadership Program is based in a Christian institution have an influence on your decision? (d) How well did the orientation make you aware of the general requirements of the Leadership Program? What aspects were valuable? What aspects could be improved? (e) Did you realize how much self-direction and self-motivation you were expected to have? (f) Would you recommend the Leadership Program to someone else? Why or why not?

Chapter 6, “Participant Interviews, Part 2: The Leadership Program in Practice,” contains an analysis of the following five questions or groups of questions: (a) Was drafting the Individual Development Plan (I.D.P.) a difficult task? How did you approach the activity? (b) Did you make revisions to your original I.D.P.? (c) How well have you been able to take advantage of the job-embedded aspect of the Leadership Program? (d) Of the six major competencies, which one has been the most useful, or most valuable, for you to develop? Which one has been the least useful, or least valuable, for you to develop? (e) List the types of physical evidence that you are using—or, if you are done, have used—to demonstrate competency?

Chapter 7, “Participant Interviews, Part 3: Social-learning Aspects of the Leadership Program,” contains an analysis of the following three questions or groups of questions: (a) Discuss your regional group. Did it function well? Why
or why not? (b) Discuss the Roundtables (annual conferences). Have they been valuable experiences? Why or why not? (c) How much have you relied on e-mail and the Internet in the Leadership Program?

Chapter 8, “Participant Interviews, Part 4: Philosophical Matters,” contains an analysis of the following four questions or groups of questions: (a) What does “leadership” mean to you? (b) Have you heard the term “tolerance for ambiguity” in reference to the Leadership Program? If so, what does it mean to you? (c) The Leadership Program demands that its participants have a strong theoretical foundation to support its practical application. How has that requirement affected you? (d) How have you changed with regard to attitude, habits, or both as a result of the Leadership Program?

Chapter 9, “Participant Interviews, Part 5: Faculty Relationships,” contains an analysis of the following six questions or groups of questions: (a) Do you believe that the faculty functions as a team? (b) Do you believe that all faculty members operate in ways that are true to the philosophy of the Leadership Program as it is described in printed and website promotional material? (c) The Leadership Program makes the claim that it is participant-driven. In your experience, does this seem to be the case? Why or why not? (d) Do you believe that a partnership exists to the extent that the faculty and students are equal participants in the Leadership Program? (e) Have you gotten the faculty support that you’ve needed? (f) If you could ask the faculty one question—without fear of reprisal—what would it be?

Chapter 10, “Participant Interviews, Part 6: The Program in Retrospect,” contains an analysis of the following five questions or groups of questions: (a) The Leadership Program is sometimes alleged to be less rigorous than a
traditional doctoral program. Please comment on that allegation (b) Which was the most difficult to complete—the dissertation or the portfolio? (c) Discuss the final paper. For example, was the nature of the paper a surprise? Did you find doing it a valuable experience? (d) Did you set a deadline for completing the Leadership Program? (e) Discuss some pros and cons about your experience in the Leadership Program. For example, did you experience any surprise—positive or negative?

Chapters 11 and 12 contain analyses of faculty and staff responses to 20 open-ended interview questions. Twelve former and current full-time faculty and staff members responded to the questions. As with the analyses of participant responses, I organized the responses into major categories—in this case three—which are reflected in the chapter titles. I submitted two additional questions to the charter faculty about the establishment of the program. Their responses echoed the information that I already had cited from other documentation, primarily minutes of meetings. As a result, I did not incorporate their responses into Chapter 12. The text of their responses is, however, available in Notebook 2: Faculty Interviews.

Chapter 11, “Faculty and Staff Interviews, Part 1: Faculty Issues,” is comprised of the first of three major categories. The chapter contains an analysis of the following 10 questions: (a) How were you approached about joining the Leadership faculty? (b) What attracted you to the Leadership Program? (c) As a Leadership faculty member, have your expectations been met? (d) What faculty changes have occurred since you joined the Leadership Faculty? Why were these changes made? How have these changes affected the program? (e) Do you believe that the faculty functions as a team? Why or why not? (f) Do you believe
that all faculty members operate in ways that are true to the philosophy of the Leadership Program as it is described in printed and website promotional material? Why or why not? (g) What criteria do you use to know when a participant had done enough to prove competency? (h) What happens when a participant demonstrates that the program is not a good fit for him or her, either because of personality or academic issues? How does the faculty deal with this situation? (i) Do you believe that a partnership exists to the extent that faculty and students are all equal participants in the Leadership Program? Why or why not? (j) If you could ask the participants one question, what would it be?

Chapter 12, “Faculty and Staff Interviews, Part 2,” is comprised of two of the three major sections. The first section, Program Design and Delivery, contains the analysis of the following six questions or groups of questions: (a) How is the process for selecting participants different from what it was when the program was first created? (b) How do you keep continuity in the program and within the faculty when the faculty changes? (c) What program changes have occurred since you joined the Leadership faculty? Why were these changes made? How have these changes affected the program? (d) Briefly describe the portfolio process, from I.D.P. to portfolio presentation. (e) Are the Roundtables valuable experiences for you? Would you like to see changes made in their content? If so, what changes would you propose? (f) Do you believe that the orientations adequately provide participants with a thorough understanding of the Leadership philosophy? Do the orientations equip participants with what they need for completing the program? Why or why not?

The second section, Communication, contains the analysis of the following four questions or groups of questions: (a) How are changes in policy and other
pertinent news communicated effectively to the participants? Is the current method effective? Are there ways to improve this communication? (b) What effect does the use of technology have on communication? For example, has the use of technology led to deeper discussion? Why or why not? (c) Do you read the minutes of regional-group meetings? Why or why not? (d) Do you respond to faculty discussion questions? Why or why not?

Chapter 13, “The Final Analysis,” provides an overview of the practices that some experts believe are needed for higher-education institutions to serve clientele—especially adult clientele—effectively and efficiently. The chapter also provides suggestions about which elements of the Leadership Program might be incorporated by such institutions as part of their graduate-education delivery systems.

A Word About Individuals and Names

I asked a variety of individuals—participants, faculty, and staff—to respond to issues that range from the procedural to the philosophical. All respondents provided well-articulated, insightful—and often nuanced—observations. Having to group their responses into thematic categories was always difficult and often nerve-wracking. As a result, I have accounted for each respondent’s comments in the analyses.

With regard to style, the first time that I cite someone in each chapter, I use the complete name of the individual. Additionally, Appendix A contains a one- or two-sentence description of the credentials of each person cited, including faculty members cited by name.
CHAPTER 2

CRISIS AS A CATALYST FOR CHANGE: WHY AND HOW A PROGRAM IS CREATED

Introduction

This chapter contains the account of why and how the Leadership Program at Andrews University came about. Minutes from faculty meetings and committee meetings, program-development documents, face-to-face and online interviews with faculty members as well as e-mail and other personal communication with faculty members supplement the story. Note: On July 17, 2002, I interviewed William H. Green and James A. Tucker together, but I conducted follow-up interviews with each of them at later dates. Whether face-to-face or online, in all other cases I interviewed faculty members individually.

The Catalyst

Andrews University, a small parochial university in southwestern Michigan, has an annual student population of about 3,500 undergraduate and graduate students. Early in 1994, the University faced a deficit of more than $1 million for the 1994–1995 school year. In order to make up for the shortfall, the administration assigned each distinct school, or college, an amount to be cut from its budget. The School of Education (SED) was assigned with eliminating $164,000, or the equivalent of four full-time faculty members, from its budget.
Warren Minder, then dean of the SED, determined that he could reduce anticipated expenditures by approximately $39,100. He also projected additional revenue from two sources. First, proceeds from the SED’s distance-learning program might offset another $20,000 of the shortage. Second, Andrews University had a long-term arrangement to deliver courses at other universities in the Seventh-day Adventist higher-education system; encouraging SED faculty to deliver additional courses at one or more sister schools might generate additional revenue. The proposed reductions and projected additional income reduced the SED’s financial obligation by half, as shown in Table 1. Eighty-two thousand dollars remained (Minutes, Meeting of the School of Education Faculty, February 3, 1994).
Table 1

*Proposed Budgetary Adjustments for the Andrews University School of Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Adjustment</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel allowance</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-student assistantships</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for supplies</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of guest professors and non-Andrews external examiners</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of other misc. expenses (designated “198”)</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Lee Canter distance-education program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from teaching at sister schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$42,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Gain for School of Education** $82,000

*Note:* Data from “Minutes, Meeting of the School of Education Faculty,” February 3, 1994, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
The Search for a Solution Begins

February 3, 1994: Meeting of the School of Education Faculty

In February 1994, $82,000 approximated the salary-and-benefits package of two full-time professors, or FTEs. The obvious recourse for balancing the budget was to eliminate two faculty members. Green, from the Department of Teaching and Learning, observes,

If I remember right, this was the third year that we had had to make cuts in the budget. . . . We did that, and then during the first semester of that year they came back and said, “Guess what? We need to cut some more.” At that time I was really disheartened. I said, if we really look at this—and this is a trend—in three years none of us are going to be here. (Green, interview, July 18, 2002)

Hesitant about making a unilateral decision, Minder presented the problem to the entire SED faculty. David S. Penner, from the Department of Educational Administration, remembers that “Warren had already cut out paper-clips and photocopying expenses.” Penner “remember[s] Dr. Minder drawing up a little budget on the chalkboard in [room] 175. . . . He basically turned his back [to the chalkboard] and [asked], ‘What are we going to do about this?’” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002). The response was the formation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Adjustments.

Minder appointed four faculty members to the committee. Three members represented the three departments of the SED as it was configured at the time: Shirley A. Freed, from the Department of Teaching and Learning; David S. Penner, from the Department of Educational Administration; and James A. Tucker, from the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology. In addition, Jerome Thayer, associate dean of the School of Education, was asked to serve as non-voting chair.
The way the committee got appointed in my remembrance was that Warren said, “We want to do something about this but we don’t want administrators on the committee, so we’re going to get somebody who does not have administrative experience or who is not in charge of anything, because we want them to think freely. We want some different ideas.” (Green, interview, July 18, 2002)

As an Andrews University administrator, Thayer’s role on the committee was “to organize the thing and get it going, but he was not controlling it” (Green, interview, July 18, 2002). As Thayer explains, “None of us were in charge of any budgets, so they assumed we would be ‘unbiased’ when it came to budget adjustments” (Thayer, interview, July 20, 2003). Three of the committee members, however, had a great deal at stake. As “new hires,” Freed, Penner, and Tucker would be terminated if faculty members were eliminated on the basis of seniority.

February 8, 1994: Meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Adjustments

The task of the Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Adjustments was to suggest ways in which to balance the SED budget. According to Tucker, the dean asked only for was “a strategy to figure out how to deal with a budget shortfall equivalent to two FTEs” (Tucker, interview, July 18, 2002). As the initial step in finding that strategy, committee members began their first meeting by asking this fundamental question: “What is our job?” (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Adjustments, February 8, 1994). That question led to others, as well as to the options summarized below:

1. Was their job to raise income? If so, they could propose to do so by adding off-campus instruction.
2. Was their job to cut expenses? If so, they could propose to do so in one or more of the following ways: (a) through personnel changes (such as reducing the number of faculty or administrators, increasing the faculty teaching-load, and decreasing the time-off allotted for research); (b) through program changes (such as adjusting the requirements in current undergraduate and graduate programs or reducing the number of programs offered); (c) through scheduling changes (such as reducing the number and frequency of courses offered); and (d) through organizational changes (such as restructuring the SED’s departmental configuration).

3. Was their job both to increase income and to reduce expenses? If so, the possible combinations of options seemed limitless.

During that first meeting, committee members generated 30 questions that addressed ways in which to deal with the cost crisis (see Appendix B for the full list of questions). The 30th and final question sums up their quandary: “How many of the above questions should be dealt with?” (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Adjustments, February 8, 1994). The discussion continued the following day.

February 9, 1994: Meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Adjustments

On February 9, the committee asserted that central to the proposal would be upholding the mission of the SED: “to serve an international clientele, preparing educators for excellence in thinking, teaching, service, and research. As companions in learning, students and faculty are committed to global Christian service” (School of Education Handbook, 1993-1994, p. 20).
Our assigned task was to bring a recommendation to the Dean’s Administrative Council that included ways to accomplish the budget cuts required of the School of Education. We broadened our task to include ways in which the School of Education could more effectively accomplish its mission.

We feel that if only some of the suggestions [that we have made] or variations of them are implemented, the required savings would be met. The primary rationale for the suggestions is that the School of Education could meet its mission more effectively if they are implemented. Efficiency and cost-saving will be an extra bonus. (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Adjustments, February 9, 1994)

As a result, the committee focused on the following three—and interrelated—actions with regard to SED programs:

1. Refashion the departmental structure in order to facilitate communication among members of the SED faculty and encourage all faculty members to be involved in problem solving.

2. Modify programs in order to increase flexibility in the ways in which programs are delivered and thereby reduce on-campus coursework.

3. Re-evaluate the content of courses in order to reduce replication between and among programs.

Freed, Penner, Thayer, and Tucker generated several specific suggestions designed to streamline the SED program structure, eliminate the duplication of courses, and increase the efficiency of how courses were delivered. Before proceeding, they elected to share these suggestions with their peers at the next SED faculty meeting.

February 15, 1994: Meeting of the School of Education Faculty

On February 15, the Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Adjustments presented their general recommendations to the SED faculty. In response, the faculty authorized the committee to begin “immediately” to develop “a more
defined proposal” and to be prepared to present that proposal at the faculty meeting scheduled for March 2 (Minutes, School of Education Faculty Meeting, February 15, 1994). That proposal was to include but was not limited to the three key action-elements already under consideration—departmental structure, program flexibility, and course content. With that directive, the Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Adjustments was renamed the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring. Committee members remained the same.

February 17, 1994: Meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring

When the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring met for the first time, on February 17, 1994, they generated three questions. The first question echoed the primary one posed on February 8: “What is our task?” Now, however, the query seemed more pragmatic than philosophical and served as a basis for the second one: “What will our product [italics added] for the March 2 faculty meeting look like?” The committee focused at once on providing an answer. The members were now clear about their objective and were ready to reach it. The third question was a tactical one and reinforced the idea that the committee members were goal-oriented: “What is our basic strategy?” (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring, February 17, 1994).

Based on previous discussions within the ad hoc committee and in meetings with the SED faculty, Freed, Penner, Tucker, and Thayer determined that the solution to the fiscal problem was to at least reduce if not eliminate departmental boundaries. Because doing so would result in increased flexibility, efficiency, and effectiveness, they began to consider ways in which to reorganize
the administrative infrastructures and the academic departments as well as to redesign the instruction process.

As stated earlier, rather than making unilateral decisions, Minder had given the faculty the responsibility of helping to solve the impending financial problem. According to Stanley Aronowitz (2000), Minder’s action runs counter to prevalent practice in universities.

Whether a department or program should be established, expanded, retained, or eliminated; which faculty should be hired or dismissed; how programs and departments will be assigned and workloads and classroom sizes determined are only a few of the crucial decisions affecting schools that have gradually been assumed by administrations and boards of trustees. (p. 65)

Using the team approach initiated by Minder, the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring included the concerns of SED administrators in their deliberations by consulting with department chairs, program directors, and other supervisory personnel. Consequently, they were able to determine which departmental components should remain distinct, which should be merged, and which should be eliminated entirely. A critical part of the process was asking each administrator to provide a rationale for his or her responses. One administrator recommended, for example, that the introductory course in research methods remain unaltered because it was a well-attended, required class for which there was no equivalent. Higher-level courses in research methods, however, could be offered in an independent-study format or in some other, non-campus-based, approach.

With regard to new initiatives, the committee explored the possibility of offering frequent “work-group” courses at several off-campus sites. Principals, teachers, deans, and parents—as well as pastors and other church-workers—
made up the list of potential participants in these courses. Chicago, Detroit, Indianapolis, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Orlando, Atlanta, Nashville, and Dayton made up the list of possible locations.

February 25, 1994: Meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring

In earlier meetings, committee members had proposed cutting faculty as a feasible option for solving the cost crisis. At the February 17 meeting, however, they did not discuss that option—even though they had listed it as an agenda item. And at this, the February 25 meeting, they gave no consideration to that option—even as an item on a list. As Penner reflects,

We talked about it for a little bit, and essentially the committee decided that it would be very difficult to decide who was going to be cut and that it might not be really politically expedient for us to cut our fellow peers and that it’s a lot more fun to create new ventures that could make up for the [the deficit] rather than cutting staff or faculty. (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002)

On February 25, then, the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring proposed significant changes in the overall configuration of the School of Education and its course-delivery methods. They also continued to discuss the ideas presented during the preceding meeting, placing those ideas into the two general categories of goals and givens.

Practical applications of several concepts comprised the goals:

1. At the course level, providing a non-traditional way to deliver courses became the goal. Developing off-campus learning in the form of independent and small-group studies would promote a reduction in faculty load. Work-study experiences, for example, would become a means to more-efficient credit-delivery.
2. At the program level, flexibility would become the watchword. Fewer specified courses would be required and more electives would be permitted, an effort to recruit more students would begin, and whenever it seemed more effective to do so, programs would broaden or merge in a give-and-take of the opportunity to reorganize the SED.

3. At the departmental level, having “fewer departmental boundaries” was seen as the “ideal” model for the future. In order to reduce faculty and share resources, courses that were duplicated in more than one department would be merged into one.

The following *givens* designated which aspects of the School of Education were amendable and which were not:

1. No foreseeable obstacles existed to prevent increased flexibility in program-design, credit-configuration, and interdepartmental cooperation.

2. The number of credit hours required for each degree would not be reduced.

3. Several aspects of the delivery system were “probably sacred” and therefore immutable. These were (a) the residency requirement for students, (b) foundations courses for all education students, and (c) comprehensive examinations and research requirements for master’s degrees and doctorates (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring, February 25, 1994).

**Redefining and Rearranging**

Annette Kolodny (1998) asserts that when faced with budget cuts, most colleges and universities eliminate programs, professors and support staff, and
services. Few if any institutions of higher learning, she states, recommend devising ways of delivering education in order to increase revenue. The Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring, however, recognized the financial problem as an opportunity not only to modify existing courses and programs but also to develop them “from the ground up.” They resolved to create an entirely new entity, a “new plan” for doctoral studies. The plan would not replace the way in which the School of Education functioned, but it would provide an alternate, innovative way in which to deliver graduate-level education (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring, February 25, 1994).

March 2, 1994: Meeting of the School of Education Faculty

On March 2, the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring presented their suggestions to the SED faculty in the form of a document titled “Plan to Restructure the Andrews University School of Education.” Five principles undergirded those recommendations:

1. Use this opportunity to make the School of Education into the best school possible.

2. Rediscover and implement the SED mission to be a community of learners dedicated to service.

3. Maximize creativity by taking such steps as reducing the number of redundant courses and encouraging team teaching.

4. Minimize “restraints” by dissolving the departmental structure and eliminating the prescribed courses “tied to 4-credit blocks.”
5. Reduce bureaucratic requirements, such as the number of signatures that petitions needed to conduct SED business (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring, February 25, 1994).

The committee members also delineated and classified the principles and characteristics of the alternate SED structure:

1. The *dynamic objective* of the new plan was to create flexible programs that would meet individual student needs, to encourage cooperation among programs, to foster teamwork among faculty members, and to develop several innovative courses.

2. The *continuing characteristics* of the new plan were to base all changes and innovations on the SED mission statement and to maintain the broad areas within which the SED currently offered degrees.

3. The *ongoing requirements* of the new plan were to maintain the current number of hours per degree and to require a dissertation as partial fulfillment for the doctorate.

The new plan for the School of Education became a new program for graduate studies. “Ideally,” the plan would create more cooperation among departments and, as a result, promote shared human and financial resources. *Program teams* would develop and execute SED programs, with one team per program. All SED faculty members would be eligible to join a team. Participation would be voluntary and the faculty who became part of a team would become members of a community of scholars. Each team would oversee such aspects of a SED program as “admissions, policies, and curriculum requirements for the program profile” (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring, February 25, 1994, p. 3). The *program profile* would
consist of a general description of flexible requirements, which would be defined in terms of student performance. Members of the program team also would join students in an orientation.

The versatility of such teams would result in faculty support for an increase in enrollment. Core requirements designed to foster the development of knowledge and skills would form the basis for each SED program, thereby ensuring that academic standards be maintained. Unlike the lock-step delivery-system of traditional programs—prescribed courses with prescribed content taken in a prescribed order—in the proposed alternative, the program teams would assign credits in a way that would best reflect the amount and nature of each student’s study-experience. On-campus courses, directed-reading, and work-group experiences would be supported by off-campus groups and individualized learning.

In the best pedagogical scenario . . . the “course” and “credit” model would be jettisoned, since it still participates in the rationalization of knowledge. Students and faculty would work together in one rolling seminar. The learning community would organize its time according to its own convenience rather than accommodating to university rules. (Aronowitz, 2000, p. 190)

In order to avoid the traditional academic meaning of course and to reflect the spirit of the proposed program, the committee intended to substitute another word for the concept. Although avoiding the word completely proved difficult, program plans did include a new nomenclature. The following glossary is based on the material presented at the March 2, 1994, SED faculty-meeting. Glossary items are italicized within the text of the definitions.

*Individual Development Plan (I.D.P.)*: The one-to-four-page document that each student develops as his or her blueprint for fulfilling the requirements of
the departmental program profile. The I.D.P., which describes the courses, strategic experiences, and activities designed to carry the plan to completion, defines individual academic criteria and career goals. The I.D.P. team approves the I.D.P.

**Competency:** The means by which participants in the program demonstrate knowledge and skills.

**I.D.P. team:** The team that consists of a faculty advisor and two additional faculty members. This three-member team approves the student’s I.D.P. at the beginning of the process and his or her portfolio at the end.

**Orientation:** The face-to-face intensive experience that launches the program for each new cohort. During the orientation, students and faculty begin to develop the community of scholars described in the SED’s mission statement.

**Portfolio:** A collection of artifacts that serves as evidence for completion of the program profile. Artifacts include but are not limited to verification of coursework; descriptions of strategic experiences and participation in study-groups; documentation of performance, honors, and achievements; videotapes of presentations; examples of innovative products; and examples of research, professional reports, theoretical and reflective papers, and published material.

**Portfolio presentation:** The event during which the student presents evidence that supports completion of the program profile to the I.D.P. team. During the portfolio presentation, the student demonstrates his or her theoretical knowledge and presents evidence of the appropriate practical application of that knowledge.

**Program profile:** “A [departmental-level] program document detailing knowledge and skills necessary for completion of the program. It is not course-
prescriptive and may include optional elements” (Minutes, School of Education Faculty Meeting, March 2, 1994, p. 2).

Strategic experiences: Real-life, practical, and primarily field-based activities, such as internships and study-groups.

Students in the new program would go through the following stages:

1. Stage I: The Plan. With his or her I.D.P. team (an advisor and two other members of the faculty) each student develops an I.D.P. At this stage, the student begins to accumulate already-existing documentation that might serve as evidence of I.D.P. fulfillment.

2. Stage II: The Program. Through successful completion of (a) the orientation, (b) the coursework and experiences described in the I.D.P., and (c) supervised research, the student fulfills the requirements stipulated by the I.D.P. At this stage, the student collects additional documentation as evidence of I.D.P. fulfillment.

3. Stage III: The Presentation. In a formal setting, the student demonstrates that he or she has met the requirements described in his or her I.D.P. by presenting the evidence outlined in Stage I and accumulated in Stage II. In addition, the student writes a synthesis paper that integrates his or her personal, professional, and academic experiences in the program by discussing theoretical issues and introspective reflections. The student also is prepared to answer questions about his or her knowledge, skills, and perspectives. The portfolio presentation represents part of the student’s performance assessment; the completion of the reflective integration paper and the successful defense of a dissertation complete the assessment process.
The committee also proposed the following reorganization of the SED institutional structure: dean, graduate-program director, SED teams, program coordinators, program teams, and I.D.P. teams. SED teams would consist of a finance team, a curriculum team, a grant-writing team, and an administrative-advisory team.

At this point the committee had only skeletons of plans for general SED reorganization and for SED studies. But even at this stage, two resolutions remained constant: (a) to promote more cooperation and less competition among the existing departments within the SED and (b) to use the financial dilemma as an opportunity to create something new. At the March 2, 1994, meeting, the SED faculty accepted the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring and gave members the go-ahead to flesh out their proposal. When the committee met next, on March 9, 1994, it did so with the same members but under a new name: the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team.

March 9 and 15, 1994: Meeting of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team

On March 9, at the first meeting of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team, committee members began the task of developing a more efficient and more effective organizational plan for the School of Education. Focusing on the collaborative aspect of their earlier recommendations, they formed course-review teams (coordinated by Tucker), an orientation team (coordinated by Freed), and two curriculum teams (one coordinated by Green, the other by John Youngberg, then director of the Andrews University family-life program). The teams were to be only the
beginning, though, for committee members resolved to enlist the cooperation of the entire faculty by calling for suggestions and volunteers for additional teams. The committee also discussed recommending that the SED share a common budget and that a team be appointed to oversee the disbursement of funds. In addition, they recommended that deadlines be set for the proposed actions.

On March 15, Minder attended the meeting of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team. At that meeting, the committee voted to take two actions that were far-reaching and represented steps in removing departmental boundaries. The first was to recommend to the SED faculty that beginning with July 1, 1994, all SED budgets be administered through the dean’s office. The second was to bring together all the professors who taught the courses that were under consideration for modification, merger, or elimination. The purpose of the meeting would be to recommend ways in which to put the plan into operation—and to do so in time for any changes to be published in the bulletin for the fall quarter of 1994.

The SED’s Dean’s Advisory Council approved the committee’s budgetary and course-related recommendations. As a result, as of July 1, the dean would administer the SED budget; and as of the fall quarter, the University bulletin would reflect the revised course offerings. Making the change in how the budget was administered was simple. Making the changes in courses was not.

March 31, 1994: Meeting of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team

On March 31, the members of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team turned their efforts to increasing income through program development in two ways. First, the committee acted on the idea of expanding
off-campus delivery of SED courses. The presidents of the affiliates of Andrews University were scheduled to be on campus from April 28 through May 4. The committee voted to ask the dean to form a team to develop a presentation for the visiting presidents that would accomplish the following goals:

1. Describe the ways in which students from other universities in the Seventh-day Adventist system could participate in Andrews University School of Education doctoral programs.

2. Describe how the restructuring of the School of Education would make completing graduate programs possible with “much more flexibility and less work done in Michigan” (Minutes, School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team, March 13, 1994).

Second, the committee voted “to begin immediately to develop two new programs using the new ideas approved at the last faculty meeting.” As before, they emphasized that “the new programs would not replace existing programs. Existing programs would use existing procedures and policies. The new programs would use the new procedures and policies approved during the March 2 faculty meeting” (Minutes, School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team, March 31, 1994).

The proposed programs would be in the areas of instruction and leadership. Committee members accepted the responsibility of organizing the program teams: Freed and Tucker for instruction and Penner for leadership. In order to allow sufficient time to recruit students for the fall quarter of 1994, the teams were to have the general description of each program ready no later than August 1. Freed also accepted the responsibility of forming an orientation team for the fall quarter. What is important about this action is that this is the first
time that the word *leadership* appears in the record of events. That word foreshadowed the program that was to come.

April 12, 1994: Meeting of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team

On April 12, Tucker reported that the course-review teams recommended that 89 existing courses be combined into 19. The new combinations reflected a decrease in duplication and an increase in interdepartmental collaboration. The School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team decided to present the list of course modifications to the SED faculty at the April 19 meeting.

In addition, Penner, who had taken on the task of forming a leadership-development team, proposed a three-step plan of action:

1. That he and two other SED faculty members—Paul Brantley, from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and Green, from the Department of Teaching and Learning—would begin planning the program by May 1.

2. That two other faculty members—Lyndon “Jerry” Furst, Chair of the Department of Educational Administration and John Youngberg—would join the team on May 15.

3. That three members of the faculty of the Andrews University Seminary who were known for their non-traditional ideas about education would be added on May 30 in order to make the program a campus-wide, interdisciplinary one.

**Regrouping and Re-forming**

Creating a new entity in the form of an innovative graduate-level delivery system protected two faculty positions. But the commitment of the SED faculty to work together either in separate departmental teams or in one school-wide
The team was unfulfilled. The reality is that very little changed. No revolutionary new SED structure was established. Departmental boundaries generally remained intact. Other than in a few instances between individual faculty members, redundant courses were not reorganized and reconfigured. As Thayer states, “We recommended that development teams be set up to form program teams and program profiles . . . around a common core of SED goals. . . . We were foolish enough to think that everyone would like this for their program” (Thayer, interview, June 20, 2003).

The lack of change may have been caused by academic territoriality. According to Alvin G. Burstein (1997), “individuals or small specialist programs” often are resistant to change. In specifically speaking of faculty, he asserts that members of such a “balkanized group are unwilling to defer, on the basis of community good, their self-enhancing specialist activities” (Burstein, 1997, ¶11). The lack of change also may have been the result of complacency. Michael Hooker (1997) explains, “Rarely does anything get done that significantly inconveniences anyone. Once programs and positions have been created, they are rarely eliminated” (¶15). In any case, the general faculty did not use the cost crisis as an “opportunity to make the School of Education into the best school possible.” It appears that when it came to doing instead of discussing, the SED faculty generally failed to act on the changes that they had authorized, to become involved in the new ventures that they had voted to put into practice, and to fulfill their individual commitments to various endeavors.
Laying the Foundation for Leadership

Initially, the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring recommended that the SED establish and implement program teams, at the ratio of one team per program. Each team was to function as a community of scholars to oversee such general-but-flexible aspects of the programs as admissions, policies, and requirements for completion (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring, February 25, 1994). The SED faculty approved the establishment of the teams (Minutes, School of Education Faculty Meeting, March 2, 1994). Ultimately, however, they failed to implement them.

Several weeks later, at the April 12 meeting, Penner presented a plan of action that incorporated specific faculty who had agreed to help to develop a new program called “Leadership” (Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring, April 12). Owing to the lack of involvement of most of the faculty members designated in the plan, that too was unrealized.

The two faculty members who did fulfill their commitments continued to conceptualize the components of what would become the Leadership Program at Andrews University. Through what Penner calls “two parallel activities,” the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring continued to meet, but the “creation of the Leadership Program—of the competencies, of the requirements for the program—that all took on very much of its own thing” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002). Penner continues:

We all read a lot, so we knew kind of the dialogue, the discipline. But we also felt free to experiment with something new. I think we were all pretty competent in ourselves. Not in a haughty sort of way, but we could question what we did without feeling badly about ourselves. That’s the confidence that I’m talking about. But I think that we must have all—and Jerry Thayer came right along with us on this—begun to be able to live in the vision without having all the details there and not being as worried
about it as perhaps [we would have if] we were developing some other kind of program. Later we began to call that “living with ambiguity.” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2003)

When the faculty involved began to create the new entity, they did so quickly, enthusiastically, and with confidence in the evolving nature of the notion.

**Kindred Spirits Collaborate**

Even though their respective faculties were unresponsive when asked to develop new programs, Green, from the Department of Teaching and Learning, and Tucker, from the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology, had discovered that they held a common interest in instructional practices and learning theory, as the following comments from my face-to-face interviews with them illustrate. As Green says, he and Tucker were “interested in the same thing”—that is, effective instruction. “And,” Green adds, “we also were both interested in leadership. . . . And we actually said that when we were talking! We have a new emerging market that seems to be out there, which is leadership” (Green, interview, July 17, 2002).

“That’s right,” Tucker agrees. “But,” he qualifies, “the fundamental thing . . . that bonded us was the learning piece. . . . People don’t learn in the traditional fashion [that we use]. We were convinced of that. . . . If they’re going to learn leadership, which is a new market, then let’s teach it the way learning occurs” (Tucker, interview, July 17, 2002).

Tucker cautions, however, that at this point he and Green had not yet identified specific leadership qualities. “We were talking about if people are going to be leaders in schools, they may need to know how to lead on the basis of
what the research says works. Dave Penner eventually came in and added that piece” (Tucker, interview, July 17, 2002).

A year earlier, Penner and Minder had attended a conference of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) in Las Vegas. “We went through a presentation and then met with the presenter afterward and had an extended conversation with him” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002). The presenter was the organizer and administrator of the Maine Leadership Academy. His model for cooperation among principals left Minder and Penner “kind of excited” . . . because [the model] had been effective “within the educational public schools in Maine as a way to improve principals—new principals [by] getting them up to speed, old principals [by] keeping them on task” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002).

When the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring recommended that each department develop an innovative graduate program, Penner attempted to incorporate ideas from the Maine Academy model into the curriculum of the Department of Educational Administration. The faculty members “asked some questions about it but at that point were interested in pursuing and building up the program that was already in place” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002).

Green, Penner, and Tucker do not recall exactly where and when they first shared ideas. They do remember, however, some of the discussions that took place. Penner remembers one encounter in this way: “I don’t know how it was that Bill [Green] and Jim [Tucker] and I got in the same room. That part is fuzzy with me. But at any rate, we got in the same room for some reason, and
I had with me a list of what we now call competencies” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002).

In a later conversation, Green recalls the sequence of events in this way:

I distinctly remember where I was and what happened at the time. I do not think I will ever forget it. Jim [Tucker] came down to my office and said he had an idea. We decided to run with it and thought that we had to involve Dave [Penner] and we wanted to involve Shirley [Freed]. (Green, personal communication, April 19, 2010)

The following excerpt provides other details about the development of the idea of a new program:

What we needed to do was not just start a new program but to start a new program that would bring new students—and therefore new money—into the school. . . . We also believed that we needed to include other faculty so that we could have a broader support base. Dave Penner came to mind, [and] we decided to approach him. Dave had already been thinking about programs to bring additional money into the school [because he had been appointed to the ad hoc committees that were dealing with the current financial shortfall]. If I remember correctly, however, he did not want to start a program that emphasized instruction. We had to do some talking and negotiating about that idea. We had to show him that people who were in educational administration could also benefit from the program. (Green, e-mail, June 18, 2004)

Penner had gleaned a list of competencies from handbooks for principals from three organizations: the National Association of Secondary School Principles (NASSP), the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), and the Maine Leadership Academy. The list represented elements that he believed should be incorporated into an Andrews University graduate program (Penner, personal correspondence, June 3, 2002; Penner, interview, July 17, 2002). Penner states that he consolidated the three lists down to half a dozen or so [items]. And Bill was there with a list of some sort that he had been working on. And Jim was there. And we sort of shared the things that we were working on, and it looked like—to me, anyway—that we were duplicating efforts, because the lists had some commonalities in them. There were some differences. My memory is that Bill had some . . . teaching-and-learning issues that I didn’t have because I
was coming from administration and not from the curriculum/teaching area. (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002)

Tucker corroborates Penner’s recollection. Independent of Penner, he and Green also had compiled a list of competencies. That list reflected their respective professional backgrounds: Tucker’s in education and state government and Green’s in education and school leadership. Green summarizes the basis for their list in this way: “The idea [was] that we wanted the central focus to be on learning, and the teaching part of that came from our background, because that’s who we are” (Interview, July 17, 2002). Upon comparing their list with Penner’s, they discovered a great deal of overlap. In a later conversation, Tucker noted, “With very little tweaking,” they produced a list of “generic but comprehensive” competencies (Tucker, personal conversation, May 19, 2007). Then, Penner says, “after we discovered that we had so much in common, we just sort of handed it over to Jim [Tucker] and said, ‘Here, pull this thing together and see what you pull out of the fire’“ (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002).

**From Proposal to Program: The “Cafeteria Meetings”**

The next scheduled meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on School of Education Restructuring was scheduled for May 16, 1994. Prior to that meeting, however, the “cafeteria meetings” began. Green, Penner, and Tucker were eager to continue talking. They decided to meet at the Andrews cafeteria for almost-daily discussions, “since most of us ate at ‘the caf’ for lunch” (Penner, e-mail, June 3, 2002). Green agrees: “We said, ‘When are we going to meet to spend more time on this in a formal way?’ All of us were busy. And so we said, ‘We all have to eat, so let’s go eat together’” (Green, interview, July 17, 2002). During
these discussions, Green, Penner, and Tucker focused on the development of an alternate, competency-based, graduate-level program for the School of Education. Thayer joined the discussions soon after they began.

The cafeteria meetings were open to anyone interested in the idea of a new graduate program. Consequently, in this environment of openly sharing ideas, university faculty and staff from several on-campus departments joined the conversation, as did a handful of students. Three employees of the nearby regional administrative office of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination also were present almost daily; they were the editor, managing editor, and editorial assistant of the region’s monthly bulletin. The conversation was titillating and the topic was, as Penner states, “hot” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002).

(I remember those lunches well. Everyone talked at once while Jim scribbled on paper napkins. Eventually, the napkins became drafts. People sitting at the other end of the long table where we usually sat began to move closer, until they too began adding comments.

My career had been in publishing, from serving as executive editor of a well-known international birding journal, to authoring several nature-oriented books, to owning a print shop. I had a bachelor’s degree and was content with my family life and my professional life. I was over 40 and couldn’t see myself in a classroom again. Yet, because of Jim’s career and the experiences that my sons had had—and were still having—in school, I had become interested in education. What was being discussed was intriguing. This was different. This might work. This was exciting!
The Graduate Program in Teaching and Learning

The result of the discussions that took place at the cafeteria and between classes and other obligations was the Graduate Degree Program in Teaching and Learning at Andrews University. According Tucker, we were “under the impression that a number of proposals were going to be brought back to the [ad hoc] committee, and then we would present those to the dean. The only proposal that came back was this one, so we retired to lunch” (Tucker, interview, July 17, 2002). That proposal, dated May 5, 1994, supported the mission of Andrews University by providing a way in which to “integrate faith and learning in a way that will prepare its graduates for service” (Tucker, 1994, p. 1). The document also delineated four competency-areas with three definitive elements each; they are listed verbatim below:

1. An effective teacher with . . .
   b. Skills in classroom management to accommodate student variability.
   c. Skills in instructional strategies.

2. An effective instructional leader with . . .
   a. Skills in organizational development.
   b. Skills in staff development.
   c. Skills in strategic planning.

3. A collaborative consultant with . . .
   a. Skills in effective communication.
   b. Skills in evaluation/assessment (reflective).
   c. Skills in problem-solving.
4. A reflective researcher with . . .
   a. Skills in reading and evaluating research.
   b. Skills in conducting research.
   c. Skills in reporting research. (Tucker, 1994, p. 1)

In addition, the document asserted that a graduate of this program would demonstrate a working knowledge of learning-theory (including principles of behavior), educational technology, and social systems (including family dynamics).

As an example of the successful fulfillment of a competency, the document included “indicators” for collaborative-consultant. The indicators are listed below:

1. Skills in effective communication
   a. Listening: Judged by a speaker (either in lecture or consultation) to have identified the salient points being stated.
   b. Speaking: Judged by an audience of 10 or more, or by five or more consultees, to have achieved preset criteria.
   c. Writing: Have an article or a book published by a firm that is independent of the candidate.

2. Skills in evaluation/assessment
   a. Communicate the difference between the terms evaluation and assessment.
   b. List and describe in detail at least four personal traits of the candidate that define his or her style of communicating in the process of teaching and learning.
c. Name at least three current methods of assessment and list strengths and weaknesses of each.

3. Skills in problem solving
   
a. List the steps in a problem-solving model.
   
b. Demonstrate ability to apply the principles of problem solving through collaborative consultation.
   
c. Demonstrate at least one situation in which you have used the principles of problem solving to resolve an issue.

The proposal emphasized that students would acquire a sound knowledge-base in such areas as learning theory, educational technology, and social systems and that they would graduate with the skills to apply that knowledge in practical situations. The proposal also described the philosophy underlying the new program, reiterating the overarching concept that the members of the ad hoc committees had articulated earlier—that the program should support a community of learners.

We have a group of people who share a common rhetoric about the goals and objectives of education. As in most places, however, there is a significant discrepancy between the rhetoric and the practice. What is missing is the cohesion that must exist for the community to act in unity. (Tucker, 1994, p. 4)

The Graduate Degree Program in Teaching and Learning at Andrews University proposed a Christ-centered, family-based degree that would encourage the integration of faith and learning into all phases of an individual’s life. The purpose of the program was to eliminate such temporal barriers to learning as age and level of education, as well as to support the premise that learning is a lifelong, continuous process that “is not built on the caste system of the more-educated or less-educated” (Tucker, 1994, p. 4). Teachers would be
defined in terms of expertise, not on the basis of credentials. As a result, “parents, teachers, and students alike [will] . . . be initiators as well as facilitators of the learning-process” (Tucker, 1994, p. 4). The program would allow participants to learn by taking progressive steps along a path to mastery and to do so in different but equally valid learning environments in school and in the community. In addition, the program would not use grades and retention as the primary-but-negative rewards for learning, and it would set no time limits for learning (although it would accommodate accreditation requirements for the granting of diplomas, degrees, and accreditation).

May 16, 1994: Meeting of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team

The Graduate Degree Program in Teaching and Learning at Andrews University formed the basis of what eventually would become the Leadership Program at Andrews University. Two important points must be made here. First, from the earliest discussions, certain members of the SED faculty, including some of the members of the ad hoc committees, consistently focused on developing an innovative graduate program that was based on Christian principles and that nurtured a community of scholars. Second, those faculty members began to develop such a program well before they were formally asked to do so.

More than a month passed before the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team met again, on May 16. Green, Penner, and Tucker already had drafted a proposal for a Graduate Degree Program in Teaching and Learning at Andrews University. I cannot corroborate whether or not they had a copy of that proposal at that meeting. Corporate memory fails here, and there is no mention
of the proposal in the minutes. Despite that omission, the May 16 meeting was a pivotal one—the one during which committee members determined to have a pilot program in place for the fall quarter, even without the full cooperation of the general faculty. The following components of the program are taken verbatim from the minutes of that meeting:

1. The new degree will be a doctorate with a concentration in “Leadership.”
2. Students may select an "emphasis" in an area (e.g., secondary principal).
3. It will include a 2-week on-campus orientation.
4. The orientation will tentatively be scheduled for the 2 weeks prior to fall registration.
5. Dave Penner will develop details of the orientation for the next meeting.
6. The program team for the degree initially will consist of Bill Green, Dave Penner, and Jim Tucker.
7. Curricular requirements will be developed over the next few months.
8. Curricular requirements will include outcomes, credits, dissertation, residency, comps [comprehensive examinations].
9. Admission requirements will be the same as for current concentrations.
10. A general description of the program will be developed for recruiting.
11. All members of the facilitating team will be involved in the orientation this fall.
12. Jerry Thayer will meet with Delmer Davis [the Andrews University graduate dean] to determine what needs to be brought to Graduate Council and the best way to do it.
13. Our next meeting will be around May 26. It will include a report from the new program team, with Bill Green [from the Department of Teaching and Learning] invited to attend.

Heading for the Finish Line

The School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team met two more times, on May 26 and June 7. Their task during both meetings was to hone the proposal in preparation for submitting it to the Graduate Council for final consideration. During those meetings, the team discussed how to ensure quality control, how to integrate learning into all aspects of the program, and how to
assign mentors to the participants. They also set the orientation date for the first cohort of the new program and presented a preliminary list of 20 applicants. Perhaps, most important, they included a budget that demonstrated a “university rake-off” of $54,000 for the first year of operation.

On June 8, at the School of Education Faculty Meeting, Thayer distributed the facilitating-team report to the SED faculty and presented a brief overview of the proposed program, along with the recommendation that a pilot program begin in September 1994 (Minutes, Meeting of the School of Education Faculty, June 8, 1994). On June 15, the Graduate Council “voted the proposed pilot doctoral program in Leadership with the understanding that the program will be reviewed and reported to the Graduate Council at the end of the fall and spring quarters of 1994–1995” (Minutes, Andrews University Graduate Council #68, June 15, 1994).

**Faculty Facts**

The Leadership Program at Andrews University would not have been accomplished without the efforts of a creative, dedicated faculty. As stated earlier, Green, Penner, and Tucker had been discussing the development of an innovative graduate program well before the May 16 meeting of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team. I can find no specific date for when the first of these discussions occurred, but the reconstruction of the chronology clearly implies that—in order for the Graduate Degree Program in Teaching and Learning at Andrews University to be completed by May 5—the first discussion more than likely took place no later than late April.
The Conceptual Faculty

As is recorded in the May 16 minutes, every member of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team made the commitment to “be involved in the orientation,” the 2-week on-campus experience that would serve as the initiation to the Leadership Program. Subsequently, although there is some overlap between them, two faculty groups evolved. The conceptual faculty designed the program; the charter faculty delivered the program.

According to the May 16 minutes, the original development team consisted of “Bill Green, Dave Penner, and Jim Tucker” (Minutes, School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team, May 16, 1994). Neither Thayer nor Freed was a member of that team. Thayer began to take part in the cafeteria meetings, donating his time and expertise to help to establish the program. Freed remained a member of the School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team and continued to attend the scheduled meetings of that committee. In addition, she and Donna Habenicht, from the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology, later became members of the Leadership Program team (Minutes, School of Education Reorganization-Facilitating Team, May 26, 1994). After considering the amount of time that she would need to invest in the project, Habenicht withdrew from the team, but Freed continued and as of this writing serves as chair of the Leadership Program.

The conceptual faculty, then, consisted of Green, Penner, Thayer, and Tucker. Their task was to create a program that would be rigorous enough to lead to a doctorate, responsive enough to adapt to the specific needs of individual students, and flexible enough to meet the time restrictions of
professionals. The program also would have to be successful enough to offset the current fiscal dilemma without sacrificing two full-time faculty positions.

According to Thayer, “most of the components [of the evolving program] were things that all of us had wanted and believed in for a long time but never had a real, practical opportunity to discuss, develop, and implement” (Thayer, interview, June 20, 2002). And as Tucker emphasizes,

We didn’t stop to think about the philosophical position here. There was a process we went through . . . but it was all practical. It was pragmatic. We had a job to get done. We had to get it passed. We had to have a new program. We intuitively believed it was the right thing to do, and we just pressed to that end. (Tucker, interview, July 17, 2002)

All four members of the conceptual faculty assert that no one took charge of the meetings but, rather, that all of them shared equally in the process. “I don’t think we worried much about roles. We pretty much did our own thing,” Thayer remembers (Thayer, interview, June 20, 2002). As Penner explains,

Nobody was calling regular meetings. Often we said, “We’ll see you tomorrow at lunch,” and we often had assignments when we left lunch. Like, “You do this and you do this and you do this and let’s come back and do that.” Particularly once we got rolling on the thing, then when we had a deadline . . . to get to grad council, so on. We really did then begin giving assignments, but we sort of volunteered or appointed somebody else. But it wasn’t a single person saying, “You do that.” And that was a lot of fun to operate in a group that did not have a hierarchy. We were all in there together. (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002)

Although roles were not assigned, the fact that the members of the conceptual faculty assumed necessary roles expedited the process of formulating the details of the program and of assuring that it would meet the requirements for a viable graduate program. Thayer, for example, took on the responsibility for working with appropriate Andrews University officials in order to facilitate the process of meeting University approval. Penner also “had connections in the
administration—and they were quite useful—so sometimes I was sent over to do
something in the [administration] building” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002).

As dean of the School of Education, Minder also played a critical role in
the development of the Leadership Program—that of allowing the faculty to take
a calculated risk. “I don’t remember that [he] was ever much of a factor in the
decision-making. He pretty much went along with us,” Thayer remembers
(Thayer, interview, June 20, 2002). Tucker elaborates:

He was an entrepreneur. He was willing to try new things—unusually so.
He didn’t come from higher education. He came from K-12 administra-
tion, and he came in with a fresh set of ideas. But they were all connected
to money. And if we could show that we could increase the University’s
bottom line, he would give us some support until it didn’t work. (Tucker,
interview, July 17, 2002)

Green makes the following observation about Minder’s role:

One of the significant parts of this working drama, at least for me, was
that the university administration allowed us to propose the program as
one way to eliminate a significant part of the budget cut that we were
required to make. My strong belief is that they would not have allowed
us to do that—that is, put off the actual cut—if it had not been for the
fiscal responsibility of Warren Minder. They trusted him to bring the
budget under control and to actually make the kind of money that we
proposed. If Warren had not been in that position, and if the top
administration in the university had not explicitly trusted him in regard to
the budget, this could never have happened. Warren, in my mind, is a
pivotal player in this entire drama. (Green, e-mail, April 19, 2010)

(In spring 1994, I remember walking down the hall of the School of Education
with Minder and Tucker while they discussed the program. Minder said
something to this effect: “You can try this, Jim. But the minute that this starts
losing money, it will have to end.”)

The conceptual faculty spent hundreds of hours developing the
Leadership Program, and they did so with no decrease in their other
responsibilities. In this case, the collective memory is sharp. As Thayer explains,
“I don’t recall any of us getting any release-time for anything we did related to Leadership at the beginning. . . . All of us did it because it was extremely exhilarating. Great colleagues, great students, great potential” (Thayer, interview, July 17, 2002).

Penner adds that not only were the faculty excited, they also were practical: “We all agreed that for one year we would do it without any credit to our load. In that we agreed with Warren [Minder], and Warren needed to go to the administration. [Doing this without getting release-time] was part of the deal” (Penner, interview, July 17, 2002). Green and Tucker echo Penner’s memory, as the following exchange from the July 17, 2002, interview demonstrates:

**Green:** One of the things that we wanted to do—because we were asked to cut money out of the budget and we didn’t want to do that—we felt that we would have to make a proposal that was strong enough and credible enough that the higher administration would buy into it and . . . not administer the cut . . . [because] . . . the program that we were proposing was going to get additional students . . . [and] . . . would bring additional money into it. We also agreed that we would not take teacher load for handling the students for that first year.

**Tucker:** And that was very important, because we wouldn’t have been able to sell it if we had asked for load credit. We agreed to do the whole program, the four of us, in addition to our full teaching load.

**Green:** In my little bit of experience outside of that program in working and helping to design it and get it started, I don’t know of another group that would take that kind of added responsibility on. I’m at Northern Caribbean [University] now, and they never have enough money for anything. There are lots of students. There is not a problem getting students there at all. But they do not have the idea that if they want to do something that’s outstanding or different or that needs more money that they are going to sacrifice everything. And even here at Andrews, I doubt we could do it again, because four people said, “We are going to work very, very hard for a year to get something going, and we’re not asking for anything in return.”

Why did they do it? Tucker speaks for the others when he states,
[I did it] because I believed in it. It was something that seemed to me the right thing to do. And it was going to demonstrate something that we would not have been able to demonstrate any other way. So it required that level of sacrifice to show that it would work. (Tucker, interview, July 17, 2002)

As for the time factor, as Thayer asserts, “Most teachers find time to do the things that they are excited about” (Thayer, interview, July 17, 2002).

A Balance of Styles

Green, Penner, Thayer, and Tucker were enthusiastic about starting an innovative graduate program in the School of Education, and they were willing to expend the time and effort to realize their goal. But as a group they may have had one other important factor in their favor: As measured by the Gregorc Style Delineator, they each had a different mind style—each with its own set of skills—that merged into a holistic and balanced creative entity.

The Gregorc Style Delineator identifies two perceptual qualities and two ordering abilities:

1. Someone with the concrete quality registers information through his or her five senses and deals with the obvious. He or she does not search for hidden meanings or attempt to find relationships between or among ideas.

2. Someone with the abstract quality visualizes ideas and believes in what could be instead of what is. He or she uses intuition and imagination to see beyond the obvious.

3. Someone with the sequential ability organizes information in a linear, orderly way. He or she tends to be logical and traditional and prefers to follow a plan rather than to rely on impulse.
4. Someone with the random ability organizes information in no particular order, starting in the middle, eliminating steps, or working from the end to the beginning when dealing with a problem. He or she prefers to act on an impulse than to follow a plan (Gregorc, 1985).

Everyone has some of all four characteristics, which in turn tend to combine in one of four predominant combinations: concrete-sequential (CS), abstract-random (AR), abstract-sequential (AS), and concrete-random (CR). Without dwelling on the somewhat metaphysical nature of the Gregorc method, I do want to emphasize that the members of the conceptual faculty were measurably different, at least according to the Gregorc criteria. Green is an abstract-sequential. Penner is a concrete-random. Thayer is a concrete-sequential. And Tucker is an abstract-random.

Additionally, the four members of the conceptual faculty seem to have formed what Jean Lipman-Blumen and Harold J. Leavitt (1999) call a “hot group.” Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt open the preface to their book with the following statement: “The time is ripe for large hierarchical, well-ordered organizations to make room for small, egalitarian, disordered hot groups” (p. xiii). A hot group, they state, is “a special state of mind. . . . The hot group state of mind is task-obsessed and full of passion. It is always coupled with a distinctive way of behaving, a style that is intense, sharply focused, and full-bore” (p. 3). In addition, hot groups use “cut-and-try strategies, so leaders have to be comfortable with ambiguity and near-chaos” (p. 92). They “grow best in free, open, interactive environments. . . . They thrive on urgency. . . . [And] they can work miracles in times of crisis” (p. 237).
(A hot group is, it would seem, precisely what the conceptual faculty embodied. When those four faculty members were together, the creative energy was almost tangible, and it was obvious that the other individuals who listened to them plan felt their excitement. Even during my interviews with them several years later, their eyes lighted up with their recollections—and in one case, the faculty member stated wistfully that he missed those days.)

The Charter Faculty

The charter faculty consisted of Green, Penner, Tucker, and Thayer, as well as Freed. Their task was to implement the program designed by the conceptual faculty; they all donated their time to do so. The charter faculty shared the activities on the 1994 orientation schedule—guiding the events that best fit their professional areas of expertise (see Appendix C for a facsimile of the orientation schedule). During the 2-week orientation, the charter faculty and the doctoral students discussed such competency-related topics as instruction, change, assessment, technology, and research. They also led discussions about several books: In the Name of Jesus: Reflections on Christian Leadership (Henri J. Nouwen, 1989), The Religion of Power (Cheryl Forbes, 1988), No Contest: The Case Against Competition (Alfie Kohn, 1992), The Different Drum: Community Making and Peace (M. Scott Peck, 1987), Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World (Margaret J. Wheatley, 1994).

(It was an intensive, frustrating 2 weeks for me. I was one of the few participants who had only a bachelor’s degree, I hated working in groups and making daily journal entries, and I had to spend the days with more than 20 people I didn’t know. When the faculty led us to the technology lab, where we
were each assigned e-mail addresses and began to learn how to use a new way of communicating, I was sure that I had made a mistake by enrolling in the program.)

Disproving the Skeptics

The Leadership Program began as a pilot program on September 11, 1994.

Green described the experience as being on “pretty much of an island. But it didn’t matter to us. We were euphoric at that point” (Green, interview, July 17, 2002). As Thayer explained, many of the SED faculty were “quite traditional and were not too excited about the innovative ideas—things that were never done. They were more interested in . . . a program to lock-step students through as efficiently as possible” (Thayer, interview, July 17, 2002). Aronowitz (2000) explains the phenomenon in this way:

Most faculty have forgotten that the main function of the higher learning and of its faculty is not "teaching" but providing an intellectual environment that will encourage the learner to dispense with intellectual authorities and to become her own authority. In the main, the learner becomes autonomous when she can confront the letter and the (p. 143) meaning of the text directly, without the mediation of the teacher. This does not exclude the value of mentorship, but the object is to achieve separation rather than acolytism. (pp. 143, 144)

Three faculty members from two different SED departments told me that the program would fail. In the first case, the faculty member expressed the fear that he would end up chairing half of the dissertations of the 20 people in the first cohort—which would overload his already full schedule. What he failed to understand was that rather than using their time to teach courses, the Leadership faculty would serve as mentors who would advise and guide the dissertation process as well as competency fulfillment.
In the second case, a faculty member invited several other faculty members and their spouses to dinner. My husband, Jim Tucker, and I were part of that group. While we were there, one of the dinner guests asked Jim, “When the program fails—and it will fail!—what are you going to do?” In that instance, he didn’t give a reason for his misgivings. In other situations, however, I heard him criticize the program for not being rigorous. Again, Aronowitz (2000) may have the answer when he points out that the effective intellectual environment nurtures the learner to become autonomous.

In the third case, the faculty member did not predict failure, but she did express skepticism when she told me that she would not invest her time in the program until it had proved that it would endure.

“We were constantly told that we should prepare [for the collapse of the program]. It never occurred to me that that would happen,” Tucker asserts (Tucker, interview, July 17, 2002). “Me neither!” Green agrees (Green, interview, July 17, 2002).

Despite negative predictions, the Leadership Program faculty persevered and the program grew. September 2013 marked the 19th year of the Leadership Program at Andrews University. In addition, the program has been offered through Andrews in Europe and in South America, and faculty members from the Andrews program have been directly involved in the development of similar programs at the University of Santo Amaro, in São Paulo, Brazil; at Northern Caribbean University in Mandeville, Jamaica; Peruvian Union University, in Lima, Peru; and at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.
CHAPTER 3

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH AND THIS STUDY

Introduction

John W. Creswell (2013) defines qualitative approach to research in the following way:

Qualitative research is an inquiry approach useful for exploring and understanding a central phenomenon. To learn about this phenomenon, the inquirer asks participants broad, general questions, collects the detailed views of participants in the form of words or images, and analyzes the information for description and themes. From this data, the researcher interprets the meaning of the information, drawing on personal reflections and past research. The final structure of the final report is flexible, and it displays the researcher’s biases and thoughts. (p. 262)

James H. McMillan and Sally Schumacher (2000) stress that qualitative research is defined by its analytical nature, which in turn drives the methodological characteristics of such research:

These methodological characteristics include a research topic related to past events, primary sources as data, techniques of criticism used in searching for facts, and interpretive explanations. Because these characteristics are general, they may be applied in different ways within a particular study. (p. 499)

Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln (1992) supplement Creswell’s description by contrasting the quantitative approach with the qualitative approach. Their statement, below, suggests that the quantitative approach has not satisfied all needs of educational research:

The epistemological assumptions on which [quantitative research] was based (logical positivism and radical relativism), however appropriate to the hard sciences (a contention that is itself debatable), were not well met
in the phenomenology of human behavior. Research results proved to be inconclusive, difficult to aggregate, and virtually impossible to relate to happenings in the real world. A competing paradigm [qualitative research], is dedicated to the study of behavioral phenomena in situ and using methods drawn from ethnography, anthropology, and sociological field studies, began to gain in popularity. (p. xx)

When the goal is to provide an in-depth understanding of the event being studied, Meredith D. Gall, and Joyce P. Gall, and Walter R. Borg (2007) add, the flexible design, analytical intent, and experiential character embedded in qualitative methods are suitable for conducting educational research.

As researchers collect data and gain insight into particular phenomena, they can change the case on which the study will focus, adopt new data-collection methods, and frame new questions. In contrast, quantitative research designs are difficult to change once they are set in motion. (p. 485)

As Joseph A. Maxwell explains, “quantitative researchers tend to be interested in whether and to what extent variance in x causes variance in y. Qualitative researchers, however, tend to ask how x plays a role in causing y, what the process is that connects x and y” (2005, p. 22; 2013, p. 31).

**Qualitative Researchers and This Study**

In *The Enlightened Eye*, Elliot Eisner (1991) defines what he deems the six features of a qualitative study (see Fig. 1). In the next several pages, I describe each feature and, where appropriate, augment Eisner’s general ideas with relevant comments from other authorities in qualitative research. Additionally, in order to make these descriptions and comments germane to this study of the Leadership Program at Andrews University (also referred to as “the Leadership Program” and “Leadership”), I explain how each component is relevant.
Figure 1. Application of Elliot Eisner’s six features of a qualitative study.
Feature 1: The Qualitative Study Is Field-focused

The field encompasses anything that serves as an important influence on the subject matter of the study (Eisner, 1991). Such influences include tangible as well as abstract components. With regard to this study, the tangible field includes but is not limited to the buildings and grounds of Andrews University campus. The physical field also encompasses such off-campus settings as the Roundtable (the annual conference of faculty and participants), regional-group meetings (regularly occurring study-groups, the members of which are usually geographically designated), and faculty meetings. Components of the abstract field include student services, library services, and other similar resources. The abstract field also includes relationships represented by e-mail and phone interaction among participants, among faculty, and between participants and faculty.

Feature 2: The Qualitative Study Uses the Self as an Instrument

The self “is the instrument that engages the situation and makes sense of it. This is done without the aid of an observation schedule; it is not a matter of checking behaviors, but rather of perceiving their presence and interpreting their significance” (Eisner, 1991, p. 34).

Jerome Kirk and Marc L. Miller (1986) express the opinion that the practice of using oneself as an instrument allows the researcher to “[watch] people in their own territory and [interact] with them in their own language, on their own terms” (as cited in Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007, p. 547). Engaging in conversation, including in the form of interviews, is an important part of using oneself as an instrument.
Maxwell is particularly persuasive about using a combination of observation and conversation when conducting qualitative inquiries:

Although observation often provides a direct and powerful way of learning about people’s behavior and the context in which this occurs, interviewing can also be a valuable way of gaining a description of actions and events—often the only way, for events that took place in the past or ones to which you cannot gain observational access. Interviews can also provide additional information that was missed in observation, and that can be used to check the accuracy of the observations. (2005, p. 94; 2013, p. 103)

Guba and Lincoln (1992) echo Maxwell’s assertion:

Of all the means of exchanging information or gathering data known to man, perhaps the oldest and most respected is the conversation. Simple or complex, face-to-face exchanges between human beings have served for eons to convey messages, express sympathy, declare war, make truces, and preserve history. As an extension of that heritage, interviewing . . . is perhaps the oldest and certainly one of the most respected of the tools that the inquirer can use. (p. 153)

Guba and Lincoln (1992) call this combination of watching and interacting participant-observation.

[Participant-observation is] a form of inquiry in which the inquirer—the observer—is playing two roles. First of all, of course, he is an observer; as such, he is responsible to persons outside the milieu being observed. But he is also a genuine participant; that is, he is a member of the group, and he has a stake in the group’s activity and the outcomes of that activity. (p. 190)

In Educational Research: An Introduction, Borg and Gall (1983) assert that the strength of qualitative methods lies in the fact that “they admittedly use the researcher’s individual experience and perspective as a tool for exploring phenomena” (p. 34). Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) state that the research report should “reveal the researcher’s perspective, thus enabling readers to determine whether the researcher’s perspective on the phenomenon is similar to theirs” (p. 484). Guba and Lincoln (1992) further state that participant-observation is particularly beneficial because the method “maximizes the inquirer’s ability to
grasp motives, beliefs, concerns, interests, unconscious behaviors, customs, and the like” (p. 193). Participant-observation “provides the inquirer with access to the emotional reactions of the group introspectively—that is, in a real sense it permits the observer to use himself as a data source” and “allow[s] the observer to build on tacit knowledge, both his own and that of members of the group” (Guba & Lincoln, 1992, p. 193). And according to Howard S. Becker and Blanche Geer (1957),

Long-term participant-observation provides more complete data about specific situations and events than any other method. Not only does it provide more, and more different kinds, of data, but also the data are more direct and less dependent on inference. Repeated observations and interviews, as well as the sustained presence of the researcher in the setting studied, can help to rule out spurious [misbegotten; artificial] associations and premature theories. They also allow a much greater opportunity to develop and test alternative hypotheses during the course of the research. (as cited in Maxwell, 2005, p. 126; 2013, p. 126)

With regard to the Leadership Program, I have been a participant-observer in several ways since 1994, year of the program’s inception. First, I have, in essence, been immersed in this study for 19 years. In early 1994, four faculty members met in the Andrews University cafeteria almost every weekday for 1 to 2 hours to discuss the creation of a program designed to increase revenue while providing a non-traditional approach to earning a doctorate. I was present at most of those lunchtime conversations, and as a result of what I heard, enrolled as a member of the first cohort. I also organized the first orientation.

I have been involved in the Leadership Program in other ways as well:

Marketing. In 1994, I wrote a press release about the then-new graduate program for the Andrews University magazine, Focus. In 1995, I drafted the description of the program for the Andrews University Bulletin. And in 1996, I designed and produced the original Leadership stationery and promotional
package (see Appendix D). Until 2001, when the University’s News and Media Relations department assumed promotional responsibilities for all campus events and programs, I wrote and edited all print-medium publicity for the program. In 2002, the promotional package that I had created in 1995 were adapted for the Leadership website. Additionally, I edited and produced two PowerPoint presentations, one in 1999 and the other in 2003. Each presentation was tailored for a specific audience: the first, for the Leadership faculty, with the focus on the relationship between education and leadership; the second, for a group of potential Leadership candidates, with the focus on the relationship between business and education.

Program-representation and -documentation. First, throughout my years as a participant-observer, I have closely monitored policy changes made since the inception of the program by attending segments of Leadership orientations in the United States, Europe, South America, and the Caribbean and by representing the 1994, 1995, and 1996 cohorts at two Leadership Program retreats. From 2002 through 2006, I delivered parts of Leadership orientation for Andrews University, Northern Caribbean University (Jamaica), and the Universidade de Santo Amaro (São Paulo, Brazil). In preparation for working with newly enrolled participants, I used effective educational methods to create orientation materials and to, as a result, fulfill competency requirements while supporting the program.

Second, I developed a working-relationship with Carol Castillo, who served as program manager from 1999 through 2004. Mrs. Castillo was an invaluable resource for clarifying issues and providing nonconfidential program documents. In 2001, she and I collaborated on a set of guidelines specific to the
Leadership Program. The purpose of the guidelines was to begin to develop a Leadership Handbook that would augment the more comprehensive Handbook for Doctoral Candidates of the School of Education.

Third, I have developed friendships and professional relationships with many other Leadership participants. I have served as a confidant to participants from several cohorts—serving as a confidant, clarifying misconceptions, and making suggestions about ways to approach developing the I.D.P. and other program requirements. In addition, I have maintained a collegial relationship with most of the former faculty members and many of the current ones.

I regard those relationships, as well as the fact that James Tucker, one of the creators of the program, is my husband, to be benefits. Sometimes novelists express ideas best: In Dean James’s novel Decorated to Death (2004), the protagonist, Simon Kirby-Jones, is a true-crime writer. Kirby-Jones persuasively articulates the advantages of being a participant-observer when trying to gather information. When addressing other individuals who, with himself, have been involved in a murder, Kirby-Jones defends his proposal to document the event himself in this way:

I realize that you will doubtless think this [practice] is in questionable taste, but I would also beg you to consider for a moment how much more palatable it will be in the long run for you to have someone sympathetic, someone who has already met you, rather than a complete stranger, write the book that must inevitably follow this regrettable occurrence. (p. 161)

Feature 3: The Qualitative Study Has an Interpretive Character

Explaining the reason why something happens is an essential component of qualitative research (Borg & Gall, 1981, 1992; Gall et al., 2007; McMillan & Schumacher, 2000). Clifford Geertz (1973) describes man as “an animal
suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun” (p. 5). The qualitative researcher uses observation and experience to understand an event and to explain that event in a way that causes others to share in the understanding. Geertz calls the practice **thick description**.

Maxwell (2005) points out that thick description, as Geertz uses the term, is “description that incorporates the intentions of the actors and the codes of significance that give their actions meaning for them. . . . It has nothing to do with the amount of detail provided” (p. 110). The qualitative researcher delves beyond the superficial and goes beyond mere reporting. Consequently, the researcher must “take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning” (Geertz, 1973, p. 5). Eisner (1991) agrees. He regards in-depth description as “an effort aimed at interpretation, at getting below the surface to the most enigmatic aspect of the human condition: the construction of meaning” (p. 15).

In order to explore the reasons behind the issues, I (a) investigated the theoretical foundations of the program instead of simply listing requirements for completion, (b) explored the reasons why some participants became disheartened about completing the program and why other participants reveled in the experience, (c) explored and related views of faculty members, and (d) perused minutes of faculty meetings, thereby ascertaining the motives behind policy changes and the reasons behind misunderstandings about program practices.
Feature 4: The Qualitative Study Uses Expressive Language

The qualitative researcher incorporates evocative words into the account. Adjectives, adverbs, and strong verbs add life to the writing, helping the reader to experience the event emotionally as well as visually. Because I am more interested in the whys and hows behind the numbers than in the numbers themselves, written descriptions are infinitely more intriguing and convey more meaning than are numerical depictions and statistical analyses.

As Maxwell cautions, however, “qualitative studies have an implicit quantitative component” (2005, p. 128; 2013, p. 128). This report, then, contains graphs to illustrate such measurable factors as demographics of Leadership’s general population and interview respondents, interview response-rates, and types of responses.

Feature 5: The Qualitative Study Pays Attention to Particulars

According to Ward Goodenough (1971), a culture is a system with patterns of behavior and patterns for behavior. These patterns include “standards for deciding what is, standards for deciding what can be, standards for deciding how one feels about it, standards for deciding how to go about doing it” (p. 21). James P. Spradley (1979) adds that culture is “the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and generate social behavior” (p. 5). James H. Chilcott (1987) summarizes his views and the views of several other anthropologists by stating that culture is an interactive collection of verbal and nonverbal symbols, meaningful rituals, and interpretable social drama. The study of culture, he says, can encompass a vast variety of topics, including educational innovations. Culture, then, can be described as a group of people in
a setting who, as the axiom succinctly states, believe that “we’re all in this together”—and act accordingly. If the descriptions put forth by Goodenough, Spradley, and Chilcott are accurate, then the Leadership Program at Andrews University is a culture.

Rather than transform elements into generic statements, qualitative research is designed to maintain the distinct characteristics of a situation, event, or individual that forms a component of a cultural system. That individuality provides “a sense of uniqueness” (Eisner, 1991, p. 39) to what is being observed. Such a narrative allows for making comparisons within a single setting (the same place, the same time, the same group of people) and among several settings (different places, different times, different people) (Eisner, 1991).

In this study, I have related details of what has happened and what is happening within the Leadership Program in order to exemplify the program and to personify its participants, specifically with regard to effective and efficient learning among the adult population that it serves. In doing so, I have provided and corroborated the process by which the program was established and the reasons for the program’s design. In addition, I used the vocabulary specific to Leadership and defined that vocabulary in the context in which it is used. Such common words and terms as cohort, regional group, and celebration take on specialized meanings in the Leadership Program.

Feature 6: The Qualitative Study Is Believable. It Is Coherent, Insightful, and Has Instrumental Utility

Using a variety of sources of information gives credence to a qualitative study and makes it more than a search for causative or correlative conclusions. The qualitative study includes a social element in which knowledge is contextual
and reasons are integral. As a result, presentation and interpretation of the data have, to use Eisner’s (1991) words, a “dynamic and living quality” (p. 39).

A wide range of accessible written and oral sources informs the creation and implementation of the Leadership Program. Jacques Barzun and Henry H. Graff (2004) call such sources “the evidence of history” (p. 119) and divide them into two categories: records and relics. McMillan and Schumacher (2000) classify sources for analytical work into three categories: documents, oral testimonies, and relics. For the most part, the contents of both categorical systems overlap. I chose to use McMillan and Schumacher’s model to create the following list because using the three-category format seemed better suited to Leadership sources material.

1. Documents, or records of past events, consist of written or printed materials deliberately prepared to serve a historical or practical purpose. Documents may be official or unofficial, private or public, published or unpublished—or they may incorporate any combination of those features. In the case of Leadership, documents include program newsletters and press releases, promotional material, enrollment and graduation records, official minutes of regional-group and faculty meetings, orientation schedules, handbooks, and the website.

2. Oral testimonies, or records of the spoken word, are the taped or transcribed recollections of people who have witnessed events. Oral testimonies may be autobiographical or they may be in-depth interviews. They may serve as primary evidence or as supplemental documentary evidence. With regard to Leadership, oral testimonies primarily consist of interviews with faculty and participants and conversations with the program manager.
3. *Relics* are objects that were not intentionally created as sources of historical fact but that do provide information about the history of the program. Relics of the Leadership Program include the following examples:

a. Discussion books, such as *Leadership and the New Science*, by Margaret J. Wheatley (1992), and *Servant Leadership*, by Robert K. Greenleaf (1977).

b. Physical components of group activities, such as StarPower, the simulation of organizational dynamics featured in the program’s orientation.

c. Symbols of the program’s philosophy, such as the flags on display at the annual conferences (to represent the international aspect of the program) and the sword-in-the-stone replicas given to attendees of one of the conferences (to represent the collaborative, “roundtable” aspect of the program).

d. Artifacts of program requirements, such as participant portfolios.

In order to cross-validate the findings in conducting the research for this study, I supplemented my own experience by using the two other sources of data that McMillan and Schumacher (2000) suggest. Figure 2 illustrates the three data-sources.

![Figure 2. Cross-validation for this study.](image-url)
William Wiersma and Stephen G. Jurs (2005) succinctly state that “triangulation is qualitative cross-validation” (p. 256), and Wolcott (2001) maintains that the basic purpose of triangulation is to establish trustworthiness in qualitative inquiry. Triangulation, asserts Maxwell, “reduces the risk that your conclusions will reflect only the systematic biases or limitations of a specific source or method, and allows you to gain a broader and more secure understanding of the issues you are investigating” (2005, p. 102; 2013, 102).

Comparing primary sources enabled me to interpret and explain—not to simply describe—the events and interactions that I observed and the comments that I collected. Examining the sources also allowed me to substantiate commonly believed facts, to evaluate perceptions, to clarify questionable or conflicting information, to authenticate findings, to clarify issues, and to resolve misunderstandings (McMillan & Schumacher, 2000; Wolcott, 2001).

**Subjectivity in Qualitative Research**

According to Denis C. Phillips (1990), the argument between objectivity and subjectivity is based on a disagreement between belief-systems; that is, when used in research, the terms *objectivity* and *subjectivity* stem from different philosophical roots. Kathryn Borman, Margaret LeCompte, and Judith Goetz (1986) explain that on the one hand, *objective* is grounded in the traditional, scientific method and is therefore a generally commendatory term among proponents of quantitative research. On the other hand, *subjective* stems from cultural anthropology and often carries negative connotations for quantitative researchers. Leslie G. and Michael W. Apple (1990) state that proponents of objective research therefore view subjective, or qualitative, methodology as
biased, value-laden, and prejudicial. Such proponents presume that a study
designed to allow the researcher to talk openly to people about their culture—
and to do so in their natural environment—results in trivial description at best
and distortion of the truth at worst (as cited in Phillips, 1990).

Despite attempts to describe objectivity and subjectivity as separate and
mutually exclusive—with objective at one end of the truth-seeking continuum
and subjective at the other—the differences between the two orientations are
ambiguous. Roman and Apple (1990) present the issue of objectivity vs.
subjectivity as a “constantly shifting” (p. 38) power-struggle and emphasize that
the presence of subjectivity does not guarantee the absence of objectivity (or vice
versa). Eisner (1991) is particularly direct with regard to the question of
objectivity vs. subjectivity in research. He asserts that no matter what preventive
measures we take, we cannot completely separate our own view of reality from
reality itself—and that to attempt to do so closes the door to potentially valuable
information.

Subjectivity, therefore, should be seen not as a weapon but as a tool
(Wolcott, 1975). William H. Green adds, “We have, in general, been brainwashed
with the idea that objectivity is better than subjectivity. I’m not convinced that it
is” (personal communication, October 29, 2003). Wolcott (1992) makes a strong
statement in favor of subjectivity when he strips the term of all euphemistic
trappings by using the word “bias” and states that “bias is essential to the
conduct of research” (p. 7).

If there were any such entity as completely unbiased researchers, they
would be doomed to sit forever in their offices, unable to take even the
first step that might lead to the study of one thing in favor of something
else. (Wolcott, 1992, p. 7)
Subjectivity in Action

In order to conduct and report accurate, dependable qualitative research, the researcher first must exercise what Frederick Erickson (1973) and Lee S. Shulman (1981) call disciplined subjectivity. While collecting data, disciplined subjectivity causes the researcher to rigorously and consciously—as well as conscientiously—examine every detail of the research process, including every question asked and every relationship established. Such self-imposed discipline, asserts Erickson (1973), “assists qualitative researchers in avoiding excessive subjectivity . . . [because they] . . . develop an awareness, not always shared by other paradigms, that instrumentation cannot be relied on to expunge bias” (p. 43).

But the awareness of subjectivity is not enough. That awareness must have a practical—even tangible—component. As Lee Cronbach and Patrick Suppes (1969) aver, the report also should reflect disciplined inquiry.

Disciplined inquiry has a quality that distinguishes it from other sources of opinion and belief. The disciplined inquiry is conducted and reported in such a way that the argument can be painstakingly examined. The report does not depend for its appeal on the eloquence of the writer or on any surface plausibility. (p. 5)

Disciplined inquiry is genuine and emergent and does not rely on a predetermined sequence of data-collection and data-reporting methods. As Cronbach and Suppes (1969) explain,

Disciplined inquiry does not necessarily follow well-established, formal procedures. Some of the most excellent inquiry is free ranging and speculative in its initial stages, trying what might seem to be bizarre combinations of ideas and procedures, or restlessly casting about for ideas. (p. 16)

The credible report is based on collected facts, on observations, and on experiences. Frederick Erickson (1973) stipulates that such a report include
“empirical assertions; narrative vignettes; quotations from observational fieldnotes and interviews, maps, tables, or figures; interpretive commentary; theoretical discussion; and a description of the research process itself” (as cited in Mary Lee Smith, 1987, p. 177). Conclusions, Smith adds, are “logically argued from empirical evidence” (Smith, 1987, p. 180). Chilcott (1987) adds that descriptive fieldnotes, interviews, and documentary evidence support the conclusions and take the report beyond superficiality.

Validity and Reliability in Qualitative Research

When designing a quantitative research-project, issues regarding validity and reliability should be addressed from the outset (Chilcott, 1987; Creswell, 2007, 2013; Gall et al., 2007; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). These concepts question the consistency and dependability of the measurement instrument used in such a study. Was the instrument appropriate for the subject of the study? If used again, would it yield the same or nearly the same results?

In qualitative research, however, the terms are not instrument-specific (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). Validity and reliability are not issues—not because they are unimportant but because “all [italics added] research is concerned with producing valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner” (p. 198). Rather, as Sharan Merriam (1998) asserts, the critical issues in qualitative studies are credibility and trustworthiness. Qualitative researchers must pay particular attention to the way in which the research is conducted and reported because “the applied nature of educational inquiry . . . makes it imperative that researchers have confidence in the conduct of the investigation and in the results of any particular study” (Merriam, 1998, p. 199).
Maxwell (2005, 2013) compiled a concise list of factors critical to promoting validity in qualitative research. Merriam (1998) did the same in order to increase the trustworthiness of a study. Although their lists overlap to some degree, they each contain unique and complementary strategies, and, when combined, seem particularly appropriate for this study of the Leadership Program. Maxwell’s (2005, pp. 126–129; 2013, pp. 126–129) list of strategies, and how I addressed each, is as follows:

1. **Intensive, long-term involvement.** I have been a participant-observer in the Leadership Program since 1994.

2. **“Rich” data.** I used transcripts of interviews with participants and faculty of the Leadership Program, minutes of Leadership faculty meetings, and other documentation as data sources.

3. **Respondent validation.** I solicited feedback about my data-collection and conclusions from the individuals who responded to the interview questions.

4. **Intervention.** Informally and formally, through casual conversations and as a representative at faculty retreats, respectively, I attempted to institute changes by advising faculty of respondents’ concerns.

5. **Searching for discrepant evidence and negative cases.** In analyzing the interviews and reviewing the minutes, I searched for corroboration of whether or not an out of the-mainstream comment, opinion, or perception was supportable.

6. **Triangulation.** I used multiple investigators, sources, and methods in order to corroborate the findings.

7. **Quasi-statistics.** I used simple numerical representations of such data as demographics and response-rates.
8. **Comparison.** I interviewed participants from a variety of annual cohorts, regional groups, and professions in order to discover similarities and differences among several settings.

Merriam’s (1998) six ways to ensure the credibility and trustworthiness and how I dealt with them is as follows:

1. **Member checks.** I allowed the people from whom data were collected to verify my interpretations.

2. **Long-term observation or repeated observations of the same site.** I gathered data over time to increase their validity.

3. **Peer examination.** I allowed colleagues to review and comment on the findings.

4. **Collaborative modes of research.** I involved participants in every phase of the research.

5. **Researcher’s biases.** I clarified my relationships, role, and assumptions at the outset.

6. **Triangulation.** I used multiple investigators, sources, and methods in order to corroborate the findings.

In the words of Barzun and Graff (2004), “facts seldom occur pure, free from interpretation or ideas. We all make the familiar distinction between ‘gathering facts’ and ‘expressing ideas,’ but in reality most of the facts we gather come dripping with ideas” (p. 145). Heeding those words, I used methods that allowed me to conduct a study and compile a report that is accurate and honest and reflects self-awareness. Chapter 4 contains a detailed description of those methods.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH PROCEDURE

The Interview Process

Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln (1992) state that “there are no ‘cookbook’ techniques or surefire recipes” for arranging and conducting interviews (p. 158). Joseph A. Maxwell (2013) also uses the cookbook metaphor.

As Elliott W. Eisner (1991) explains,

I know of no “method” for the conduct of qualitative inquiry in general or for educational criticism in particular. There is no codified body of procedures that will tell someone how to produce a perceptive, insightful, or illuminating study of the educational world. Unfortunately—or fortunately—in qualitative matters cookbooks ensure nothing. (p. 169)

I targeted two populations for this study of the Leadership Program at Andrews University. The first population consists of the 148 former or current participants of the Leadership Program for the cohort years 1994 through 2002; the second is all former and current full-time faculty members of the program from 1994 through 2002. The interview process for this study was an integrative, evolving, responsive one. Figure 3 illustrates the chronological development of the process.
Figure 3. Participant-interview process.
Phase 1: Selection of Participants

Researchers use both *purposive sampling* and *purposeful sampling* to describe selection strategies. Walter R. Borg and Meredith D. Gall (1983) as well as Michael Q. Patton (1990) use the former term; John W. Creswell (2007, 2013) as well as William Wiersma and Stephen G. Jurs (2005) use the latter. Both terms, in Maxwell’s opinion, are problematic, because “‘sampling’ . . . implies the purpose of ‘representing’ the population sampled” (2005, p. 88; 2013, p. 96).

In this study, I did not intend to find a representative sample of the participants of the Leadership Program in order to generalize to the entire participant population. Rather, I intended to discover the varied experiences of participants and faculty members in order to gain a comprehensive picture of the Leadership Program. As a result, I used what Maxwell calls *purposeful selection*—to choose the potential respondents for this study. “In [purposeful selection], particular settings, persons, or activities are selected deliberately to provide information that is particularly relevant to your questions and goals and that can’t be gotten as well from other choices” (2005, p. 97; 2013, p. 97). The participants whom I selected are characterized by the fact that they were “experimentally accessible” (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 241) and had “a special knowledge of or familiarity with the situation” (Guba & Lincoln, 1992, p. 166).

Note: As Guba and Lincoln suggest, throughout this dissertation I refer to the person being interviewed as a “respondent” rather than an “interviewee.”

The primary criterion for selection was that each potential respondent be a Leadership participant who was likely to take part in an interview, either in a face-to-face setting or online. Because the Leadership Program essentially is an
off-campus program with some on-campus requirements, convenience—in the form of participants who were likely to respond via e-mail—was essential.

The secondary criterion was that the group include graduates and current participants who represented several characteristics of the participant population. Making certain that the group included potential respondents from a variety of annual cohorts, advisors, and regional groups was critical to providing a comprehensive overview of participants’ views.

In order to determine the most likely candidates for the participant interviews, I consulted with Carol Castillo, program manager from 1999 through 2004. Following the general guidelines described above, she and I selected a minimum of five candidates from each annual cohort, increasing that number to six or seven when the cohorts consisted of more than 20 participants in order to enhance the variety of respondents. In only one case, the Detroit 2000 cohort, were we unable to list at least five potential respondents who fit the criteria. Table 2 illustrates, by annual cohort, the number of participants selected as well as the distribution of the respondents. Note: The regional-group names are abbreviated. Regional group information is included in order to demonstrate the regional-group distribution of the respondents. In addition, “A” designates participants who were active in the program during the interview process and “G” designates participants who had graduated at the time of the interview process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Regional Group</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>K–12 Educator</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–09</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NE/CH</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BD/OH</td>
<td>K–12 Admin.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–06</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>K–12 Educator</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Rel. Leader</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Higher-ed. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>K–12 Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>K–12 Educator</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Higher-ed Admin.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>K–12 Educator</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>K–12 Educator</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Religious Leader</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Religious Leader</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Higher-ed. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>K–12 Educator</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Higher-ed. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Religious Leader</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>K–12 Educator</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Religious Leader</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>K–12 Educator</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Corp. Admins.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-Detroit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F–07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Higher-ed. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>BS2</td>
<td>Higher-ed. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>BS2</td>
<td>Higher-ed. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–03</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Higher-ed. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Religious Leader</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MMC</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Corp. Admin.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F–05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Did not respond in any way.
** Advised me that they did not intend to respond.
*** Assured me that they would respond but did not do so even after repeated reminders and deadline extensions on my part and after repeated assurances on theirs. First deadline was June 30, 2003; final deadline was August 25, 2003.
Phase 2: Conducting Face-to-face Interviews of Participants

My objective for conducting interviews with participants was to make discoveries, not to verify preconceptions. The unstructured interview, “the backbone of field and naturalistic research and evaluation” (Guba & Lincoln, 1992, p. 154), was the most effective means to that end. As Gall et al. (2007) explain,

The unstructured interview does not involve a detailed interview guide. Instead, the interviewer asks questions that gradually lead the respondent to give the desired information. Usually the type of information sought is difficult for the respondent to express or is psychologically sensitive. For this reason, the interviewer must adapt continuously to the respondent’s state of mind. This format is highly subjective and time consuming. (p. 246)

Guba and Lincoln (1992) make the following qualifying statement:

Unlike the structured interview, the unstructured, or “elite,” interview is much less abrupt, remote, and arbitrary than is the structured interview. It is used most often in situations where the investigator is looking for nonstandardized and/or singular information. As a result, it tends to stress the exception, the deviation, the unusual interpretation, the new approach, the expert’s view, or the singular perspective. The unstructured interview has a very different rhythm from that of the structured interview; it tends to be very free flowing and it is likely to move however the respondent causes it to move because of the cues he provides. (p. 166)

In May 2002, I conducted face-to-face unstructured interviews with five participants individually and four participants in two pairs of two, for a total of nine participants and seven interviews. In the case of the paired interviews, one happened by chance (although both participants were on the list of potential respondents) and the other was scheduled.

I initiated the conversation by asking these two questions: (a) How did you find out about the Leadership Program? and (b) What made you decide to apply? I ended each interview with this question: If you could ask the faculty
one question—without fear of reprisal—what would it be? I did not, however, attempt to direct the conversation in any specific way because I intended to promote an atmosphere in which “the respondent’s responses [could] be explored and fruitful leads [could be] exploited” (Guba & Lincoln, 1992, p. 187).

Based on her in-depth study of moral philosophy, Karen R. Graham (2004) identifies the four conditions of moral well-being as privacy, identity, autonomy, and community. I hoped to preserve those conditions in conducting this study—and to thereby establish what Borg (1992) considers to be a clear and fair agreement with the respondents. To do so, I took the following steps:

1. Whenever possible, I conducted the interviews in a neutral location, such as in a restaurant over lunch or dinner—rather than in a more formal setting, such as a meeting-room—in order to make the process more of a conversation and less of an interrogation. I also took time to engage in casual conversation before asking questions that would lead to the information that would meet the objectives of this study.

2. I explained the purpose of the interview, revealing that the information I obtained would be used to help to provide a comprehensive picture of the Leadership Program and to share participants’ experiences with the faculty. Consequently, respondents became shareholders in the study.

3. I audiotaped each interview. The advantage of this method was fourfold: (a) it was nondisruptive, allowing the conversation to unfold naturally; (b) it provided a way to record the exact words of the respondent, reducing the risk of making errors, which may occur when working from written notes (Gall et al., 2007), (c) it provided a complete verbal record, which reduced any
tendency I might have to choose, albeit unconsciously, data that would favor my own biases, and (d) it established a permanent, unalterable record of the conversation that other individuals can review (Gall et al., 2007). “In interview studies,” Maxwell asserts, “such data require verbatim transcripts of the interviews, not just notes on what you felt was significant” (2005, p. 110; 2013, p. 126).

Gall et al. (2007) caution that a recording device may discourage respondents from sharing personal or sensitive information and feelings. When a respondent wanted to reveal information about an experience with a faculty member or with another participant but did not want the comments to become part of the written report, I turned off the recorder. Seven of the 9 respondents went “off the record” when information was highly personal and could result in the respondent’s being identified.

4. I assured each respondent that I would protect his or her identity. No one other than a third-party transcriptionist heard the tapes, each of which was labeled simply as Interview 1, Interview 2, Interview 3, and so forth. The transcriptionist was not acquainted with the respondents, so voice-recognition was not a concern. In the transcripts, codes replace the names of respondents. In addition, no identifying material, such as the respondent’s reference to his or her cohort year, advisor, or regional group, appears in the transcripts.

5. I listened to the interviews again, transcripts in hand, in order to pick up nuances and words missed during the initial run-through, correcting the transcripts when necessary.
6. I sent the transcript of the interviews, via e-mail, to each of the 9 respondents for their approval, clarification, and additional comments. All 9 replied.

7. I gave each respondent the opportunity to withdraw from the process at any time. None did so.

Phase 3: Developing the Master List of Interview Questions

As stated earlier, I encouraged the 9 respondents to speak spontaneously about their experiences in the Leadership Program. Although I did ask two initial questions and one final question to initiate and conclude the conversations, I did not restrict the discussion to any given aspect of the Leadership Program. Respondents expressed a number of similar opinions and common concerns, but each of them also raised one or more discrete issues. In order to incorporate all their comments, I read the transcripts again and made a comprehensive list of the specific issues raised by participants.

I took one additional action to augment the oral-testimony element of the triangulation process. Regional study-groups form an integral component of the Leadership Program, and I asked the other four members of my own group to discuss the program. The regional-group meeting took place at a local restaurant, and the members played ideas off each other, often all talking at the same time. I did not tape-record the meeting, but I did take notes. And I found it very difficult to take part in the discussion.

William Green, one of the creators of the program, attended. Within 7 years of the program’s inception, all four members of the conceptual faculty had resigned from their positions on the Leadership faculty. It did not surprise me
when primary concerns of my regional-group members were about upholding and practicing the original program values—values that they perceived had been changing. I also found it reassuring, from a research perspective, that the members of my regional group and the 9 interview respondents raised parallel issues. The consistency of the concerns of the two groups added validity to the research process. I integrated the nuances that they suggested into the list of issues that the original 9 respondents had raised and compiled a master list of interview questions.

After consolidating all the comments, I examined them for overlapping and recurring issues through a process that James Spradley (1979) calls domain analysis and several other experts, including Creswell (2007, 2013) and Wiersma and Jurs (2005), call coding. I then organized the resulting groups’ comments into broad, descriptive themes, and, finally, labeled the themes.

For consistency, I formatted the questions so that all the interviews were presented in a uniform style. I rephrased the issues raised by the 9 respondents as questions, making certain, as Borg and Gall (1983) advise, that they were clear, concise, positive, and pointed. For the most part, I phrased the questions either as reason-why questions, which address the respondents’ explanations for experiences or feelings, or as qualified yes-no questions, which attempt to probe the intensity of a feeling or belief (Guba & Lincoln, 1992). The resulting 31 questions, which appear in Appendix E, fell into nine major categories that range from finding out about and applying for acceptance into the Leadership Program to fulfilling the requirements for graduation.
Phase 4: Using the Master List of Interview Questions

After compiling the master list from the face-to-face interviews, I read the transcripts again. On the transcript of each respondent’s interview, I noted which questions from the master list he or she already had addressed. I then inserted the responses under the appropriate questions, and via e-mail, sent each respondent the master list of questions with those responses in place. I asked each respondent to answer any unanswered questions from the master list. A respondent, for example, may have addressed only 23 of the issues that appeared on the master list. In that case, my goal would be to get responses to the remaining 8. Again, all 9 respondents who had taken part in the face-to-face interviews replied.

It had taken had several months to complete the process to this point, and my overarching goal was to contact at least five Leadership participants from each annual cohort for the years 1994 through 2002. Mrs. Castillo and I had selected 54 potential respondents, including the 9 whom I interviewed in person. I needed a workable method by which to interview the 45 remaining participants.

Phase 5: Online Interviews of Participants

Although interviewing “does provide the richest information per unit of time invested,” the process has two drawbacks: inefficiency and cost (Guba & Lincoln, 1992). E-mail—convenient and inexpensive—was the practical way to go. As a means of communication, e-mail had served me well in following-up exchanges with the original 9 respondents; therefore, it seemed the most efficient and effective way to conduct the remaining interviews. As with the audiotaped
interviews, e-mail responses provided verbatim records of respondents’ comments and questions. In addition, respondents were able to reply in their own words (without having to be transcribed) and at their own convenience (within the requested deadline).

With the decision made about how to interview the 45 remaining potential interviewees, I composed a cover letter to accompany the questions. The text of the letter to those participants appears in Appendix E. Borg and Gall (1983) attest that the cover letter is a crucial source of information about the study, and it is instrumental in the respondents’ deciding whether or not to address the interview questions. Consequently, I made certain to explain the source of the questions, the purpose of the study, the preferred way to respond, and the steps that would be taken to safeguard anonymity. Again heeding Borg and Gall, I consistently used the word “interview” rather than “questionnaire,” a word against which “many persons are prejudiced” (p. 442).

On June 18, 2003, I sent the master list of the interview questions to the 45 additional participants and asked them either to respond by Monday, June 30, 2003, or to notify me by that date if they would be unable to do so. Although 12 days may appear to be insufficient time for completing such a task, I had learned from my experience as managing editor of a bimonthly journal that a deadline must allow enough time for a considered response but not so much time that it seems remote and is, as a result, postponed or forgotten. The timespan incorporated a weekend, and it gave me the leeway that I needed to follow up on participants who were non-responsive.

Some of the questions—such as “How did you find out about the Leadership Program?”—required short responses. Other questions—such as
“Have [the Roundtables] been valuable experiences?”—required longer, more-considered responses. When respondents answered questions with a simple yes or no, I contacted them and, in the course of thanking them for taking the time to take part in the interview, asked them to elaborate on their responses. In some cases, I asked respondents to clarify comments or to attend to questions that they had overlooked. I avoided potential problems with using—and possibly with having to translate—a variety of word-processing software by sending the interview questions as e-mail messages. I asked respondents to insert their comments immediately after each question in the e-mail message and to send the message back to me. I also conducted all correspondence via e-mail. I assigned a random numerical code to each respondent and filed all e-mail messages—my original request, respondents’ answers, and follow-ups—according to the codes. For uniformity I then reformatted all e-mail interviews.

Response Rates of Participant Interviews

Fifty-four participants comprised the interview sample, 9 face to face and 45 online. I had asked that respondents send their comments by June 30, 2003. I sent reminders to and extended the deadline for the participants who had not responded by June 30. By the new deadline of August 15, 2003, 8 of the 9 participants interviewed in person and 31 of the 45 participants interviewed online responded to all original and follow-up questions. Ten months later, in June 2004, the ninth participant interviewed face to face responded. I had already begun analyzing the interviews; however, because the participant had taken the time to complete the interview, I incorporated the responses. The total number of completed interviews was, consequently, 40.
Because no acceptable response rate for online interviews has yet been
determined, I sought advice about how to deal with that issue. Hinsdale
Bernard, a Leadership faculty member whose area of expertise is quantitative
research, responded in this way:

I would treat . . . [the e-mail interviews] . . . the same as a regular-mail
survey. In the broadest sense, a survey is an attempt to collect information
on an issue by means of a series of questions. These questions may take
various forms, but there are two ways this information may be accessed—
face-to-face, as in an interview, or by sending the survey to the subject.
This may be accomplished by snail-mail or e-mail (online). The only issue
here is that with snail-mail one can be better assured of anonymity. I
would expect similar estimations for the two response rates. So you are in
good shape. (Personal communication, March 24, 2005)

W. Lawrence Neuman and Larry W. Krueger (2003) state that a 10% to
50% response rate is typical for a mail survey. Earl Babbie (2004) defines a 50%
response rate as “adequate for analysis,” 60% as “good,” and 70% as “very good”
(p. 261) for mail surveys. In the latest edition of his book, Babbie (2012) notes
that “while it is possible to achieve response rates of 70% or more, most mail
surveys probably fall below that level” (p. 273). Given the open-ended nature of
the interview questions and the fact that the 45 of 54 potential respondents
would have the task of typing their responses rather than speaking them, I
hoped for a 50% response rate. I was both surprised and pleased that the online
interviews yielded a response rate of 31 out of 45, or 69%. When the 9 face-to-
face interviews are factored in, however, the resulting response rate is 40 out of
54, or 75%.

Guba and Lincoln (1992) advise ending the data-collection phase of a
study when certain practical and theoretical conditions exist, among them
exhaustion of sources and emergence of regularities. I ended attempts to follow
up on participants who had not responded when both of those circumstances
occurred. Given the combination of the selection process used and the relatively high yield of responses received, I was certain that I had tapped the interview source to its practical limit. Responses had reached the point where they became so consistent that I was unlikely to gain new information. Sending additional reminders seemed useless.

**Faculty and Staff Interviews**

My purpose in conducting interviews with faculty members was threefold. First, I wanted the creators to tell their own stories of the Leadership Program’s inception. Second, I wanted to discover what attracted other faculty to the program. And third, I wanted to ask the faculty the questions that participants had posed. Because her interaction with participants and faculty would serve as another check for reality, I submitted the same questions to Carol Castillo, program manager, in order to gain her perspective.

The configuration of the Leadership faculty has been somewhat fluid, which created a dilemma about whom to interview. In 1994, four Andrews University School of Education (SED) faculty members, William Green, David Penner, Jerome Thayer, and James Tucker, designed the program, thereby serving as the conceptual faculty. They and Shirley Freed, also an SED faculty member, delivered the first orientation and formed the charter faculty of the program.

During subsequent years, three members of the creative faculty accepted positions at other universities; the fourth remained at Andrews University, but he did so as a faculty member in another department. All four eventually were replaced by a combination of part-time adjunct faculty and full-time onsite
faculty. Given the changes, I determined that the best way to get a comprehensive picture of the program from the faculty’s perspective would be by interviewing former and current full-time faculty from the program’s inception in 1994 through June 30, 2002, the dates encompassed by this study. The information from these interviews supplemented the other documentation used in Chapter 2, “Crisis as a Catalyst for Change.”

Phase 1: Interviews With the Conceptual Faculty and Other Key Players

The purpose of Phase 1 was to obtain personal testimonies—some oral and some online—about how and why the Leadership Program was created. To that end, in July 2002, I conducted face-to-face interviews with three of the four members of the conceptual team, two (Green and Tucker) as a pair and one (Penner) alone. I initiated each interview by asking for a description of the events that led them to creating a Leadership Program, then encouraged them to talk freely and thereby guide the conversation:

1. I audiotaped the interviews and had them transcribed by a third party.

2. I listened to the recordings, comparing the tapes to the written transcripts and making necessary corrections.

3. I sent each of the three faculty members transcripts of their interviews for their approval, for clarification, and for further comments, and made any necessary changes.

4. As part of the verification process, I distributed copies of all the corrected, approved interviews to each of the three faculty members interviewed so that they could review the others’ comments.
5. I did a domain analysis of the face-to-face interviews with the three members of the creative faculty, teasing out the ones that were specific to the creation of the Leadership Program.

6. In May 2004, I sent those questions, via e-mail, to three more individuals: (a) Jerome Thayer, the remaining member of the conceptual faculty, (b) Shirley Freed, who had assisted with the first Leadership orientation, and (c) Warren Minder, the SED dean in 1994, the year of Leadership’s inception. I did not provide a deadline for their responses, but they all responded quickly. In some cases, follow-up correspondence was necessary for clarification and completeness.

Phase 2: Dealing With Participants’ Issues

The fifth question in “The Faculty” category on the master list for participants is, “If you could ask the faculty one question—without fear of reprisal—what would it be?” The resulting questions covered faculty issues, program design and delivery, and communication problems. The purpose of Phase 2 was to get answers to those questions.

I compiled a comprehensive list of the participant-generated responses and used that list to conduct online interviews. I wrote a cover letter to accompany the interview questions, explaining the purpose of the interview and the source of the questions, as well as assuring the anonymity of the responses. The cover letter and list of questions are in Appendix H.

Elsie Jackson, chair of my dissertation committee, distributed a copy of the interview questions at a Leadership faculty meeting, explained their purpose, and encouraged the faculty to respond by the suggested deadline. One faculty
member reported how another member made the accusation that the questions seemed to have been produced to deliberately disparage the faculty. No other faculty member reportedly expressed any distrust. On the contrary, the other members seemed eager to address the issues. Jackson assured the faculty that the questions were indeed participant-generated concerns and offered to show them the original interview responses—coded, of course. In any case, on June 7, 2003, I sent the interview questions, via e-mail, to all former and current full-time faculty members. I asked that the faculty respond by June 14, 2004. Most did so quickly, although one member—not the one who initially balked at answering the questions—failed to respond until September, and then only after several reminders from me and from the program manager.

Reactions to the Participant-Interview Process

As I think back over the interview process, I realize that I was completely unprepared for how long the task would take. I conducted the first two face-to-face interviews in May 2002 with graduates of the Leadership Program; then conducted the remaining seven—two of which consisted of pairs of participants—during the 2002 Roundtable, the annual conference of all Leadership participants and faculty, held from July 14 through July 17. But the subsequent steps to completing the goal of interviewing a total of 54 former and current Leadership participants took another 11 months.

The online interviews consisted of 31 open-ended questions classified into nine general categories, and for the most part respondents provided well-thought-out comments. To my delight (and relief!), several participants replied promptly to my request, including two who immediately advised me that they
chose not to take part in the interview process. Until August 15, 2002, however, the date for which I had set the final extension, I spent a great deal of time determining whether or not the non-responsive participants had received the request or whether they had received it and chose not to answer it. Several participants stated that they had not, in fact, received the original request, asked that I send it again, and responded quickly. Others stated that they were eager to address the issues but needed more time.

As of the August 15 deadline, I had received responses from 31 of the 45 participants. Of the remaining 14 participants, 8 failed to respond to my request in any way even after a number of queries, 2 participants stated that they did not intend to respond, and 4 participants repeatedly assured me that they would respond to the questions but failed to do so even after several reminders and deadline-extensions. I had chosen the potential respondents with the intention of getting input from several members of each annual cohort, and, as a result, the participants who did not respond did not affect the representation of the cohorts except in one case: 1999. I conducted a face-to-face interview with one participant from that cohort. Only 1 of the 6 participants from the 1999 cohort contacted online completed the interview; the remaining 5 neglected to respond in any way. I have no explanation for this anomaly. It seems unlikely that lacking more representation from the 1999 cohort—one of the nine represented by the sample—would affect this study because the two participants who did respond echoed the comments and concerns of respondents from the other cohorts.

I enjoyed the interview process because it provided me with the opportunity to discuss, if somewhat passively, program issues with colleagues.
The respondents with whom I conducted face-to-face interviews were eager to talk at length about the matters that concerned them—likely because I was one of “them.” I was from the same population as were the respondents, a relationship that Carol H. Weiss (1974) advocates as a way in which to produce more-valid responses than if someone outside the program had done so. I believe that I was able to maintain what Robert S. Weiss (1994) calls a working research partnership during the face-to-face interview. R. Weiss (1994) warns,

You can get away with phrasing questions awkwardly and with a variety of other errors that will make you wince when you listen to the tape later. What you can't get away with is failure to work with the respondent as a partner in the production of useful material. (p. 119)

During the interviews, I encouraged respondents to take the lead but explored issues as they arose. My interrupting the flow of the conversation with specific questions might have inhibited spontaneity. If I had done so, I would have been less likely to elicit unexpected and authentic information. By using open-ended questions, I avoided limiting the discussion to “stated alternatives or implied boundaries” and allowed the respondent the freedom to “answer in his own terms and to respond or create his own frame of reference” (Guba & Lincoln, 1992, p. 177). Each interview had its own rhythm. I found myself mirroring each respondent’s pace. Some respondents were lively and animated, punctuated with frequent changes in position (leaning forward, then relaxing against the back of the restaurant booth, then leaning forward again), hand and arm gestures, and grasping my hand for emphasis. Other respondents were more pensive, characterized by clasped hands and long pauses to search for a precise word.
A few interviews began tentatively, especially one of the two that were comprised of a pair of participants. In that case, at the beginning of the conversation, a participant who was openly critical about perceived current conditions in Leadership dominated the conversation. As a result, the other participant, who was concerned about the same issues but was less negative, initially was hesitant to be candid. As Guba and Lincoln (1992) warn, “the danger in interviewing a number of people at one time is that either everyone may want to talk at once or certain members of the group being interviewed may defer to stronger or more vocal members” (p. 161). As the interview progressed, however, both participants relaxed and both shared their concerns honestly. During the same interview, a faculty member entered the room for a moment. Although the interview took place in a large conference room in a convention center, the participant who was speaking appeared uneasy and stopped talking until the faculty member left.

The degree to which personal beliefs and their behavioral manifestations may influence an interview is an issue among researchers. Borg and Gall (1983) warn, “Never hint, either by specific comment, tone of voice, or nonverbal cues such as shaking the head, to suggest a particular response. The interviewer must maintain a neutral stance on all questions to avoid biasing the responses” (p. 443). According to Maxwell, though, reactivity, “the influence of the researcher on the setting or individuals studied” (2005, p. 124; 2013, p. 124), is not something to be eliminated but is something to be understood and used productively:

For interviews . . . reactivity—more correctly, what [Martyn] Hammersley and [Paul] Atkinson (1995) called “reflexivity,” the fact that the researcher is part of the world he or she studies—is a powerful and inescapable
influence; what the informant says is always influenced by the interviewer and the interview situation. While there are some things you can do to prevent the more undesirable consequences of this (such as avoiding leading questions), trying to “minimize” your effect is not a meaningful goal for qualitative research. . . . What is important is to understand how you are influencing what the informant says, and how this affects the validity of the inferences you can draw from the interview. (as cited in Maxwell, 2005, p. 125; 2013, p. 125)

I resisted the impulse to influence what participants were revealing, either by agreeing with them or by correcting what I perceived were misconceptions. I did nod in acknowledgment of a comment and interject words such as “I understand” in order to encourage participants to continue talking. And I did use probes, either for clarification or to gain critical awareness by asking “why.” I could never play poker; my face would give me away. Consequently, I am certain that I did not maintain the neutrality that Borg and Gall advocate. I believe, however, that my gestures and comments mirrored the respondents’ feelings and concerns and that they enhanced the feeling of camaraderie that developed during the interviews.

With regard to the online interviews, the length of responses varied. Given the fact that participants whom I interviewed online were required to type their own replies, I expected—and generally received—shorter responses. When I compared all the responses, however, I discovered that the content of the written ones appeared to be no less forthright than the oral ones; they were simply more to the point. As with the face-to-face interviews, I believe that I established a working research relationship with the online respondents.

In general, I had expected to find—and did find—some instances of agreement and some feelings of fellowship with other participants, with the
faculty, and with the staff of the Leadership Program. As Roman and Apple (1990) concisely and clearly state,

I as researcher might expect to find some overlap in assumptions, beliefs, and worldviews between myself and the researched, given that we live in the same society. However, this would not minimize the value of the ethnographic account as a social science method. Ethnography could still render a description of the cultural patterns and practices that vary across and within society, especially those that shed light upon the social meanings and contexts that constitute such variations. (p. 46)

Borg and Gall (1983) caution that the interview questions need to be “meaningful to the respondent,” that “[items] that are interesting and clearly relevant to the study will increase response rate” (p. 442). One respondent noted, “You asked questions that just begged to be answered. At least they made me want to share my thoughts” (P–14, personal communication, August 5, 2003). These were not my questions, of course, but that respondent seems to have spoken for many of his fellow respondents, and I was pleased with the results—especially when I considered the anonymity factor that Bernard had noted (see p. 36). The high response-rate resulted in a new problem, however. I had a lot of data.

The result was that 40 respondents answered 27 questions each, for a total of 1,080 responses. The 20 respondents who had graduated at the time of the interviews provided three more responses each, bringing the total responses to 1,140. Additionally, 15 respondents addressed the concluding open-ended invitation to make other comments. The final count was 1,155 responses.

Using Minutes and Other Documentation

My somewhat extensive coverage of the interview process should in no way minimize the importance of using meetings of minutes, promotional
material, and other documentation to add validity, reliability, and credibility to
the discoveries made and the conclusions reached in this study. Indeed, when
using such documentation, I was equally vigilant in using the information fairly
and appropriately. The minutes would be particularly vulnerable, because
choosing supportive statements to prove a point would have been easy. My own
principles would not have allowed me to have done so, but as an added
safeguard, I asked a third party to group the minutes according to the nine broad
themes of the interview questions.

While I served as program manager for the Leadership Program, the
faculty often asked me to research past minutes in order to gain a
historical perspective of an upcoming agenda item. When Priscilla Tucker
asked me to compile the portions of minutes that pertained to her
questions, I felt very qualified to do so. In Priscilla’s case, I read over each
set of minutes from 1994 through 2006. I then categorized the pertinent
excerpts from the minutes by using the interview questions as heading. I
listed quoted minutes chronologically, by both the date and number, of
the minutes. (Carol Castillo, e-mail, September 12, 2007)

Given the fact that I am a participant-observer, that I have developed
personal and professional relationships with fellow participants and with
faculty, that my dissertation committee consists of past and present Leadership
Program faculty members, and that I am married to one of the program’s
creators, this study may be considered to be especially prone to bias. It is im-
portant, therefore, to confront the question of objectivity vs. subjectivity head-on.

Perhaps the most thorough investigation of the issues, though, is reflected
in the interviews with participants and faculty. According to Maxwell, “both
long-term involvement and intensive interviews enable you to collect ‘rich’ data,
data that are detailed and varied enough to provide a full and revealing picture
of what is going on” (2005, p. 110; 2013, p. 126). “In interview studies,” continues
Maxwell, “such data generally require verbatim transcripts of the interviews, not
just notes on what you felt was significant” (2005, p. 110; 2013, p. 126). In Howard S. Becker’s (1970) words,

[Rich] data counter the twin dangers of respondent duplicity and observer bias by making it difficult for respondents to produce data that uniformly support a mistaken conclusion, just as they make it difficult for the observer to his observations so that he sees only what supports his prejudices and expectations. (as cited in Maxwell, 2005, p. 110; 2013, p. 126)
CHAPTER 5

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS, PART 1: ATTRACTION, PREPARATION, AND SATISFACTION

Introduction

This chapter contains the analysis of responses that relate to anticipatory, readiness, and contentment factors of participants in the Leadership Program. The responses are intended to reveal (a) how participants found out about the program and who and what influenced their decision to enroll, (b) to what degree the orientation prepared them for fulfilling program requirements, and (c) how well the self-directive and self-motivational aspects were understood and carried out, and (d) whether or not the respondent would encourage other individuals to enroll in the program.

The analysis of each question stands alone. The chapter summary provides conclusions drawn from the analyses as well as new questions generated by those analyses. The six specific questions analyzed in the chapter are as follows:

Question 1. How did you find out about the Leadership Program?
Question 2. What made you decide to apply?
Question 3. Did the fact that the Leadership Program is based at a Christian institution have an influence on your decision?
Question 4. How well did the orientation make you aware of the general requirements of the Leadership Program? What aspects were valuable? What aspects could be improved?

Question 5. Did you realize how much self-direction and self-motivation you were expected to have?

Question 6. Would you recommend the Leadership Program to someone else? Why or why not?

Question 1: How Did You Find Out About the Leadership Program?

Background

For the most part, the charter faculty of the Leadership Program recruited the members of the initial, 1994, cohort. In subsequent years, program faculty and staff disseminated information about Leadership in several ways. The recruiting and marketing methods used from 1994 through 2002, the years that this study incorporates, are detailed below:

Faculty and Staff Contacts

Andrews University is located in Berrien Springs, Michigan. When expeditious, Leadership faculty went to other states in order to conduct preliminary interviews with potential candidates rather than require applicants to travel to Michigan. By early 1996, Green had traveled to Florida and Tucker had traveled to Tennessee in order to speak to interested individuals. In addition, Freed, Minder (then dean of the School of Education), and Thayer had made plans to travel to Texas, Alabama, and Ohio, respectively, in the upcoming months for the same purpose (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 3, 1996).
In addition to making visits to interested individuals, Tucker delivered three formal presentations in response to requests for program information. The first took place in 1995, when he described the program to friends and colleagues of 1994 participants from the Connecticut Department of Education (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, March 20, 1995). That presentation generated several participants during subsequent years. The second and third occasions were in 1999, when Tucker “gave two presentations in Detroit on the Leadership Program for a potential initiative there. . . . Those who attended represented TACOM [Tank Command of the United States Army], Ford, Chrysler, and GM” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, November 10, 1999). The Detroit presentations generated a full cohort in 2000, as well as additional participants during the next several years.

Print Material

In 1996, I designed the initial formal marketing material for the Leadership Program (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, June 5, 1996). The publicity package contained an introductory letter from the program coordinator, a tri-fold “teaser,” a full-size descriptive booklet, a postcard to be used to solicit additional information and application forms, and a program-oriented business card. In order to distinguish Leadership as a distinctive program of Andrews University, I designed the material with several features that were atypical for marketing material for the University. First, the principal colors were maroon and white, rather than the Andrews colors of blue and gold. Second, in order to highlight the academic aspects of the program, cover images featured the University’s James White Library and stock photos of generic University buildings rather
than the usual image of the on-campus church. Finally, photos were, for the most part, of actual Leadership faculty and participants in social-learning settings rather than in the traditional classroom environment of a professor standing at the front of a room full of students seated in neatly aligned rows of desks (see Appendix D for facsimiles of the original marketing materials).

**Online Information**

The date of the establishment of the initial program website is not available. What is documented, however, is that by 1998, David Heise, a Leadership participant who used his expertise to fulfill his technology competency, had become webmaster for the Leadership website. The online material was identical in content and color to the original print material (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, September 4, 1998), described above. In order to support the website information, in 1999, Carol Castillo, then program manager, listed the Leadership Program on www.graduateschools.com (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, December 18, 1999). And in 2002, Neal Boger, director of instruction and innovative support for the School of Education, was assigned the task of updating the website (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, October 13, 1999). Mr. Boger revealed the update at the 2002 Roundtable. Although he retained the text and the question-and-answer format of the original print material, Mr. Boger replaced the photographs and changed the colors of the website to blue and gold.

**Analysis of Responses**

The responses of 38 of the 40 respondents fell into two major categories: sources affiliated with the Leadership Program (28) and sources external to the Leadership Program (10). P–32 (1996) had no memory of “the event,” and P–02
(1998) related only that he heard about the program while visiting Andrews. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Sources Affiliated With the Leadership Program (28)


Seven respondents learned about the program from members of later cohorts. One of those seven, P–35 (2001), “also did some exploring” on the Leadership webpage. In general, potential participants became “excited” by the prospects of such a program. The following comment, from P–25 (1999), represents the enthusiasm that respondents used to recruit new participants: “[A graduate of the program] said, ‘Hey, have I got a program for you!’ And he started telling me about the . . . Leadership Program at Andrews. It sounded really intriguing, and because of [his] influence I looked into it, and here I am.”

P–14 (1998), who initially was deterred by the fact that the program was based in the School of Education, credits a pair of faculty members with assuring him that he would get the individualized education and experience that he sought. His account serves as a summary for all respondents in this sub-category:

I started looking around for a doctoral program that I could take as a distance student and that would benefit me in my job. . . . I was aware of the school of Education Ph.D. in Leadership, but had not examined it at all, assuming it to be targeted at educational leaders. I wanted something that had relevance to my interests. . . . I did some extensive searching on the web, and received application packages from about six institutions. . . . It was at this point that I decided I ought to check out a degree called Ph.D. in Leadership at Andrews University. I was assured that the program was not limited to educational leadership. . . [and] . . . my meetings with F–04 and F–09 excited me, so I applied to join the program. (P–14, 1998)

Promotional material. Four respondents investigated the Leadership Program in response to print and online promotional material. P–16 (1996) was seeking a non-traditional doctoral program and found Leadership listed in the Bear’s Guide to Earning Degrees by Distance Learning. The promotional brochure attracted P–27 (2000). And P–08 (2002) discovered the program by searching online for degree programs offered specifically by Andrews University.

The most comprehensive explanation about finding the Leadership Program through promotional material comes from P–29 (2000):

I was looking for a Ph.D. program, so I did an Internet search and narrowed my search down to [three other universities in addition to Andrews]. My background is in business, so I was hoping for more of a behavior, organizational leadership. . . . The Andrews program . . . seemed to make the most sense relative to what I thought I had done in my past that would allow me to continue to learn the way that I had acquired some of the knowledge I had prior to going into a program. . . . Andrews was the most flexible, relative to the way I would learn. And that’s what worked for me. (P–29, 2000)
Category 2: Sources External to the Leadership Program (10)

Non-Leadership Andrews University students, faculty, and administrators. Two of the 5 respondents in this sub-category learned about the Leadership Program from a co-worker or a friend (P–05, 1995; P–17, 1997). P–07 (1995) learned about the program from a former Andrews University professor, and P–15 (1996) learned about the program from an Andrews seminary student, then “immediately called the university.” The following comment from P–04 (1995) reflects the impact that such referrals may have:

I have enormous respect for Dr. C. and would never take his recommendation lightly. I’m not sure I would have even investigated the program if he had not recommended it. (P–04, 1995)

Information from non-Andrews University faculty and administrators. Five respondents indicated that non-Andrews-affiliated individuals recommended the Leadership Program to them. P–11 learned about the program from a colleague, P–24 from a training coordinator, and P–28 from a friend. All three respondents are from the 2000 cohort. In addition, P–03 and P–18, both from the 2002 cohort, learned about Leadership from former professors—one of whom described the program as “highly respected.”

Question 2: What Made You Decide to Apply?

Background

In 1995, the Andrews University 1995–1996 Bulletin contained the first published description of the Leadership Program (see Appendix D). The write-up described Leadership as a competency-based, flexible, student-driven, collaborative doctoral program designed for self-motivated, self-directed
individuals. Each Leadership participant would work with an advisor to design an Individual Development Plan (I.D.P.) that would tailor coursework and directed activities to his or her individual needs. That description formed the basis for the promotional package that followed in 1996, as well as for subsequent descriptions—print and online—for several years.

Analysis of Responses

The 40 respondents fell into three major categories: those who designated one factor as the reason for enrolling in the Leadership Program (15), those who designated two or more factors as the reasons (18), and those who provided non-specific responses (7). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of the responses, as well as for responses extrapolated according to specific factors.)

Thirty-three respondents named the following eight specific factors that attracted them to the Leadership Program:

1. The ability to adapt the program to specific professional needs.
2. The opportunity to be actively involved in a cutting-edge program.
3. The advantage of being in an interdisciplinary program.
4. The expediency of a program that provides flexibility of time and place.
5. Respect for particular faculty members.
6. The opportunity for personal and professional growth.
7. The attraction of a competency-based program.
8. The Christian nature of Andrews University.

Eighteen of the 33 respondents selected more than one factor for choosing the Leadership Program; 15 respondents emphasized a single factor. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)
Category 1: Decision Based Upon Two or More Factors (18)


The structure and philosophy was in line with my needs at the time. . . . The program design allowed me to continue my work while I was studying topics that related to my work and topics that were of interest to me. In addition, my personality style fit this program. (P–33, 1994)

Category 2: Decision Based Upon One Factor (15)


Job-related aspects of the program. P–06 (1995), P–32 (1996), and P–12 (2001) indicated that the job-related aspects of the program were attractive. In describing this feature, P–12 mirrored the opinions of the other respondents in this sub-category, “[I] wanted to get another degree and this seemed to be the most useful to me. . . . My friends told me that they could use everything they were learning and apply it immediately to their work.”
Flexibility of time and place. The flexible scheduling and the fact that participants were not required to fulfill degree requirements on campus influenced P–07 (1995), P–01 (1997), P–17 (1997), and P–40 (1997). As P–17 states, “I would not have to go to . . . spend extended time on one campus, and I could keep my job.”

Other single factors as determinants. Without referring specifically to components of the Leadership Program, P–11 (2000), P–27 (2000), and P–08 (2002) indicated that they enrolled in the Leadership Program because earning a doctorate would be valuable. In the words of P–11 (2000), a Ph.D. was “the next logical step in my career and professional development.”

Category 3: Non-specific Responses (7)

Question 3: Did the Fact That the Leadership Program Is Based at a Christian Institution Have an Influence on Your Decision?

Background

In 1994, the initial year of the Leadership Program, the mission statement described Andrews University as Seventh-day Adventist in its orientation and purpose. The mission statement remained unchanged for 3 more years.


The Leadership Program echoed the Christian orientation of the University, using the following biblical text to support one of its founding principles—that of developing servant-leadership: “And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant” (Matt 20:27). That text, which was incorporated into program literature through 1999, supported the University’s mission in the broad, non-sectarian Christian sense of “facilitating the
development of a community of learners dedicated to service” (*Welcome to Leadership*, 1994, p. 2).

From 1994 through 2002, the fact that Andrews University was a Seventh-day Adventist institution was of varying concern to interview respondents. During the orientation, no members of the 1994 cohort indicated concern about Adventist orientation of Andrews. In a regional-group meeting in 1996, however, members of the 1994 cohort as well as members of the 1995 and 1996 cohorts expressed the view that “more non-SDA participants are needed in the Leadership Program to keep a healthy balance” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, September 25, 1996).

Eventually, the issue of the Adventist nature of Andrews and its impact on the participant demographics and program procedures began to be addressed directly. Carol Castillo, then Leadership program manager, provided the following summary:

At the 1999 orientation then dean Dr. Karen Graham assured participants that the faculty was open to all points of view. In 2000, a number of potential Leadership candidates expressed concern that the belief system of Andrews might be imposed on them. Later, the same individuals expressed their appreciation about the open-mindedness of the faculty. And in 2001, there was some disagreement between two groups: participants who were members of two conservative Christian denominations and participants who had no religious affiliations, specifically over the issue of beginning the sessions with devotional reflections and prayer. The faculty resolved the issue by allowing attendance to the opening 15 minutes of day, when spiritual matters were discussed, to be optional (C. Castillo, personal correspondence, January 9, 2003).

Analysis of Responses

Because denominational associations are not germane to this study, I did not ask respondents about their specific religious affiliations. Andrews
University is, however, part of the SDA higher-education system, and factoring in whether or not each respondent was an Adventist seemed appropriate.

Of the 40 respondents, 21 were not affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist church and 19 respondents were. Within each of these two demographic groups, the responses fell into two major categories: respondents who were drawn to the Christian setting of Andrews University (19), and those who were not drawn to the Christian setting of Andrews University (21). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

**Category 1: Respondents Not Drawn to the Christian Setting of Andrews University (21)**

**Seventh-day Adventist affiliations.** Five of the 21 Adventists indicated that the Christian worldview of Andrews did not influence their decision to apply to the Leadership Program. Instead, the practical design of the program was the primary attraction. They are P–37 (1994), P–06 (1995), P–40 (1997), P–05 (1998), and P–29 (2000).

**Other affiliations.** Sixteen respondents fit this sub-category. Seven simply replied that the fact that Andrews is Christian based was not a deciding factor (P–01, 1997; P–23, 1998; P–11, 2000; P–24, 2000; P–36, 2000; P–39, 2000; P–18, 2002). Interestingly, to varying degrees, 4 of the 16 respondents in this sub-category were either not aware or “vaguely” aware (P–31, 1994) of the Christian worldview of Andrews University. P–20 (1995) and P–26 (1999) stated that they were completely unaware of the religious affiliation, although P–20 stated, “It was a very pleasant surprise to have the orientation session begin with prayer.” And, although not a factor in his decision, P–21 (1994) “found it very satisfying
that I could work on my doctorate in a holistic manner; that is, I could openly
dress issues of faith and action, and spirituality.” And P–10 (2001) was
“thankful . . . that . . . the Christian format has helped me grow in my faith also.”

It is also noteworthy that 3 respondents expressed apprehension as well as
example, “was a bit concerned initially. I wasn’t looking for a Christian-based
program. In the end, I appreciated the diversity of the groups.” For P–25 (1999),
“the university’s Christian philosophic base was both a major attraction and a
major worry.” And P–03 (2000) used a metaphor to explain his attitude about
the issue: “I consider myself a Christian, but I prefer my education [to be] more-
or-less secular. Please keep the chocolate out of the peanut butter.”

Category 2: Respondents Drawn to
the Christian Setting of
Andres University (19)

**Affiliations other than SDA.** Five of the respondents who were not
affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist church indicated that they enrolled in
the Leadership Program because it was based at a Christian university (P–37,
1994; P–06, 1995; P–40, 1997; P–05, 1998; P–29, 2000). In the words of P–05, they
did, however, “[appreciate] the Christian focus to leadership issues/topics.”

**Seventh-day Adventists affiliations.** Fourteen of the 19 Adventists
enrolled in the Leadership Program *because* Andrews University is a Christian
institution, at least to some degree (P–09, 1994; P–04, 1995; P–07, 1995; P–15, 1996;
P–28, 2000; P–08, 2002; P–34, 2002). P–04 was somewhat ambivalent, stating,
“Probably, but I didn’t search for other alternatives.” P-07 explained her decision in this way:

I had actually applied to a nearby state university and was still awaiting word when [one of my professors] told me about AU’s program. I thought that it would be a broadening experience to receive a degree from a non-Adventist institution since all my education had been in SDA schools. After the orientation session, I was extremely glad that my education was at a faith-based institution. It has been a joy to incorporate personal growth in my spiritual life as part of my educational endeavors and to experience the affirmation and challenge of others who are serious about the Christian journey. I also greatly value having fellow students in the program who do not profess a Christian faith.

The following comments represent the range of philosophical and practical reasons of respondents in this sub-category:

Attending an SDA institution was a deciding factor. As a lifelong SDA, I had not previously had the opportunity to attend an Adventist school, and here was, for me, “my last chance.” (P–16, 1996)

As a Seventh-day Adventist, I don’t think I’d [have] gotten my degree from outside our denomination. I still believe the institution’s philosophy influences the students, which influences who they become and how they influence. (P–32, 1996)

I could have done a doctoral program in any number of secular universities and it would have been even more strongly focused on [my area of interest]—but be really secular. (P–19, 1997)

I looked at local university programs, but Sabbath problems made it unworkable. (P–27, 2000)


Background

The original promotional material for the Leadership Program stated that “Leadership requires a two-week orientation. During this time, participants
experience intense and rewarding interaction that leads to a camaraderie that is vital to the program” (Andrews University, 1996a, panel 3; 1996b, p. 5). During the years that this study encompasses, the faculty discussed ways in which to use the orientation to prepare participants as well as ways in which to improve the program itself.

In late 1995, the faculty expressed four concerns about orientations. The first was the need for a “strong rationale . . . [that] needs to be defined for the importance and function of the study groups.” The second was the responsibility of the faculty to “continually bring back to consciousness the basic principal of the Leadership Program—to incorporate competency practice into job tasks rather than devise an artificial experience outside and in addition to one’s employment.” The third was the necessity to “take into consideration the natural phenomenon of leaving orientation motivated, returning to immediate new-school-year responsibilities, and having no time to follow through until October/November.” The fourth was the use of “the [annual] Leadership Conference as an opportunity rapport-building between old and new cohorts” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, October 24, 1995) is important.

In 1996, in order to increase the effectiveness of the orientation, the faculty determined that participants needed to complete certain tasks by the end of a 2-week period, including a completed vision statement and a “significant outline of a credit worksheet” showing credits already earned and credits needed to complete the degree (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 17, 1996). In 1998, Green presented guidelines for drafting the I.D.P. that would “be helpful in clarity issues” and that would underscore the value of “working through . . . [such] . . . guidelines . . . for personal growth” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty,
February 11, 1998). And in 2001, Tucker recommended that “the orientation be a bit more structured—not more prescriptive but more integrated in structure. Every task should relate to the whole. All participants should leave knowing what an I.D.P. is rather than viewing it “as an insurmountable task” in the months following the orientation (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, August 30, 2001).

The following analysis indicates whether or not, according to participants, the stated purposes of the orientation were fulfilled. Note: Many statements demonstrate that faculty concerns reflect participants’ concerns.

Analysis of Responses

This question addressed two aspects of orientation-delivered program preparation: conceptual and logistical. Conceptual aspects include job-embeddedness, self-direction and self-motivation, competency-fulfillment, and social learning. Logistical aspects include I.D.P.-development, regional-group issues, and advisor time.

Thirty-nine of the 40 respondents fell into two major categories: the orientation prepared respondents conceptually but not logistically (31) and general comments about the orientation (8). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Orientation Prepared Respondents Conceptually but Not Logistically (32)

Thirty-two respondents commented on the conceptual aspects of the orientation. Seven of those 32 made general statements and 24 related to specific aspects of the program or of the orientation.
General comments about conceptual aspects. P–02 (1998) stated that he felt “only about 50 percent aware of the general requirements” as a result of the orientation. He added, however, that “on the positive side, it introduced us to a new concept, a new philosophy, and the necessary commingling of self-improvement and social responsibility.” P–25 (1999) felt prepared “from the standpoint of encouragement, inspiration, and enthusiasm” but cautioned that organizational issues and program requirements “could have been addressed better.” P–11 (2000) stated that “generalizations of how the program works and how we tailor it to our needs” were presented well but that participants need “a detailed road map” to direct them. P–22 (2000) “caught a clear vision of the program” but “lacked a clear description of what is required and what is not.”

Four additional respondents conveyed similar ideas. P–28 (2000) “left with questions” as well as “the desire to figure it out.” P–29 (2000) deemed the orientation “reasonable preparation,” but only “on a macro level.” He would have welcomed a “‘how-to manual’ that covered the practical aspects of the program.” P–12 (2001) asserted that the orientation left her “very well” prepared but observed that “there were still lots of ‘fuzzy’ bits. Participant questions were often answered with, “Well, what would you like to do?” rather than [with] a definitive answer—not something most students are used to!” And P–30 (2001) observed that although the orientation made her aware of general program requirements, “there were gaps as to how to approach certain things and [that] consistency was lacking. . . . The focus could have been on more concrete examples of the portfolio process and the dissertations.”
**Tolerance for ambiguity.** Four respondents related directly to or alluded to having a tolerance for ambiguity. For 3 of the 4 respondents in this sub-category, the emphasis on ambiguity was the most valuable aspect of the orientation. P–09 (1994), for example, stated that “orientation allowed me to understand I was responsible for my learning and application of developing my competencies throughout my life and profession.” P–21 (1994) appreciated the “emphasis on being comfortable with ambiguity.” And P–17 (1997) remarked that “the ambiguity gave me the freedom to design my own program.” P–13 (2002), however, found the ambiguity a stumbling block: “I am only now beginning to understand what they were trying to tell us. . . . [Some people get] it from the very first minute of orientation. Some people—like me—take longer.”

**Specific valuable aspects and suggestions for improvement.** In addition to stating that orientation prepared them conceptually, 9 respondents made specific observations about the orientations. P–31 (1994) and P–23 (1998) made only positive comments about the orientation. P–31 stated that she appreciated covering “a lot of good introductory material” in “topics pertinent to the program. . . . Each faculty member taught topics that they had expertise in.” In this way, “we learned about the faculty and their areas.” And P–23 (1998) regarded the orientation “as an excellent learning experience in the theory of learning, effective instruction, and important skills needed for success in any field.”

P–37 (1994) appreciated discussions about leadership, education, and community, but he also stated that by knowing about initial program assignments “early on would have helped us all to digest the requirements
through the orientation and not be so shocked at the end.” P–06 (1995) stated that “the discussions about research were some of the most powerful I’ve ever heard. I think those days made me a successful critical researcher and thinker more than any other experience I have ever had.” P–20 (1995), however, from the same cohort and therefore in the same orientation, suggested that more time be “focused on the research aspect of the program.” P–20 also considered the experience an “excellent” way to meet faculty and to work in cooperative groups. P–19 (1997) echoed the sentiment of P–20 with regard to the orientation as an opportunity to acquaint participants with faculty members. “The collegial contact with the program faculty,” he stated, “was perhaps the most important aspect.” He added, however, that “it would have been helpful to have more advisor time and more regional group time during that two-week period.”

P–37 also “really wished for more time to meet with my advisor and to have him go over with me the entire program in more detail.” As did P–37, P–10 “really wished for more time to meet with my advisor and to have him go over with me the entire program in more detail, made suggestions for courses, etc.” P–18 (2002) indicated that the orientation gave him “a flavor of” the participants as well as of the program, adding that “the program lacks structure, which is positive and negative. For me, I would like more structure.” P–18 is, incidentally, the only respondent who remarked that the Leadership Program Handbook (2002) was his “best resource for requirements.”

**Program as new, different, or both.** Five respondents focused their comments on the specific ways in which the Leadership Program was different from other graduate programs (P–04, 1995; P–07, 1995; P–01, 1997; P–14, 1998;
P–26, 2000). P–04, for example, commented that “this program is radically different from any other previous (or present) educational experiences,” P–07 (1995) described the program as “hard to visualize,” and P–24 (2000) stated that “this concept is very unique to me.” P–14 (1998) seemed to appreciate the differences that the program promoted.

The orientation program began an important learning process for me, and that was an appreciation of different ways of approaching life, especially ways that were different from my own. I have really come to value people who think differently from the way I do, because so often they fill in blind-spots in my own thinking. (P–14, 1998)

Specific comments about the I.D.P., portfolio, and dissertation. In addition to making comments similar to those of other respondents, 6 respondents designated the logistical details—such as the I.D.P., the portfolio, and the final paper—as valuable aspects of the orientation. P–15 (1996) stated that “the I.D.P. was perhaps most beneficial.” P–38 (1995), for example, needed “more information about what the I.D.P. was supposed to do for me,” and P–16 (1996) would have benefited by knowing how the I.D.P. “related to identifying required coursework.” P–26 (1999) “became aware of the big pieces: the I.D.P., the portfolio, the course-plan, and the dissertation” but added that “the details of the requirements were the part I didn’t get a clear picture of during the orientation.” P–27 (2000) “wished for greater clarity on the I.D.P. and the options available for drafting it.” P–08 (2002) left orientation with enough [preparation] to get started. I came out of the orientation with about half of my I.D.P. completed. However, it was reviewing some of the online sample I.D.P.s and talking to members of my regional group (whom I met before orientation) that crystallized for me what an I.D.P. can look like, not the time spent in the orientation classroom.
P–34 (2002) was the most negative respondent in this sub-category, asserting that a “lack of direction with regard to the I.D.P.” existed, adding that “there appeared to be ‘unwritten’ standards—but [they] were not shared with us. I felt like I had to jump through hoops to figure out what they wanted.”

Category 2: General Comments
About the Orientation (8)

General comments about conceptual as well as logistical aspects. The 7 respondents who comprise this group would have preferred what P–36 (2000) described as a clearly defined map. The following comments represent the frustration that such respondents experienced:

The orientation was not as intense or as helpful as I expected. I would recommend finding ways to connect the new cohorts with their regional groups, current and past program participants, introducing and connecting them with faculty, and focusing on how things work and getting things done once they are off the university campus. The “orientation” should be a bridge that connects the new cohorts with “life after orientation.” (P–39, 2000)

I loved orientation, mostly because of the energy that [the faculty] infused into the process. I felt somewhat aware of the requirements of the program before I came to orientation . . . and [from] my local regional group and from the program materials sent. Orientation gave me a greater depth of understanding (although there are days even now that I’m not sure that I understand the general requirements). (P–35, 2001)

Finally, P–03 (2002) spoke more to program standards than to the utility of the orientation experience.

Requirements are defined, but the standards for those requirements are typically substandard. A primary problem is that the program professes to be flexible to the point that “anything goes.” This is an attraction to many students. But others find it a hindrance. The reality is that if requirements were well defined, all participants would be able to work toward those requirements with laser focus—rather than [through] trial and error. (P–03, 2002)
Question 5: Did You Realize How Much Self-direction and Self-motivation You Were Expected to Have?

Background

At its inception, the Leadership Program was designed to appeal to self-directed, self-motivated individuals who would welcome learning in collaborative and cooperative settings. Prior to 1996, participants learned about the program primarily through contact with other participants, with other potential candidates, and with faculty members. In 1996, at the request of the Leadership faculty, I designed the initial promotional package for Leadership. A “teaser” in that package emphasized that Leadership was a competency-based program intended “to give self-directed, self-motivated [italics added] individuals a way to take charge of their own education (Andrews University, 1996a, panel 2). The accompanying full-size booklet also underscored the self-directional, self-motivational characteristics of the program: “Although some coursework is necessary to complete the degree, Leadership gives self-directed, self-motivated [italics added] individuals a way to take charge of their own education while incorporating their past professional experience and their current positions” (Andrews University, 1996b, p. 6).

Analysis of Responses

The 40 respondents fell into two major categories: those who were aware of the need for self-direction and self-motivation (31), and those who were unaware of the need for self-direction and self-motivation (9). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)
Category 1: Respondents Aware of the Need for Self-direction and Self-motivation (31)

Respondents aware of need for self-direction and self-motivation. Eight respondents simply answered “Yes” but made no further comment (P–38, 1995; P–15, 1996; P–02, 1998; P–27, 2000; P–28, 2000; P–39, 2000; P–08, 2002; P–18, 2002). In addition, P–21 made a short, non-specific comment: “Yes, I think so. This is one of the aspects of the program that appealed to me. I have always been pretty self-motivated and self-directed.” The remaining 21 respondents in this category provided explanations in the following sub-categories for their responses:

Generally positive responses. Seven respondents fit this category. P–21 (1994), for example, responded enthusiastically, “Yes. I actually really liked that. Oftentimes in other college courses I was bored at the slow pace that things moved. So I liked the fact that I could go as quickly as I wanted for the program.” P–14 (1998) observed that the self-directional and self-motivational expectations of the program were “just as expected.” P–10 (2001) asserted that the program suited him “just fine,” and P–37 (1994) called the program “exciting and challenging.” P–23 (1998), cited below, provides further insight into what P–35 (2001) succinctly called “home-schooling for grown-ups.”

I think the thing that was most attractive to me about this program was that I had flexibility, not only in terms of what I wanted to do but the time that I had to do it. The pace that I wanted to do it and what I wanted to do. Learning was about time, but it was also about determining your own path, following your own path and making the program work for you with you being the key emphasis. You being the key most important person and player. . . . I’m a person who doesn’t need a high degree of this-is-what-you-need-to-do, this-is-how-you-need-to-do-it. I want to experience it on my own, make my own mistakes. (P–23, 1998)
Cautionary comments. The 6 respondents in this sub-category made cautionary statements about the self-directive, self-motivational aspect of the program. P–01 (1997) noted, “It is hard to see all of the personal and professional changes that one will go through at the time you enter. Priorities are reorganized constantly and therefore it takes more self-direction and self-motivation than expected.” P–17 (1997) also underestimated the amount of self-direction and self-motivation needed, admitting, “I don’t think I really knew exactly what it was going to be like. . . . This program is for people who are very much self-motivated, which I am, but probably not as much as I should be. It’s helped me to be more self-motivated.”

Three respondents related that they underestimated the amount of time and focus that completing the degree required (P–06, 1995; P–07, 1995; P–16, 1996). When relating to time, P–16 (1996) recommended that “having current or former participants share experiences would be a good idea. Most of us need help establishing effective time-management systems and our abilities in this area should not be assumed.”

Other factors needed for completion. Five respondents stated or implied that they were aware of the expectation and that regional-group and advisor time is essential (P–33, 1994; P–20, 1995; P–32, 1996; P–22, 2000; P–12, 2001). As P–20 (1995) stated,

I was quite clear that this was not a traditional program and that it would require self-direction and discipline. I never had the feeling that this was about anyone else doing anything for me. I got my motivation from within and sustained the effort through regional-group participation and well-guided direction from my advisor.
Program more prescriptive than anticipated. Three respondents were disappointed by the lack of opportunity to exercise their self-directive, self-motivational personalities (P–25, 1999; P–36, 2000; P–03, 2002). In the following comment, P–25 (1999) summarizes the concern of the respondents in this sub-category:

I remember some of the opening paragraphs [of the advertising material that was displayed the night before at the Roundtable]. I remember reading those and thinking, You guys are going to have to rewrite if you continue. Specifically, I think the thing that caught my eye were a couple of the very beginning promos that talk about the fact that the program is participant-driven. That the program is individual. That the program is self-motivated, self-designed, self-driven, self-all-those-things. We’re getting away from that . . . . Remember, you are dealing with highly professional and in some cases quite wealthy patrons, and they do not put up with that sort of thing. If there is a huge discrepancy between what is promised and what is delivered, there will be a lawsuit. . . . I think the major problem is that most of the faculty members cannot see that it’s changing. They’re too close to it and they are not recognizing it and they’re thinking, Well, these are just little things. But they’re symptoms of a larger thing.

Category 2: Respondents Unaware of the Need for Self-direction and Self-motivation (9)

Nine of the 40 respondents seemed unaware, at least to some degree, of the self-motivational, self-directional nature of Leadership. P–34 (2002) answered simply, “No.” P–05 (1998) explained her experience in this way: “That only became clear later. There always seemed to be the underlying question, ‘Just what do they expect for this?’” And P–11 (2000) stated, “I did not realize that I was on my own more than not.” And P–30 (2001) revealed, “Both of these items were my biggest surprise and to this day [are] the most challenging aspects of the program.”
P–04 (1995) was less absolute in her response, stating that she “probably underestimated” the need. And P–29 (2000) rationalized that no one “pursuing a doctoral degree ever knows what it will really take.” In addition, P–09 (1994) and P–24 (2000) implied that they initially were not aware of the amount of self-direction and self-motivation that was expected. P–09 stated that after attending the 2-week orientation and beginning to work on program requirements, however, “it became more clear.” P–24 echoed that comment with “Not at first, but I caught on quickly.” And P–13 (2002) seemed to assume the responsibility for his lack of awareness: “Not really. But it was not because they did not try to make that clear.”

**Question 6: Would You Recommend the Leadership Program to Someone Else? Why or Why Not?**

**Background**

Question 6 was intended to investigate whether or not current participants in and graduates of the Leadership Program would recommend the program to friends and colleagues. The first part of the question is open-ended; the second part asks respondents to provide reasons for their responses.

**Analysis of Responses**

The 40 respondents fell into two major categories: those who would recommend the Leadership Program to other individuals (30), and those who would not (10). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)
Category 1: Respondents Who Would Recommend the Leadership Program to Other Individuals (30)

Thirty respondents stated that they would recommend the Leadership Program to other individuals. Three respondents were especially enthusiastic. P–16 (1996) answered with “a resounding, yes.” And P–01 (1997) began his response with “Yes! Yes! Yes!” The remaining 26 respondents elaborated on their responses with specific comments.


Three respondents in this sub-category generally related to positive as well as negative aspects of the program. P–02 (1998) stated philosophically that “everything has positive and negative aspects,” and P–22 (2000) observed that “the advantages are greater than the disadvantages.” The following two comments represent the respondents in this sub-group who relate to program changes in their comments. As the statements below indicate, whereas P–19 (1997) seems resigned to changes, P–05 (1998) seems to applaud them.

Yeah. I don’t have a problem with it. They haven’t attacked the core. I mean, they’ve attacked—they’ve limited—some of the freedom, the flexibility. . . . From my way of viewing the job-embedded [aspect] . . . this is experiential learning. It’s cooperative learning. It’s all of the good things about education combined together. . . . Compared to the vast
majority of doctoral programs, I don’t think there is anything out there that’s as good. (P–19)

I would recommend it for anyone who is interested in developing as a leader. The program is flexible enough to fit the interests/needs of almost anyone interested in leadership. I think changes I have seen in the program since I began are positive and helpful. (P–02)

**Respondents who made cautionary statements.** Twelve respondents fit this category. Ten of them designated the type of individual who would be suited to the non-traditional nature of the Leadership Program. Five of those 10 warned that the program “is not for everyone” (P–04, 1995; P–07, 1995) and that the program must be “a good fit” (P–38, 1995). P–18 (2002) explained, “I would accurately describe the program. I would not recommend it to someone who is not self-driven.” And P–28 (2000) stated, “I have recommended it to some and not to others.”

Five respondents described successful participants as being self-driven but also as able to work hard, to invest a great deal of time in their own learning, and to incorporate program requirements into job responsibilities (P–21, 1994; P–17–1997; P–40, 1997; P–26, 1999; P–11, 2000). P–17, cited below, makes a statement that incorporates the comments of all respondents in this group:

I have recommended it, but I always explain that this definitely is a self-directed, nontraditional program. . . . For some it is just a shocking thing to be in a program where . . . they are so used to everything being spelled out for them, that it was almost like they were floundering. . . . You need to let them flounder. Absolutely. And so in that respect I am grateful for the fact that we did a lot of that floundering. At least it was [good] for me. I needed to know that.

There were people in [my] group who needed more structure. They’re still there but it has been a struggle for them. My problem has been time more than anything else. For some of them, the struggle is they don’t know how to do this. Is that a problem with the program or a problem with the person? I think it might just be a bad fit. I think that they just don’t fit the profile.
Could they have realized that by the end of orientation? To a certain extent maybe. They probably didn’t get the full understanding until they were out there on their own, looking forward to what they had to do and all of a sudden realized, you know I don’t think I really understood this. (P–17, 1997)

Respondents who were generally positive. Four of the 30 respondents in this category provided generally positive responses to this question. P–24 (2000) planned to do so, and P–13 (2002) had already done so. The remaining 2 respondents in this sub-category stated that, as a result of their recommendations, “other persons are already in the program” (P–15, 1996) and “at least one person is now enrolled and another making enquiries” (P–12, 2001).

Category 2: Respondents Who Would Not Recommend the Leadership Program to Other Individuals (10)

Respondents who had faculty concerns. Four respondents fit this sub-category. P–09 (1994) stated that “it depends” on the faculty members and program changes. P–31 (1994) echoed P–09’s comment: “I have serious concerns about the leadership—meaning the faculty—and the direction of the program. Right now, I would not recommend . . . this program.” P–06 (1995) believed that newer faculty members were “linear thinkers” who, because they “didn’t help design it [the program],” were changing the essence of the program. The statement from P–33 (1994), cited below, represents the comments of the 4 respondents in this sub-category:

Not now. I don’t feel confident in the leadership at this time. No specific reasons, just a sense. I don’t think it is what it was meant to be, and I think we have lost the vision of the program. I also believe there are too many participants and individuals now [who] do not get the one-to-one [treatment] that I feel I got. (P–33, 1994)
Respondents who perceived a shift in vision. Four respondents noted a drift to traditional education in the program. P–23 (1998) perceived a “shift from a program dependent on the [participant’s] individual talents and skills.” P–36 (2000) asserted that that shift is to a program in which “learning [is] driven by the requirements of your teacher and/or advisor.” The following two comments are representative of this sub-group, and they add the dimensions that economic factors and sectarian allegiance, not the change in faculty, may be responsible for any change in direction.

If [the program] continues to go in the direction that I’m afraid it will, I would not recommend the program to someone who’s looking for . . . the kind of program that I’m thinking about . . . This is marketing. Let’s face it. The program as it existed appealed to a very specific, unique, bottom-less market of highly professional, highly competent people who were just looking for the educational component and the philosophic component. You change it very much and you’ve lost that audience. (P–25, 1999)

No, only from the standpoint that I’m not confident of the direction . . . [The need for money] was the very reason this program started—because they needed money and they came up with a great idea. It fit their money criteria, not that they were all of a sudden leadership-enlightened. So with that fear being something I had right from the beginning—and now seeing the changes that have happened relative to strength of people involved from a faculty/administration standpoint, and knowing what the position the university is in relative to the whole Adventist system—I wouldn’t put someone in that position. It’s not that I would say, no, don’t ever talk to them. But I wouldn’t spend any energy recommending it, because I can’t be sure of what will happen knowing the mission of Andrews University relative to the church and knowing where the Leadership program falls very low on that food chain. (P–29, 2000)

Participants who requested a more-traditional approach. Two respondents appeared to criticize the participant-driven, individualized nature of the Leadership Program. Although not completely negative in his response, P–32 (1996) stated that he would recommend the program—but only with reservations, because he “[misses] the professional interaction a traditional
program may provide.” P–03 (2002), however, would not recommend the program “until such time as fundamental changes are made, teaching [is] reintegrated and rigor [is] restored. The rest is negotiable, but without those two things, the program is barren.”

Summary and Conclusions

How did you find out about the Leadership Program? Between 1994 and 2003, the primary means of Leadership Program promotion were personal recommendations and promotional material. Two of the 40 respondents did not recall how they discovered the existence of the Leadership Program, and 4 obtained information from print and online promotional material. Of the remaining 34 respondents, 24 learned about the program from Leadership faculty (13) and participants (11). The remaining 10 respondents obtained information about Leadership from non-program sources—5 from non-Leadership students, faculty, and administrators, and 5 from non-Andrews-affiliated colleagues, co-workers, and professors.

As the preceding figures indicate, for 38 out of the 40 respondents in this study, word of mouth endorsement—whether or not from Leadership-affiliated individuals—was a much more influential marketing tool for the Leadership Program, at least from 1994 to 2003. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 1.) These data raise several questions: Was word of mouth promotion more influential because the idea of finding information online a new concept? If so, why does it seem as though the print material, a common advertising medium, had so little impact? More basically, would there have been a full cohort in 1994 without the personal relationships between the
conceptual faculty and the potential participants? If not, would the program have begun in later years as a result of aggressive recruiting through all available means?

What made you decide to apply? The Leadership Program was designed to appeal to self-motivated, self-directed individuals, and aspects of that design proved to be popular with respondents. Twenty of the 40 respondents identified one or more advertised program-specific factors—such as adaptability to professional needs, job-related elements, and flexibility of time and place—as determinants for enrolling in the program. Twelve respondents indicated respect for one or more particular faculty members as the deciding factor. The remaining 8 respondents were less specific, perhaps more holistic, about the attraction of Leadership, citing the opportunity to be actively involved in a cutting-edge program (3), the advantage of being in an interdisciplinary program (3), and the opportunity for personal and professional growth (2).

Adaptability, flexibility, and professional relevance were critical aspects of the Leadership Program. In addition, the faculty relationship was essential. Based on the responses, it seems safe to conclude that both factors are necessary for a program for adults who prefer a self-motivated, self-directed program: The elements need to be in place, as do the individuals who support them. The responses to Question 2 generate the following additional questions: None of the three primary reasons for enrolling in the program predominated. If asked to do so, how would respondents rank them? Given the importance of the faculty role in the participant’s decision, how can the program support faculty members’ enthusiasm, knowledge, and practices? And given the importance of specific faculty, what can be done to maintain the role of those individuals if they choose
to leave the program or the university? (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 1, Questions 2a and 2b.)

Did the fact that the Leadership Program is based at a Christian institution have an influence on your decision? The question about the religious orientation of Andrews University was stated in terms of Christianity in general rather than in terms of Seventh-day Adventism in particular. The 19 Adventists who responded to this question interpreted “Christian” in denominational terms. Twelve of them chose Andrews because it is a Seventh-day Adventist institution; 7 did not. In contrast, 5 of the 21 non-Adventists were influenced by the Christian philosophy of Andrews. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 3.)

For 17 of the 40 respondents the spiritual aspect of the program was a strong selling point for the Leadership Program. Because the 19 Adventists who enrolled in the program likely were looking for graduate programs in Adventist institutions, would they have enrolled in such a program in a non-denominationally Christian institution? In a secular institution? Would the program demonstrate more “hybrid vigor” if it actively recruited participants from other religious philosophies? If so, how would such a practice affect the configuration of the faculty? The strength of the program?

How well did the orientation make you aware of the general requirements of the Leadership Program? After being accepted into the Leadership Program, participants are required to attend an orientation that is intended to prepare them for fulfilling the requirements of the program. None, however, stated that the orientation prepared them both conceptually and logistically. Respondents used phrases such as “excitement and inquiry” (P–17, 1997), “a lot of big-picture
discussion” (P–31, 1994), and “encouragement, inspiration, and enthusiasm” (P–25, 1999) when referring to the orientation experience, but they also asserted that the orientations lacked tactical information. As P–06 (1995) summarizes, most respondents observed that the orientation went “logistically, not well; but conceptually, quite well.” (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 4.)

It was my understanding, in 1994, that the orientation was intended to acclimate participants to the program. To do so, we discussed issues and, at least in my case, determined who we wanted to be at program’s end. We frequently asked this question: “What do we want to be when we grow up?” We also familiarized ourselves with how the program worked. To that end, as the initial cohort, we needed a high tolerance for ambiguity about the evolving nature of the program. The Leadership Program was not intended to be stagnant, and we were to take part in its development.

What is especially revealing from the responses, however, is that 32 respondents from 9 consecutive cohorts shared the feeling, to varying degrees, that they were conceptually prepared—that is, that they were aware of the program’s principles and general requirements—but that they would have appreciated better-articulated standards and more direction, especially the I.D.P., portfolio, and course-plan. How could the Leadership Program define standards more clearly while supporting the intrinsic flexibility and adaptability built into its design? Would a set of such standards be suitable—even, acceptable—to all participants? Given the number of traditional graduate programs available, should it even attempt to do so? Is it not likely that participants who need a great deal of direction would fare better in a more prescriptive program?
Did you realize how much self-direction and self-motivation you were expected to have? This question directly ties in the preceding one in that it speaks to what some participants view as lack of direction. Leadership Program materials emphasize that the program is designed for self-directed, self-motivated individuals who are ready to take charge of their own education. In spite of that, 9 respondents from the 1998 (1), 2000 (3), 2001 (1), and 2002 (2) cohorts were unaware of this expectation. Of the remaining 31 respondents, 10 provided brief answers. The remaining 21, however, made more-detailed, generally positive statements. Three respondents, also from later cohorts (one each from 1999, 2000, and 2002), found the program to be too prescriptive for a participant-driven program. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 5.)

Respondents indicated that their primary concern was unanticipated amount of time needed to complete program requirements. In the earlier years of the program, time requirements may not have been predictable. But in later years, with experience in their favor, could the faculty have advised participants better about this aspect? Had no participants reported the issue to them? Could it simply be that some people take longer to accomplish goals than others? Or is the main issue that, no matter how long it takes, the participant carry out the I.D.P. because the plan is a valid one?

Would you recommend the Leadership Program to someone else? Why or why not? As a result of their experience, the majority of respondents—30 out of 40—reported that they either had recommended or would recommend the Leadership Program to other individuals. Of the 10 who had not or would not do so, 2 believed that the program needed more structure and rigor. The remaining 8 cited concerns about the then-current faculty and program-delivery.
Ultimately, however, respondents perceived that positive aspects of the program far outweighed any negative ones, and most respondents appreciated—to some degree—the innovative approach to higher education that the Leadership Program presents, especially the participant-driven aspect. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 1 Question 6.)

It would be interesting to ask respondents this question now, 12 years after they responded initially. Because many of them had not completed the program at the time of the interviews, would their opinions be different? Have any of them been in touch with more-current participants, and would the experiences of those individuals influence their responses?
CHAPTER 6

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS, PART 2: THE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM IN PRACTICE

Introduction

The Leadership Program was designed as a competency-based graduate program. This chapter contains the analysis of responses to questions relating to each participant’s Individual Development Plan, or I.D.P., the plan that delineates his or her proof of competency in six areas: instruction, change, organization, consultation, research, and scholarship. I have analyzed the responses to each question, then provided a summary and conclusions at the end of the chapter. The five questions are as follows:

Question 1. Was drafting the I.D.P. a difficult task? How did you approach this activity?

Question 2. Did you make revisions to your original I.D.P.?

Question 3. How well have you been able to take advantage of the job-embedded aspect of the Leadership Program?

Question 4. Of the six major competencies, which one has been the most useful, or most valuable for you to develop? Which one has been the least useful, or least valuable for you to develop?

Question 5. List the types of physical evidence that you are using—or, if you are done, have used—to demonstrate competency.
Question 1: Was Drafting the I.D.P. a Difficult Task? How Did You Approach this Activity?

Background

As originally conceived, the Leadership Program was competency-based rather than course-driven. Twenty individual competencies formed the framework for the Individual Development Plan, or I.D.P., which in turn reflects the goals of the individual participant as well as the ways in which he or she will reach those goals. The task of drafting the I.D.P., then, is an integral part of the personal and professional growth that Leadership promotes—that of discovering the gap between where we are and where we want to be. As Penner (2002), a member of the conceptual faculty, explains,

The Individual Development Plan (I.D.P.) is the document that describes the general course of action and the specific supporting activities that the participant will use as a means to completing his or her degree. Each participant’s I.D.P. is individualized and takes into account the participant’s past experience, current level of knowledge and skills, and career goals. By comparing the information to the program’s competency profiles, the I.D.P. becomes the map that will take the participant from admission into the program to successful presentation of the portfolio. (p. 92)

The I.D.P. consists of three components. Part one, the vision statement, or narrative, articulates “where you are going and how you are going to get there. This is the participation portion of the I.D.P.” (Welcome to Leadership, 1994, p. 17). Penner (2002) notes that “within the vision there may be a review of the past, but it is looking toward the future that creates the necessary gap . . . that we want to bridge during the course of the program” (p. 93).

Part two, the outline of competency development provides a detailed description of the activities and artifacts that will verify competency fulfillment. “This is the demonstration portion of the I.D.P.” (Welcome to Leadership, 1994,
p. 17). As with the vision statement, the outline often includes specific written goals. In addition, as with the vision statement, the outline refers to the past as well as to the future by listing already-completed activities as well as projected activities (Penner, 2002).

Part three, the credit worksheet, translates the plan into “a list of course numbers and the resulting number of credits earned” (Welcome to Leadership, 1994, p. 17). These data are reflected on the participant’s transcript.

Participants begin to develop the I.D.P. at orientation, then follow four steps to competency fulfillment:

1. Each participant works with an advisor in order to develop the I.D.P.
2. A two- or three-member team of Leadership faculty reviews and approves the I.D.P.
3. Throughout the planning and fulfillment stages of the program, the participant collects documents and other artifacts into a portfolio, which in turn serves as evidence of competency.
4. The participant presents the completed portfolio to the advisor and the program team for final approval (Penner, 2002).

The Leadership Program “has always valued the creative development of individuals, faculty encourage distinctive approaches to ways in which competencies are demonstrated as well as in the format in which I.D.P.s are organized and written” (Penner, 2002, p. 92). Indeed, examples of I.D.P.s were not available to the 1994 cohort, and because the development of the I.D.P. has been considered a critical component of the participants’ development, when examples became available, many faculty members discouraged their use. Instead, discussion with other participants and advisors, consultation with
experts in the participant’s field of study, and engaging in self-reflection were considered critical components of the development of the I.D.P. (Penner, 2002).

Analysis of Responses

The 40 respondents fell into two major categories: those who did not find drafting the I.D.P. difficult (22), and those who did find drafting the I.D.P. difficult (18). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Respondents Who Did Not Find Drafting the I.D.P. a Difficult Task (22)

Respondents who used earlier I.D.P.s as templates. In order to make the task easier, 6 respondents in this category used the approved I.D.P.s of other participants as templates to develop their own plans. P–14 (1998), for example, found the task “very difficult from the point of view that I had no idea on how to begin. My advisor was as new to the program as I was, and for 6 to 9 months I simply drifted.” P–14 solved his dilemma in this way: “Eventually, I got some help from my regional group in the form of ideas and encouragement and copies of several other I.D.P.s. This was invaluable and helped me to get started with a style that I was happy with for setting out my competencies.” P–24 (2000) reported that he and the other members of his regional group used “previous formats” as a basis for writing their I.D.P.s. P–11 (2000) and P–18 (2002) did much the same. P–11 found the process time consuming but not difficult “once he saw a sample and understood what the end-product was to look like,” and P–18 drafted his I.D.P. by looking at “successful” I.D.P.s and “just replacing my information.” In addition, P–13 (2002) examined already approved I.D.P.s and
“talked to people.” P–27 (2000) provided the most comprehensive response in this sub-category. The process he used is as follows:

The difficult part was figuring out what was expected. Once I found a model that made sense, I had no problem. I used a linear model organized by competencies. Each competency had an introductory vision statement followed by a matrix consisting of “Prior Experience and Documentation” and “Planned Experience and Documentation.” I included a transcript section at the end.

Developed I.D.P. through interaction with others. Five respondents (P–31, 1994; P–38, 1995; P–28, 2000; P–39, 2000; P–34, 2002) indicated that their primary aid for developing their I.D.P.s was interaction with faculty and regional-group members—a process that P–39 considered to be “critical.” P–38 outlines the systematic way in which respondents in this sub-category developed their I.D.P.s:

Each member of our regional group wrote what we thought was appropriate for each of the competencies. Then our regional [group] met and we took turns reading what we had written. Others would give input to help expand what we had written. When we had finished discussing what each of us had written for one competency, we moved on to the next. (P–38, 1995)

Developed I.D.P. independently. Eleven respondents considered drafting the I.D.P. an easy task. P–33 (1994) was able to translate her experiences into competencies “with ease.” P–15 (1996) found that the task “required focus,” so he developed a timetable and followed it until the I.D.P. was approved. P–17 (1997) regarded the process as an enjoyable challenge that provided the opportunity to “take an in-depth, reflective look at my past and [to] determine how to integrate these experiences and build on them to complete competencies.” P–08 (2002) selected projects that he anticipated doing, then “mapped their tasks to the competencies.” And P–36 (2000) considered “the
development of the I.D.P. was a great exercise,” although he believed that there was a need for clear rubrics to be used “to determine whether an I.D.P. will lead to a demonstration of competency.”

Other than determining how to demonstrate competency in all the competency-areas, 2 respondents in this sub-category described the task as not “particularly difficult” (P–21, 1994) and “not a challenge” (P–20, 1995). P–21 tackled the problem by “[taking] a lot of time with the teaching competencies and [breaking] them down in quite a detailed fashion.” P–20 solved the problem by designing an I.D.P. that “was broad enough to capture the essence of the program and specific enough for me to demonstrate the competencies.” In addition, she “constantly . . . updated and changed” the I.D.P.

Three respondents in this subcategory described three different ways to approach the I.D.P. P–26 (1999) explored two aspects of her life: “(a) who I was as a person and learner and how that connected to the design of the Leadership Program and (b) the work I do and how I could demonstrate competence in each of the areas through that work.” P–10 (2001) “made lists of what I wanted to work on even before I was accepted into the program, so when I did the I.D.P. I had to think about and ‘sculpt’ the ideas to make them work for me.” And P–30 (2001) “approached it from the standpoint of a journey . . . [which] . . . forced me to think about many things that I had not ever given a lot of mind to . . . It became an enjoyable process to write about what was on my mind and what I had accomplished.”

The remaining respondent in this sub-category was somewhat critical of the role of the faculty in the development of the I.D.P.:
The I.D.P. for me was relatively easy. Approved within 6 months of starting the program. I used a template from another student and added my own flair. . . . The difficulty arose in the establishment of a vision—not because my vision wasn’t suitable but because it did not meet the expectations of the readers. Once again, ill-defined expectations. (P–03, 2002)

Category 2: Respondents Who Found Drafting the I.D.P. a Difficult Task (18)

Drafting the I.D.P. proved challenging for 18 respondents. As the following analysis indicates, they cited a variety of reasons for the difficulty.

General comments. Two of the respondents who fit this sub-category reported that the time needed to write the I.D.P. made the task difficult. P–09 (1994) compared the assignment to giving birth, because it took “9 months or longer.” P–37 (1994) called developing the I.D.P. “a fairly long and involved task. I wrote it over a period of about three months as I gathered input and existing documentation from numerous sources.” And P–07 (1995) could not remember how she approached the task but declared that it was difficult.

Need to fulfill competencies. Fulfilling the competencies challenged the 6 respondents in this sub-category. P–01 (1997), for example, found the process “extremely difficult” because “a lot depends on how well you can see the future.” For P–02 (1998), the difficulty was collecting the necessary artifacts to document competency. P–40 (1997) compared writing the I.D.P. to “putting the cart before the horse” because “before I had studied many of the issues I wanted to approach, I had no idea how to study, what I should read, what I would learn, and then what I would be able to do with what I learned.” And P–22 (2000)
stated that “some areas sounded strange” but determined that “after almost having finished my I.D.P., I learned that each area is valuable.”

For 2 respondents, however, incorporating professional responsibilities into the competencies was difficult. P–16 (1996) asserted, “Next to my dissertation, this part of the program presented the greatest challenge.” And P–32 (1996) indicated that the task “took much time.”

**Need for a framework.** Five respondents found writing the I.D.P. difficult until they had a framework to guide them. P–19 (1997) and P–23 (1998) reviewed approved I.D.P.s in order to complete the task. And P–25 (1999) implied that he designed his own framework. “It was tough! The roughest part was coming up with the concept/framework to hang the competencies on. Once the skeleton was in place, the rest evolved over time.”

Two respondents in this sub-category described how they developed frameworks for the I.D.P. P–06 (1995) began with his vision statement, then used the structure of an “Individualized Educational Program (IEP), which is what we write for K–12 students with special needs.” In spite of using the IEP format, P–06 had difficulty thinking of “the six competencies [as] autonomous in and of themselves. It was very difficult to say this [piece of evidence helps to fulfill] this competency and this is not this one.” P–29 (2000), however, “did not have much structure experience with a document of this type . . . [so] approached [the I.D.P.] as a consulting project with each competency as a deliverable.”

**Other reasons for finding the I.D.P. difficult to develop.** The reasons given by the 4 respondents in this sub-category are unique to the respondents. For P–12 (2001), “the portfolio documentation and course outline were relatively
easy. I simply made a grid of all the competencies and what I could show and what I had to offer under each category. This gave me my strengths and weaknesses and I just went on from there.” The vision statement was difficult, however, because it was “very emotional and quite traumatic.” P–04 (1995) implied that the difficulty was determining goals and how to achieve them. P–05 (1998) felt “a good bit of apprehension” because she was unclear about “just what was expected.” And P–35 (2001) was unsure about “what and how I wanted to learn the content areas that early in the program.” She eventually regarded her I.D.P. as evolving and added, “I did begin to look at my work activities differently while writing the I.D.P., because I began looking for ways to develop my leadership abilities and opportunities as part of my studies.”

**Question 2: Did You Make Revisions to Your Original I.D.P.?**

**Background**

The approved I.D.P. serves as a contract between each Leadership participant and Andrews University. The I.D.P. is not, however, unalterable. Rather, because the program was designed to be job-embedded, the I.D.P. is likely to be—indeed, it is expected to be—revised in order to reflect changes in the participant’s professional life. Penner (2002) describes the original I.D.P.-revision practice in this way:

> During the course of the program, changes may occur—new opportunities may develop—in the life of the participant. Consequently . . . participants, with the approval of their advisor, may submit written requests for changes in the I.D.P. These substitute activities must be equal to or of greater value than the original activities. (p. 94)

As the following citation indicates, the approval process remained essentially unchanged through 2002, the final year encompassed by this study.
Additional experiences that strengthen the competencies and your focus in the program may be included in the portfolio without changing the I.D.P. on file. However, deletions of items in an approved I.D.P. and changes in a participant’s program focus must be approved by the advisor. Should there be substantive changes, it will be the discretion of the advisor to require a review of the program team. (*Leadership Program Handbook*, 2002, p. 16)

Analysis of Responses

The 40 respondents fell into two major categories: those who had made or intended to make changes in their I.D.P.s (30), and those who neither had made nor intended to make changes in their I.D.P.s (10). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

**Category 1: Respondents Who Had Made or Intended to Make Changes to Their I.D.P.s (30)**

**Little or no description of or reasons for changes.** Eighteen of the 30 respondents in this sub-category provided little or no description about changing their I.D.P.s. P–32 (1996) and P–03 (2002) stated that they were in the process of revising their I.D.P.s but did not describe the proposed changes. P–32 indicated that seeking approval for the changes was “part of the worry. Should I be going through an official process, or can I replace within the principles of what I expected to accomplish?”

Eight respondents in this sub-category simply stated that they planned to, needed to, or expected to do so (P–07, 1995; P–38, 1995; P–11, 2000; P–24, 2000; P–28, 2000; P–29, 2000; P–13, 2002; and P–34, 2002). Seven respondents in this sub-category already had made what they called minor revisions to their I.D.P.s. Four of the 7 did not describe the changes (P–21, 1994; P–19, 1997; P–40, 1997; and P–14, 1998). P–26 (1999), however, changed “a few course titles,” P–17 (1997)
changed book titles, and P–08 (2002) changed an independent study. P–09 (1994) is the only respondent in this sub-category who made “several” revisions. The changes, she stated, were “mostly in language.”

**Provided reasons for changes.** Twelve respondents provided explanations for the changes they had made or expected to make. P–22 (2000), for example, commented that one could not complete the program without making revisions, if only minor ones. P–33 (1994) explained that she made “one revision only because I was in the program longer than expected and wanted to add some important aspects to support my competencies.” And P–37 (1994) considered the change process a benefit: “I made revisions several times based on feedback from my advisor and other program ‘admins’.”

Four respondents in this sub-category revised their I.D.P.s in order to integrate job changes. P–15 (1996) had experienced one change in employment since beginning the program; P–04 (1995), P–06 (1996), and P–23 (1998) had experienced two changes each.

Four respondents—P–31 (1994), P–20 (1995), and P–05 (1998)—made changes in their I.D.P.s in order to incorporate unforeseen opportunities or to clarify stated goals. P–31, for example, stated that “after the initial submission . . . some things became clear about specific projects that I wanted to do.” P–20, who revised her I.D.P. “continuously,” explained, “I had ideas that I started with, but you never know what a day will bring, so it was flexible to accommodate the changes in my plans.” And P–05 indicated, “I have become involved in projects and activities that I could not have known about in writing my I.D.P.” At the time of the interviews, P–27 (2000), the final respondent in this
sub-category, was “currently making revisions to allow for slight changes and a few unrealistic expectations.”

**Category 2: Respondents Who Neither Had Made nor Intended to Make Changes to Their I.D.P.s (10)**

Five of the 10 respondents in this category simply stated, “No” (P–02, 1998; P–36, 2000; P–39, 2000; P–12, 2001; and P–18, 2002). Of the remaining 5, P–10 (2001) already had completed the coursework and projects outlined in her original I.D.P.; what remained to be done—the completion of the dissertation and final synthesis paper—would not affect the original plan. P–01 (1997) and P–35 (2001) stated that although they did not make formal revisions in the document, they had presented more evidence than had been described in their original I.D.P.s. P–25 stated that “from the start, I viewed my I.D.P. as a contract with the university, so I took longer to put it together and it began in a more ‘finished’ form.” And P–30 observed, “I did not change it once it had been approved. Why rock the boat?”

**Question 3: How Well Have You Been Able to Take Advantage of the Job-embedded Aspect of the Leadership Program?**

**Background**

The original promotional material for the Leadership Program states that “Leadership actively uses the practical application of skills in the workplace as part of the process of fulfilling the competencies” (Andrews University, 1996a, panel 2; 1996b, p. 3). In order to provide an arena in which to fulfill that requirement, employment was one of the provisions for acceptance into the program.
I can find no published statement of the intended job-embedded aspect of the Leadership Program between 1996 and 2002. The faculty did, however, discuss the principle several times during those years. In 1996, they “reaffirmed the importance for students, as part of their I.D.P., to incorporate their competency tasks into the workplace rather than focus only on reading and paper-writing [because] many have prime opportunities to gain competency by pursuing activities in their job” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 31, 1996). In 1997, they observed that “we’re missing the implementation of competencies in the workplace” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, May 13–14, 1997). In 1999, they “re-emphasized that Leadership participants must maintain professional employment to remain active” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, November 4, 1999). The stipulation was voted into practice in 2000 (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, January 24–23, 2000). And in 2002, in the initial edition of the Leadership Program Handbook (2002), the mission statement states that “Leadership is job-embedded and work-related” (p. 3). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Analysis of Responses

P–22 (2000) stated somewhat cryptically, “As professor I was allowed to do it job-embedded, but I had less time than I expected.” The remaining 39 respondents fell into two major categories: those who took advantage of the job-embedded aspect of Leadership (28), and those who did not take advantage of the job-embedded aspect of Leadership (12). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)
Category 1: Respondents Who Took Advantage of the Job-embedded Aspect of Leadership (28)

Respondents who made generally positive comments. Six respondents in this sub-category used terms such as “completely” (P–17, 1997; P–02, 1998; P–25, 1999) and “totally” (P–39, 2000) in their responses. P–36 (2000) stated, “I have certainly made it relevant to my job,” and P–24 (2000) explained, “Everything I do, I think about how I can make it applicable to the program.”

Five respondents in this sub-category were less absolute in their responses but were, nevertheless, positive. P–13 (2002), who had just begun the program, expressed his response as a future intention: “I hope that I am able to do so to a great extent.” P–21 (1994) explained that “nearly everything she did” either was job-embedded or related to “professional activities,” a factor that she regarded as “one of the beauties of the program.” P–06 (1995) “took great advantage of the job-embedded aspect of the program.” P–38 (1995) and P–03 (2002) stated that the job-embeddedness worked “very well.”

Nine respondents specified individual program requirements when relating to the job-embedded aspect of Leadership. P–09 (1994) singled out her dissertation; P–20 (1995), P–16 (1996), and P–08 (2002) identified the I.D.P. or portfolio; P–30 (2001 specified the I.D.P., portfolio, and dissertation; and P–10 (2001) and P–34 (2002) named specific courses. The following comprehensive statements from the remaining respondents in this sub-category reflect the comments of all the respondents in this sub-category:

All the way. I think this was a powerful aspect for me. Two things helped: I was in a situation that allowed me to seek out experiences that were helpful to the program and . . . I tend to be creative when it comes to making connections and looking at the “big picture.” (P–33, 1994)
Almost totally. Every class I designed for the program was either designing a class to teach, doing assessment of my work, etc. A great advantage was that I was even able to design some classes around my leadership in my church and a community ministry. Everything I did in the program related to and improved something I was doing in my life and job, including my dissertation. (P–40, 1997)

Program requirements as professional benefits. The 6 respondents in this sub-category described the impact that Leadership had on their professional lives. P–26 (1999), P–27 (2000), and P–12 (2001) indicated that quality of their work had improved. P–26 “used the competencies” to enhance her work. P–27 asserted that his work had “increased dramatically.” In addition, P–12 attributed improvement in his work to “extra knowledge I have gained . . . [and to] . . . preparing materials . . . for my portfolio.” As P–31 (1994) indicated, pursuing the degree through the program helped me concentrate on some things at work that I wanted to accomplish, and because of the interconnectedness between work and school, everything that I was doing at work I somehow parlayed into a school project. So that was a time when I really excelled at work as well. (P–31, 1994)

P–35 (2001) added that “this program pushes you to seek [opportunities] out more earnestly and intentionally.” And P–14 (1998) commented on the way in which program requirements could be tailored to professional needs:

I am . . . a great advocate of the relevance of this program for leaders in any field, and really appreciate the job-embedded aspect. As I work through documenting my competencies, I delight in applying my I.D.P. in very specific ways to the essence of my job in IT leadership. (P–14, 1998)

Category 2: Respondents Who Did Not Take Advantage of the Job-embedded Aspect of Leadership (12)

General statements about not integrating one’s job into program requirements. Six of the 12 respondents in this category indicated that their
efforts to take advantage of the job-embedded aspect of Leadership had been less than successful. P–28 (2000), for example, disclosed, “I am stretching my job to interface with the program.” P–37 (1994) incorporated “many job-embedded activities” into competency fulfillment, and P–18 (2002) attempted to quantify his effort as “maybe 20 percent, if that.” P–15 (1996) used “some” job-related materials for the competency fulfillment, and P–04 observed, “It took a while, especially for some competencies.” P–29 (2000) made the following observation about this aspect of the program:

It worked] pretty well when I made an effort. Any complaint about the job-embedded aspect of this program is one that can only be an issue of the participant’s willingness. All jobs can facilitate a major role relative to our program when the participant makes it happen. (P–29, 2000)

**Specific statements about not integrating one’s job into program requirements.** Three respondents attributed the difficulty of incorporating critical changes in their professional lives. P–07 (1995) and P–19 (1997) were unable to integrate the requirements for their new jobs into the requirements of the Leadership Program. And P–32 (1996), who had held five different positions in five different organizations between 1996 and 2002, observed,

It started out well. But now I feel I’m to the place where I have to write about what happened before in a manner that will fit my portfolio—but really won’t help my job—and connect this with books and theories. I feel that I’m back in the classroom, [that] the job isn’t embedded anymore. (P–32, 1996)

Of the remaining 3 respondents in this sub-category, P–11 (2000) revealed that he was able to integrate only the dissertation into the program, stating, “Everything I do is usually done on my personal clock.” P–01 (1997) and P–05 (1998), however, related that the inability to embed their current professional responsibilities into the program served to enhance their professional lives:
I did not have the opportunity to perform all of my competencies in my one job, so I was forced to branch out (take on other jobs to show competence). This branching-out has made me more of a leader than I ever thought I could be. I grabbed two opportunities that I know I never would have had it not been for this program. Those opportunities helped me grow tremendously. (P–01, 1997)

There are many parts that are “add-ons” to my regular responsibilities. My dissertation is especially removed from my job. However, I am not regretting the ways I am getting stretched. (P–05, 1998)

Questions 4 and 5: Of the Six Major Competencies, Which One Has Been the Most Useful, or Most Valuable, for You to Develop? Which One Has Been the Least Useful, or Least Valuable, for You to Develop?

Background

Leadership is a competency-based graduate program. “Competency,” states James A. Tucker (2002), “has been defined as the demonstrated ability to perform a skill and to articulate the knowledge-base upon which the skill is based” (p. 54). As initially designed and implemented, the ability to demonstrate skill in and to be fluent in the knowledge base of 20 non-mutually exclusive competencies provided the framework for the Leadership Program.

The 20 individual competencies were categorized into six areas. These areas are effective teacher/instructor/mentor, dynamic change-agent, effective organizer, collaborative consultant, reflective researcher, and competent scholar. In 2000, an additional competency—the working knowledge of ethics and personal/professional development—was added to the area of competent scholar. Concurrently, the three competencies in the area of effective organizer were consolidated into two (Tucker, 2002).

The process by which those competencies were chosen is described in the chapter titled “Crisis as Catalyst for Change.” Briefly, the faculty merged lists of
desired competencies published in the handbooks of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) (Tucker, 2002). The faculty used the combined list as a framework, then added details based on their own expertise to produce the initial list of Leadership competencies.

In the years following 1994, the list of competencies has been revisited and revised. “The changes represent either a matured understanding of the field [of Leadership] or evolving developments in the field” (Tucker, 2002, p. 55). Although the competency-areas have remained essentially unchanged since the inception of the program, the faculty refined competency-area one, competency-area three, and competency-area six in order to reduce the original emphasis on education and to incorporate a broader understanding of leadership across disciplines. The changes are summarized below:

**Competency-area 1: Effective teacher/instructor/mentor.** In 1994, an individual who was competent in this area was described as an effective teacher/instructor with (a) skills in using, evaluating, and adapting instructional materials; (b) skills in instructional management to accommodate individual variability; and (c) skills in instructional strategies. In 2000, the individual components were combined and augmented to read as (a) skills in using, evaluating, and adapting learning materials to accommodate individual variability; (b) skills in learning-strategies, including group processes; and (c) mentoring. In 2002, the title of this competency-area was changed from teacher/instructor to instructor/mentor. This is the only competency-area that has undergone a change in title.
**Competency-area 3: Effective organizer.** Duplication prompted the faculty to reconsider the elements of competency-area 3 (effective organizer). At the inception of the program, the first two individual competencies in this area were “skills in organizational development” (3a) and “skills in allocating resources” (3b). The faculty later concluded that differentiating between the two elements seemed arbitrary. Consequently, the faculty combined the two into one—which became the revised 3a—“skills in organizational development, management, and allocating resources.” Competency 3c, “skills in interpreting laws, regulations, and politics,” became 3b.

**Competency-area 6: Competent scholar.** In 1994, a competent scholar was defined as an individual with a working knowledge of (a) educational foundations; (b) theories of leadership foundations; (c) theories of leadership and management; (d) social systems, including family dynamics, political issues, and bureaucratic structures; and (e) educational technology and its application. In 1999, “educational foundations” was changed to “leadership foundations” in 6a; then it was moved in 2000 to 6b as “philosophical foundations.” Also in 1999, “educational technology” was changed to “current technology” in 6e; in 2000, it became simply “technology.” In 2000, “political issues” became “community structure” and “bureaucratic structures” became “global development” in 6d. Additionally, in 2000, a new component was added as 6a—working knowledge of ethics and personal/professional development—shifting each of the other five down a notch. What began as a list that appeared to be grounded in education, evolved into a list that accommodates participants from a wide range of arenas,
including civil service, the military, business, health services, social services, and religion.

Before presenting the analysis, I must address three aspects about the wording of the interview questions. First, when I wrote the questions, I used the term “six major competencies” in order to designate the six competency-areas. Some respondents, however, related to the individual competencies rather than to the six major areas.

Second, I worded the questions in such terms of “which one,” “least,” and “most.” The intent was that respondents choose only one competency-area. In several cases, however, respondents chose two or more areas. All participant responses have been incorporated into the following analysis.

Third, I drafted the questions so that “valuable” would be viewed as synonymous with “useful,” as the punctuation indicates. Several respondents, however, interpreted the two adjectives as being discrete rather than synonymous. For example, P–12 (2001) stated that there is a “big difference between ‘useful’ and ‘valuable,’” but she did not describe the distinction. In addition, P–35 (2001) rejected both words and evaluated the competencies according to their “fun-factor.”

Analysis of Responses

Two of the 40 respondents—P–11 (2000) and P–13 (2002)—stated that they had not been in the program long enough to make a determination about the relative usefulness of the competency-areas. P–19 (1997) failed to respond directly to the question but, instead, asserted one of the factors that he had been “impressed with about the program is the 20 competencies. I think that a lot of
thought went into them being fairly thorough about that.” Two additional respondents assigned all the individual competencies equal value. P–40 (1997), for example, asserted, “every one has been useful, plus they are so intertwined that it is difficult to separate where one by itself has been more valuable than others.” And P–28 (2000) pointed out that the competencies cover “every aspect of leadership.” The remaining 35 of the 40 respondents rated the competencies as to usefulness, or value, either individually or in combination with other competencies. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

**Category 1: Competency-area One, Effective Teacher/Instructor/Mentor**

**Effective teacher/instructor/mentor as the single most useful, or most valuable, competency-area (6).** The original title of this competency-area, “effective teacher/instructor,” was changed to “effective teacher/mentor” in 1996. This is the only case in which the title of the competency-area was changed.

Six respondents fit this sub-category. P–32 (1996), P–01 (1997), and P–24 (2000) identified competency-area one without providing additional comments. P–09 (1994) stated that this competency-area was life changing, and P–03 (2002) said that it “targeted a weak spot early.” In addition, P–29 (2000) made the following observation:

While I have acted as teacher, coach, leader, facilitator, and mentor in a number of different situations, this competency is the one that has caused me to challenge myself. . . . The process of teaching, coaching, leading, facilitating, and mentoring is grounded in serving others. Developing this as a key competency is a personal BHAG [big hairy audacious goal] of mine.
Effective teacher/instructor/mentor in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as more useful, or more valuable (4). Four respondents fit this sub-category. P–21 (1994) included reflective researcher and competent scholar with effective teacher/mentor as the more useful, or more valuable, competency-areas. P–06 (1995) included competent scholar. Both P–21 and P–06 neglected to provide a more-detailed response. P–23 (1998) included collaborative consultant, “although they are all pervasive.” And P–35 (2001) included dynamic change-agent and competent scholar, because

I’m a teacher, so I’d say the teaching competency has helped me improve my teaching, mostly in terms of having a better understanding of learning theories and teaching methods. The worldview and philosophy areas have also helped me become more inwardly reflective and better understanding of others. Change-agent is the most interesting and attractive area for me in terms of study.

Effective teacher/instructor/mentor as the single least useful, or least valuable, competency-area (3). Three respondents fit this sub-category. P–07 (1995) and P–12 (2001) chose effective instructor/mentor because they were not teachers in the traditional sense and believed that the competency-area was geared to the classroom environment.

Effective teacher/instructor/mentor in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as less useful, or less valuable (0). No respondents fit this sub-category.

Category 2: Competency-area Two,
Dynamic Change-agent

Dynamic change-agent as the single most useful, or most valuable, competency-area (5). Five respondents fit this sub-category. P–07 (1995), P–39

This competency helped provide the incentive to initiate several new programs at my school, which were all successful and also became part of my portfolio. Studying the change process, particularly with Margaret Wheatley and Michael Fullen’s books, inspired me and really provided the direction for my career as well as all other aspects of my personal life. (P–17, 1997)

Change-agent was the one that I wanted to spend the most time on. I’m not content to just talk theoretically about things. I want to be able to take that information and use it. I want to use it on a personal level and also on a systems level. So anything important for me to learn is something that I want to then be able to use in some important way within my life. (P–36, 2000)

Dynamic change-agent in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as more useful, or more valuable (4). Four respondents fit this sub-category. P–05 (1998) included collaborative consultant and reflective researcher, but made no further comment. P–12 (2001) included competent scholar and commented, “Two different questions here. Big difference between useful and valuable!” She did not, however, respond to the question. P–35 (2001) included effective instructor and competent scholar. Her comments are presented in the analysis of effective instructor/mentor. And P–33 (1994) included reflective researcher with dynamic change-agent as the more useful, or more valuable, competency-areas:

It’s hard for me to recall all of them right now. I would say change agent. The work I continue to do is around working with adults to change practices and try to allow people to see other perspectives. The one that really challenged me was the research competency. While that was the most difficult, it was the one that I learned the most in. (P–33, 1994)

Dynamic change-agent as the single least useful, or least valuable, competency-area (1). Only P–16 (1996) designated dynamic change-agent as
least useful, or least valuable, competency-area. She did, however, find some benefit in the contemplative aspect of the competency: “I have conceptually lived out this competency throughout my life. However, the reflection was helpful.”

Dynamic change-agent in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as less useful, or less valuable (0). No respondents fit this sub-category.

Category 3: Competency-area Three, Effective Organizer

Effective organizer as the single most useful, or most valuable, competency-area (1). Only P–02 (1998) indicated that this was the most useful, or most valuable, competency-area. P-02 emphasized that he can apply what he has learned by fulfilling effective organizer to any position that he may hold in his career: “Part of all my jobs has been to think and do.”

Effective organizer in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as more useful, or more valuable (0). No respondents fit this sub-category.

Effective organizer as the single least useful, or least valuable, competency-area (15). Fifteen respondents comprise this sub-category. P–37 (1994) and P–01 (1997) singled out “skills in organizational development,” component 3(a), as the least useful, or least valuable—but made no further comment. P–31 (1994), P–38 (1995), P–05 (1998), and P–08 (2002) also failed to elaborate on their responses. Four additional respondents stated that effective
organizer was the “least challenging” (P–33, 1994), the “least favorite” (P–19, 1997), and “pretty easy” (P–22, 2000).

Three of the 4 respondents in this sub-category either implied or stated that this competency-area is “almost redundant” (P–29, 2000; P–36, 2000; and P–03, 2002). As P–23 (1998) explains,

> By doing all the other competencies, you’re meeting [the requirements for] effective organizer. You are doing public speaking. You are doing communicating. You are doing that in writing. You are doing it on the Internet. You are doing it interpersonally. And by nature, you are following laws and operating within the foundations of your position, whatever that may be. It’s the most mechanical to me. (P–23, 1998)

P–27 (2000) chose this competency-area because he had “already developed those skill areas prior to entering the program.” And P–30 (2001) made the following distinction: Effective organizer has been “not ‘the least valuable’ but maybe ‘the least useful.’” Having said that, I still believe it was good and gave an overall completeness to the competencies, as it addresses [everything from] problem-solving to allocation of resources.”

**Effective organizer in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as less useful, or less valuable (1).** Only P–35 (2001) included collaborative consultant with effective organizer as the less useful, or valuable competency-areas. She relates to the fun-factor of the competency-area rather than to its utility, or value:

> “Useful” is an interesting term to use in this question. They’re all useful, but I don’t enjoy them all equally. I’d say that the consulting and organizational competencies are my least favorite areas, but they also are probably the places where I’m weakest and have to work harder at. The fun-factor is important to me, and I don’t like it when it feels like work.
Category 4: Competency-area Four, Collaborative Consultant

Collaborative consultant as the single most useful, or most valuable, competency-area (3). Three respondents fit this sub-category. P–04 (1995) singled out “skills in effective communication,” component 4(a) but made no additional comment. The remaining two respondents in this sub-category stated that fulfilling the requirements of this competency-area was “just a natural” (P–15, 1996) and “has made the greatest difference” (P–27, 2000).

Collaborative consultant in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as more useful, or more valuable (1). Only P–05 (1998) included dynamic change-agent and reflective researcher with collaborative consultant as the more useful, or more valuable, competency-areas but made no further comment.

Collaborative consultant as the single least useful, or least valuable, competency-area (0). No respondents fit this group.

Collaborative consultant in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as less useful, or less valuable (1). Only P–35 (2001) included effective organizer with collaborative consultant as the less useful, or less valuable, competency-areas. Her explanation is included in the analysis of competency-area three, effective organizer.

Category 5: Competency-area Five, Reflective Researcher

Reflective researcher as the single most useful, or most valuable, competency-area (5). Five respondents comprise this sub-category. P–10 (2001)
did not elaborate on her response. P–16 (1997) stated, “This area extensively
broadened my knowledge base and research performance skills,” and P–25
(1999) observed, “That was by far my least-developed competency, and . . . I
have made significant gains in that area.”

explained, “As a practical theologian, I can now do research, which I could not
do prior to the program.” And P–30 observed, “‘Reflective researcher’ is most
useful because it relates specifically to a growth area at my company and one
that I am intimately involved with these days from a leadership prospective.”

**Reflective researcher in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as more useful, or more valuable (3).** Three respondents fit
this sub-category. P–21 (1994) included effective instructor and competent
scholar with reflective researcher as the more useful, or most valuable,
competency-areas, but made no further comment, and P–05 (1998) included
dynamic change-agent and collaborative consultant; neither elaborated on her
response. And P–26 (1990) included competent scholar as the more useful, or
most valuable, competency-areas, stating that “scholar” was the biggest stretch,
and along with the research competency has added the most to the quality of my
work.

**Reflective researcher as the single least useful, or least valuable,**
competency-area (2). Two respondents comprise this sub-category. P–32 (1996)
did not elaborate on his response, and P–18 (2002) stated that “research does not
mesh well with my job.”
Reflective researcher in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as less useful, or less valuable (0). No respondents fit this sub-category.

Category 6: Competency-area Six, Competent Scholar

Competent scholar as the single most useful, or most valuable, competency-area (7). Seven respondents comprise this sub-category. P–31 (1994), P–38 (1995), and P–08 (2002) made no further comment. P–14 (1998) chose competency-area six, but also observed that “even in the areas where I had strengths, I found value in further developing and documenting my competencies.” P–37 (1994) singled out “working knowledge of theories of learning and human,” component 6(b), but provided no explanation. Additionally, P–18 (2002) indicated that the “working knowledge of technology and its application,” component 6(f), as the most valuable or most useful, adding, “I did a large webpage for work.”

P–20 (1995), the remaining respondent in this sub-category, made the most comprehensive response:

I learned the most from the “scholar” competency. I had a lot to learn, and found the requirements to lead me to new knowledge and a renewed energy to continue my journey as an educator. I continue to read and apply [the] skills [that I] learned to improve my business almost on a daily basis.

Competent scholar in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as more useful, or more valuable (4). Four respondents comprise this sub-category. P–21 (1994) included effective instructor/mentor, and reflective researcher with competent scholar, but she did not elaborate on her response. P–
26 (1999) included reflective researcher because “‘scholar’ was the biggest stretch, and along with the research competency has added the most to the quality of my work.” P–12 (2001) included dynamic-change agent. Her comments are discussed in the analysis of dynamic change-agent. And P–35 (2001) included effective instructor mentor and dynamic change-agent because “change-agent is the most interesting and attractive area for me in terms of study.”

**Competent scholar as the single least useful, or least valuable,**

**competency-area (3).** The 3 respondents who comprise this sub-group chose one component of this competency-area rather than the entire competency. That component is 6(e): “working knowledge of educational technology and its application.” P–21 (1994) and P–02 (1998) made no additional comment. P–09 (1994) made the following statement:

> Technology, because I use what I need. I need what I use. If I need to get more educated on it, I can. To be made to make that a component of a competency... I had to learn how to do the stats program. And I did it and I learned it and it took me hours—perhaps days—to learn it and to get the numbers that I needed and then to develop the ideas around the numbers. And the research that I did with that piece of it was interesting to me. But I’ll never use that research again. ... I’ll never use that program again. I haven’t—not even for my dissertation. I used it only in my competency. Just to be competent in technology. ... I think it’s outdated! ... Technology is changing so fast that to me it seems like a competency in technology would be being able to use your e-mail, being able to communicate effectively online, maybe being able to use PowerPoint—that kind of thing. But most people who are teaching today are already competent doing those things. So that was the least helpful to me. I would have rather spent more time somewhere else, anywhere else in those components than that one.

**Competent scholar in conjunction with one or more other competency-areas as the useful, or less valuable (0).** No respondents fit this sub-category.
Question 6: List the Types of Physical Evidence That You Are Using—or, If You Are Done, Have Used—to Demonstrate Competency

Background

The Individual Development Plan (I.D.P.) maps how each participant intends to achieve proficiency in 20 competency-areas. Tangible evidence of that achievement is collected in a portfolio. Penner (2002) explains that “whatever evidence is included and how it is organized is for the most part up to the participant, but the evidence should include items from a variety of categories” (p. 94), including artifacts such as publications and videotapes as well as evaluations from peers and supervisors.

Analysis of Responses

A great deal of overlap occurred in the types of documentation that respondents listed as proof of competency. Rather than analyze those items in terms of the number of respondents who included each nuance, I categorized similar items into four broad categories: intrapersonal examination, certified and uncertified academic documentation, non-academic professional documentation, and technological evidence. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

_Intrapersonal examination_ consists of journals, reflective notes, and self-evaluations.

_Certified academic documentation_ consists of transcripts, master’s theses, doctoral dissertations, and published articles and books. _Uncertified academic documentation_ consists of reflective notes and self-evaluations.
Professional documentation consists of participant-generated products, such as published articles; résumés and artifacts from administrative files (memoranda, letters, proposals, research reports, and reports to boards, briefings, problem-solving diagrams, handbooks and manuals, program and personnel evaluations, legislation drafted, non-thesis and non-dissertation surveys, and drafted and adopted policies); advertising products (public-relations materials, marketing materials, and event flyers); business-related documents and actions (budgets, business plans and proposals, grants written, agendas and minutes of meetings, project reports, job-descriptions developed, organizational descriptions/maps, mergers-and-acquisitions plans, outcomes measures, and building-projects); training and professional development (completed curricular materials, workshop materials, teaching-log/journals, syllabi, and sermons); and evaluations and testimonials (letters, memoranda, and reports from supervisors, peers, and students; awards; certificates of achievement; and formal consumer evaluations).

Technological evidence consists of photos, videotapes, audiotapes, PowerPoint®, software production and evaluation, webpages and websites, CD-ROMs, and digitized documents.

Summary and Conclusions

Was drafting the I.D.P. a difficult task? How did you approach this activity. With regard to drafting the I.D.P., it is intriguing that respondents frequently used the same reason to support opposing perceptions of difficulty and ease. The opportunity to pursue graduate education without “real guidelines” (P–17, 1997) summarizes this dichotomy. Some respondents found the lack of specific
guidelines as a way to be creative and to grow personally and professionally. Others saw the lack not as an opportunity but as a deterrent to completing the task. On the one hand, the development of the I.D.P. could be “fun and stimulating” (P–30, 2001); on the other hand, the process “created a good bit of apprehension” (P–05, 1998).

The responses suggest that drafting the I.D.P., which is an example of the self-directive aspect of the Leadership Program, was a generally difficult task. Four of the 18 respondents expressed the need for a framework. Four more needed clarification of program expectations. And although 22 respondents indicated that doing so was not difficult, 6 of them used I.D.P.s from participants in earlier cohorts as templates. Again, it is interesting that individuals who have enrolled in a program designed for self-directed, self-motivated adults request a prescriptive format for the item that outlines and documents their proof of competency. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 1.)

If the responses in this study are typical of students in higher education—especially when combined with the need for direction and standards as expressed in the responses to earlier questions—then a more-structured approach to graduate education may be necessary. If drafting the I.D.P. is critical to completing the Leadership Program, how much help should advisors provide? Would a template facilitate the process? Or would a one-size-fits-all template be unsuitable for such an individualized program and deprive participants of the “development” part of the I.D.P.?

Did you make revisions to your original I.D.P.? When completed and approved, the I.D.P. remains a dynamic document. Indeed, 30 of the 40 respondents either had made or expected to make changes to their original
I.D.P.s, often because of changes in their professional lives. As a result, for the most part, participants were able to incorporate the requirements for fulfilling the Leadership Program into their professional lives. Indeed, several respondents commented that demonstrating competency enhanced their work experiences. Respondents who were in new work situations or who changed jobs while in the program did, however, experience difficulty in developing and carrying out the activities in the I.D.P. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 2.)

The Leadership Program readily accommodates I.D.P. revisions. Such revisions reflect the evolving nature of participants’ personal and professional lives. Ten respondents, all in the 1997 through 2002 cohorts, had not or did not intend to revise the document. Did they do so later? Did their initial drafts perfectly accommodate their goals?

*How well have you been able to take advantage of the job-embedded aspect of the Leadership Program?* To varying degrees, 28 respondents integrated program requirements into their professional lives. Indeed, in some cases, they were so determined to do so that they assumed or designed workplace projects to fulfill competencies, thereby enhancing their performance at work. The 12 respondents who did not take advantage of the job-embedded aspect of the program were unable to do so, in general, because of the nature of their jobs or because they had changed jobs since drafting the original I.D.P. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 4a.)

Given that the I.D.P. is a flexible document, the responsibility for accommodating—even enhancing—one’s job should lie with the participant. Were the respondents who did not take advantage of the program aware of their
options? Did they consult with their professional supervisors or academic advisors? Did they discuss the problem with regional-group members? Should the advisors be better acquainted with advisees, even to the extent that they visit participants’ workplaces to fully understand the latters’ duties and responsibilities?

Of the six major competencies, which one has been the most useful, or most valuable, for you to develop? Which one has been the least useful, or valuable, for you to develop? The framework for the I.D.P. is the list of 20 competencies arranged into six general competency-areas. Twenty-six of the 40 respondents designated a single competency or competency-area as the most useful, or most valuable. Six of these 26 identified effective teacher/instructor/mentor, 5 identified dynamic change-agent, 1 identified effective organizer, 3 identified collaborative consultant, 5 identified reflective researcher, and 6 identified part or all of competent scholar. The remaining 14 respondents either had no opinion; regarded the usefulness, or value, of all the competency-areas as equal; or chose one or more competency-areas.

Twenty-four of the 40 respondents designated a single competency or competency-area as the least useful, or least valuable. Five respondents identified effective teacher/instructor/mentor, 1 identified dynamic change-agent, 15 identified effective organizer, none identified collaborative consultant, 2 identified reflective researcher, and 3 identified competent scholar. The remaining 16 respondents either had no opinion; regarded the usefulness, or value, of all competency-areas as equal; or chose one or more competency-areas.

(See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 2, Questions 4a and 4b.)
Participants in the Leadership Program come from a wide variety of professions, and their selections seem to reflect this variety. It is interesting, however, that respondents designated reflective researcher and competent scholar, competency-areas 5 and 6, respectively, as the most useful, or valuable. It is equally interesting that 3 respondents singled out competency 6(e), technology, as the least useful, or valuable.

Given the range of professions that Leadership Program respondents represent, how does the faculty ensure that each participant have an advisor who has a suitable professional background? With regard to the range of competencies, how does the program ensure that they remain relevant and timely?

List the types of physical evidence that you are using—or, if you are don, have used—to demonstrate competency. Participants in the Leadership Program have come from a wide variety of professions. As a result, evidence of competency also consists of a wide variety of items, such as intrapersonal examination, certified and uncertified academic documentation, non-academic professional documentation, and technological evidence. When coupled with the individualized nature of the program, that variety allows each participant to select the combination of items that best suits his or her profession and purpose.
CHAPTER 7

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS, PART 3: SOCIAL-LEARNING ASPECTS OF THE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Introduction

That learning is socially constructed is a fundamental principle of the Leadership Program. As a result, at its inception, the program emphasized and supported “the fertile development of a learning community” (Tucker, 2002, p. 38). This chapter contains the analysis of participant responses to questions that relate to developing the social-learning aspects of the Leadership Program.

Again, I have analyzed each question in this chapter individually, then, based on the responses, I draw conclusions and pose new questions. The three interview questions discussed in this chapter are as follows:

Question 1. Discuss your regional group. Did it function well? Why or why not?

Question 2. Discuss the Roundtables (annual conferences). Have they been valuable experiences? Why or why not?

Question 3. How much have you relied on e-mail and the Internet in the Leadership Program?
Question 1: Discuss Your Regional Group. Did It Function Well? Why or Why Not?

Background

One of the ways in which Leadership encouraged the development of a learning community was to stipulate that each participant become a member of a regional group. Originally, regional groups were designated as geographically defined study-groups. The proximity of participants allowed a group “to meet regularly (at least quarterly) for face-to-face cooperative-learning experiences” ([Welcome to Leadership, 1994, p. 15.]).

The frequency of meetings was the only specific behavioral guideline imposed. Early groups were expected to function as study-groups, however. Regional-group members were to work together to investigate the theoretical foundations for the competencies and to document their knowledge and application of those foundations. When invited to do so, faculty members attended regional-group meetings in order to serve as facilitators both in learning and in the group process. Generally, group members rotated the responsibility of submitting, via e-mail, minutes of the meetings for two purposes: (a) to document that the meeting took place and (b) to share the content of their discussions with the participant population at large. Faculty members as well as non-regional-group-member participants often responded to the minutes, generating further discussion.

The initial promotional material, published in 1996, elaborated on the description of regional groups: “The synergy that occurs when participants work together to reach common goals is one of the program’s most important tools for success. Quarterly study-group meetings are mandatory; monthly meetings are
recommended” (How Does Leadership Work?, n.d., panel 3). Groups were expected to meet monthly for several hours or quarterly for several days. Owing to the individualized nature of the program, no other specific operational guidelines were provided. The members of each group were to assess how to determine and how to meet the individual needs of group members in a cooperative and collaborative setting (J. A. Tucker, personal communication, November 19, 2009).

As early as October 1995, approximately a year after Leadership’s inception, the faculty addressed the issue that not all regional groups were functioning well, possibly indicating the need for more direction and support (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, October 24, 1995). In November 1996, suggestions included establishing “an overall plan for Leadership faculty travel so that the group can schedule equally among the regional groups” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, November 6, 1996).

In 1997, the faculty made several proposals with regard to regional groups: (a) “having a faculty [member] meet with all new groups every time for the first three or four meetings” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, February 20, 1997); (b) assigning each faculty member to “work with a regional group for a one-year period, switching to a different group the following year” (Minutes, Leadership Retreat, May 13–14, 1997); and (c) contacting regional groups that had not submitted schedules of projected meetings (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, November 5, 1997).

In 1998, the faculty suggested making regional groups the focus of the 1998 Roundtable. The suggested topics for the 1998 Roundtable included providing ways in which the groups could be more intentional and emphasizing
the philosophical purpose of the groups to be intellectual collaboration in a social-learning environment (Minutes, Leadership Retreat, May 3–4, 1998). In addition, the discussion about how to support and enforce regional-group meetings continued subsequent to the Roundtable, resulting in only one substantive change in policy. That change occurred in late 1998, perhaps as a way to encourage the groups to be more intentional, when the faculty added assessment responsibilities: They voted to include regional-group members in the sign-off process for I.D.P.s and portfolios. Group members would approve the I.D.P.s and portfolios of other members before those items were submitted for faculty approval (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, November 18, 1998).

The first recorded mention after November 1998 of regional-group functioning was made in early 2000, when “it was stressed that regional groups should be visited by a variety of faculty” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 11, 2000). The minutes for this meeting reflect no further discussion of faculty visits. The next indication of the discussion about regional groups occurred when then program coordinator Loretta Johns, via e-mail, solicited participant comments about the function or functions of the regional groups. I can find no copy of Johns’s initial inquiry, but responses from Leadership participants indicate she likely sent the e-mail in late 2001 and that the resulting discussion continued for several months.

Based on the responses of participants who agreed to share their comments with the Leadership population at large, regional groups served primarily as study-groups. As such, groups met in order to work on competency requirements (Berrien District, e-mail, December 7, 2001); attend I.D.P. presentations to observe the process as well as to learn from the content of the
presentations (Mid-Michigan Millennium, e-mail, January 3, 2002); examine personal worldviews by studying a number of philosophers (Berrien Springs Local–2, February 8, 2002); and to share discoveries made while conducting literature reviews for the dissertation (Northeast, e-mail, April 2, 2002). Only one participant agreed to have her response shared with the rest of the Leadership population. She stated that the primary role of the regional group was a supportive one (Mid-Atlantic, e-mail, March 31, 2002).

Despite faculty and participant discussions, the written description of regional groups in promotional material remained unchanged for the first 8 years of the program. Indeed, the 2000 online description was identical to the 1996 promotional material. Beginning in 2002, however, with the publication of the Leadership Program Handbook, the stated function of regional groups and frequency of the meetings changed from the original design. To some degree, changes resulted from the development of technological communication, which redefined geographical parameters. In the early years of the program, group members met face-to-face, occasionally supplementing those encounters with e-mail communication. In later years, that practice changed—and it did so without diminishing the importance of the regional group.

Your group may be a “regional group” in that you all live in the same geographic region and usually meet face to face in your region, or your group may be scattered geographically, but you generally meet using some form of technology or some combination of face-to-face and virtual interaction. At any rate, the group experience is a critical part of your Leadership program. It is here where you will develop significant competence in leading, setting goals, evaluating progress, solving problems, resolving conflict, and providing support. (Leadership Program Handbook, 2002, p. 17)
In addition, faculty members increased the responsibilities of group members: approval sign-offs for the dissertation topic, the dissertation proposal, the final synthesis paper (to be described in the discussion of Question A–4), and, for non-doctoral candidates, the master’s research project. Sign-offs could be done either in person or online.

The handbook also described fundamental changes regarding the frequency of meetings and the purpose of the Roundtable with respect to regional groups. Rather than the recommended monthly meetings, the 2002 handbook stated the requirement as “a minimum of seven times a year . . . [that included] . . . attendance at the annual Roundtable Conference, where you will evaluate your group activities, plan for the next year’s activities, reconfigure your group to accept new members, and/or change groups” (Leadership Program Handbook, 2002, p. 17).

Following the 2002 Roundtable and the distribution of the 2002 Handbook, in July 2002, the faculty continued to explore the issue of regional-group functioning. In September, for example, this discussion took place:

What is the purpose/philosophy of the regional groups/learning communities? What makes a group work well together? Do the faculty need to intervene when a group is not functioning well? Do we need to develop guidelines regarding growth and new memberships? The following points were then noted:

This is not a distance-education program—the study groups maintain a face-to-face connection between participants and the faculty throughout the program.

It was intended that regional groups would continually accept new members as others leave and would adjust accordingly.

A regional study group should ideally be an ongoing microcosm of organizational behavior to demonstrate Leadership. (Minutes, Leadership Retreat, September 30, 2002)

As a result of that discussion, three other participants, Dr. Jackson, and I formed a regional-group task force (Minutes, Leadership Retreat, September 30,
In addition to the recommendation that the faculty revisit and revive the implementation of the original purposes of the regional groups, the task force advised that a regional-group coordinator be appointed—someone who was not necessarily a faculty member but who could serve as a facilitator (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, November 20, 2002). Although these details were not recorded in the minutes, I recall that we recommended that the coordinator be someone trained in group process, be a permanent part-time member of the Leadership faculty or staff, and be able to travel extensively in order to fulfill the anticipated requirements of the role.

Task-force discussions precipitated several changes in the function of regional groups. First, regional groups were no longer charged with “approving” the I.D.P. but were, instead, expected to “review” it. Second, the stipulation that the regional group approve the dissertation topic, portfolio, and other academic documentation was eliminated; rather, the role became one of collaboration and providing feedback rather than one of authority. Third, the task force members determined that they would address regional-group functioning at the 2003 Roundtable. And fourth, Jackson took on the role of regional-group coordinator as part of her faculty responsibilities (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, November 20, 2002; Minutes, Leadership Faculty, December 11, 2002; Minutes, Leadership Faculty, February 12, 2003; Minutes, Leadership Faculty, May 6, 2003).

Analysis of Responses

P-13 (2002) provided an inconclusive response to the questions:
I think that the group serves a vital function. If it were not for the group, I would not have a competency signed off and others lined up. A certain member of our group kind of led by example.

I am not as clear on having the groups sign off on papers. The aforementioned member of our group has not brought a single thing to the group that has not already been signed off on by his advisor. The first time that he did it, it really annoyed me. However, I first presented my “different” paper to the group and got blasted. So I presented the same paper to my advisor, who “got it.” I made a few changes and presented it to my advisor and she signed off on it. I then took it back to the group and two people immediately signed off on it. The fourth person in my group would probably never sign off on it, if given a choice. I currently have no plans to ever again present anything to my group that has not already been signed off on by my advisor. (P–13, 2002)

Additionally, P–22 (2000) made a somewhat puzzling comment. Although he was not a member of a primarily online group and although his regional group met infrequently, he observed, “Ours is very effective—but we [have met only twice] in three years.”

Only one respondent, P–11 (2002), reported having been a member of a totally non-functioning regional group:

Our group is comprised of . . . very headstrong folks who all have different ways of doing things. We meet very infrequently and get very little accomplished. I get very, very little from the group. We don’t operate as a team due to strong personalities. (P–11, 2000)

The remaining 37 respondents fell into two major categories: those who believed that regional groups sometimes functioned well (20), and those who believed that regional groups always functioned well (17). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

**Category 1: Regional Groups Sometimes Functioned Well (20)**

Changes in the group perceived as either detrimental or an improvement. P–10 (2001) observed that “the group keeps changing as people move away and new people enter the group,” and action could produce negative
consequences. P–33 (1994) summarized the problem in this way: “The functioning changed as people began to graduate and new people came in. Different needs at different times. It was difficult to accommodate that.” P–38 (1998) explained that when several people who “wanted it to work . . . finished, the group lost momentum.” P–40 (1997) remarked, “There has to be a better way of adding new members without destroying a perfectly functional group.” And P–30 (2001) addressed the negative effect of changes in the group: “As people advanced faster than others and there was no influx of fresh recruits other than [a participant] who was very well along when he entered the group, the disconnect has become very important.”

For other groups, however, changes in the regional group had positive consequence. P–25 (1999), for example, described the successful evolution of his regional group in this way:

I have been in two regional groups. The first regional group that we started [lost all but two members in the first year.] At the end of that year, the [remaining] two of us . . . formed what essentially was a virtual group, and it worked out really nicely. . . . We’ve been functioning now for a few years. And in that group we’ve got [four members from four different states] one from [outside the United States]. . . . We get together once a quarter, face to face, and we meet for two-and-a-half days—usually start meeting on a Friday afternoon and end up on a Sunday evening—with a very prescribed agenda. . . . And in between we e-mail constantly. Back and forth. So we’re staying in touch during the three-month period. But then once in those three months we have a very intense focus. (P–25, 1999)

P–05 (1998) confirmed that the addition of members can help the group to function effectively:

Our regional group has been quite dysfunctional. We’re getting better with the addition of some new members recently. Part of the reason is probably because we are so much alike. (P–05, 1997)
**Personalities a factor.** The 3 respondents in this sub-category, cited below, indicated that “strong” members affected the success of their groups. P–04 (1995) described how one member can negatively affect the group. P–27 (2000) and P–39 (2000), however, stated that groups may need such a member.

I’ve been a part of a spectrum—dysfunctional to functional in varying degrees. Dysfunctionality has resulted from a strong individual and from the difficulty of integrating new members and from not having or agreeing on a task that could only be completed if the group worked together. Functionality has resulted from everyone being willing to give and take [and when] specific group goals that met all members’ individual goals. (P–04, 1995)

Within the past year it has turned around, and we are making good headway now. No organization and little leadership (ouch!). P–17 [one of our group members] helped it turn the corner when she needed to move forward to complete her program. (P–27, 2000)

We functioned well when we had a shared vision and when individuals took a leadership role and facilitated meetings, minutes, etc. (P–39, 2000)

**Group not always cohesive.** For the 2 respondents in this category, the regional group functioned well until the needs of the individual members changed. P–21 (1994) stated that her “pretty successful” regional group “fell apart after a while.” As a result, she “pretty much finished up on my own. This was really a disappointment, as I would have liked a mock defense and other support as I was finishing up my dissertation and portfolio.”

P–20 (1995) described her group as functioning extremely well . . . until there was a rift in the choices that some of the participants made. The commitment to the group was not unconditional. The group became further fractured when new participants joined and were not accepted by others. It also became very challenging to meet the needs of new people when the old group was well established and moving in a good direction as a whole. I maintained my connection to some members of the group as I attempted to complete my dissertation, but it was very difficult as some members were not interested in my needs. Our group has now ended as the last member finished her requirements. (P–20, 1995)
Other characteristics lacking. The 7 respondents in this sub-category believed that their groups lacked some aspects of a successful group. P–07 (1995) perceived that her group “hasn’t worked very well (ever) from a ‘scholarly’ perspective, as I perceive other RGs have been able to accomplish.” P–15 (1996) indicated that “at the beginning individuals had trouble attending the sessions. Perhaps the lack of priority and focus may have been part of the problem.” P–32 (1996) asserted, “We have not collaborated. Our approaches are different, we are spread out geographically, our needs are different, and we haven’t found a way to work together. Our efforts to help each other don’t seem to be a mutual experience benefiting all.” And P–26 (1999) stated that because her regional was comprised of work colleagues, what they “missed was the diversity that others from different disciplines and fields would have brought.”

The remaining 3 respondents in this sub-category—P–06 (1995), P–19 (1997), and P–23 (1998)—belonged to the same regional group. The original group split into two because some of the members “focus on process and focus on people and just the learning in and of itself” and others focus on deadlines. P–23 described the experience as a painful one in which the deadline-oriented members “were ready to move on beyond where some of the rest of us were. I can’t debate that, but they dumped us like we were luggage.” P–19 added that, “in two years, most of them have gotten to their dissertation. Three of them are finished and one is well on the way. But another one is defending and that only leaves the fifth one. I don’t know if [the three who have graduated are seeing the other two through].”
P–06 (1995) joined P–19’s and P–23’s resulting regional group, after enduring frustration with his own original group. He described his experience with both groups in this way:

The regional groups were frustrating. The first one I was four hours [away]. Everyone else lived in [within the same vicinity], so they met Wednesday nights at 5:00. And I said, Don’t let me keep you from coming. . . . And they had impromptu meetings. They had a class together, or something, so the rest of them got together that night. And I couldn’t participate in that.

Then I joined a different group that was the Northern Michigan group, and when I joined I joined right in the midst of a painful separation. It was pretty bad. And I wasn’t part of that. . . . There were personality conflicts, there were interest conflicts. . . .

My regional group now is . . . an outstanding one. . . . I graduated shortly thereafter, so I guess I can say that I never had a good experience from my regional group. I did in that I liked the people quite a bit, but I really didn’t get much out of it.

**Category 2: Regional Groups**

*Always Functioned Well (17)*

Seventeen respondents stated that their regional group always functioned well. Five of them used superlatives such as “best” (P–09, 1994), “excellent” (P–31, 1994), “wonderful” (P–12, 2001), and “perfectly” (P–03, 2002) to describe their groups. In addition, P–18 (2002) stated that he “would be surprised if a group out there functions better,” adding that “we meet monthly. We set agendas and goals for each other. We care about each other’s success.”

The remaining 12 respondents in this category echoed P–18’s comments about what constitutes a well-functioning group. In addition, they identified five common characteristics of a well-functioning regional group:

1. Feeling a sense of responsibility to the other members in the form of commitment, accountability, and mutual support—at times even after graduation.
2. Using the personalities and professional backgrounds of group-members to advantage—either because they were similar or because they were different.

3. Having a focused agenda and common goals—including written plans, charters, and evaluation forms.

4. Building a sense of camaraderie—with professional and academic goals supplemented by social activities.

5. Meeting regularly—if not face-to-face, then through e-mail.

Respondents in this category reported that their groups exemplified one or more of those characteristics, as the following statements indicate. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.) P–17 (1997), for example, indicated the regional-group members were accountable to each other, as did P–14 (1998), P–24 (2000), P–29 (2000), and P–34 (2002). P–08 (2002) said the members of his “small group” are “committed to completing the program.” P–28 (2000) also referred to his “small group,” indicating that the size made communication easy. P–37 (1994) and P–16 (1996) emphasized the benefit of “community’ support” and “family members as well as persons who were in the same church organization” in their groups. And P–01 (1997) and P–02 (1998) regarded the differences among group members as advantages. P–01 says, “We have a few concrete-sequentials and a few abstract-randoms. . . . It can be frustrating, but I have learned so much from my regional group.” And P–02 describes his groups as “[having] a balance: a philosopher, a strategist, and a forceful representative of contemporary ideas.” P–35 (2001) seemed to see the need to defend her regional group in her response.
We’ve been described as dysfunctional by a faculty member, but I think we have our own method to the madness. We’re pretty loyal to each other and have become much more focused in our meetings [during] this academic school year. . . . We also try to cover less material in a given meeting, which allows us to focus more attention on one group member’s concerns than spread a little attention to a lot of topics. (P–35, 2001)

The remaining respondent in this category, P–36 (2000), made it a point to add that “a real life meeting” with his regional-group members “is a whole lot different than correspondence by e-mail. It’s a whole lot different.”

**Question 2: Discuss the Roundtables (Annual Conferences). Have They Been Valuable? Why or Why Not?**

**Background**

Annual conferences are an integral component of the Leadership Program that began as “an annual ‘homecoming’ experience” (*Welcome to Leadership*, 1994, p. 8). Because the conference is the only event when all Leadership participants meet jointly, attendance has been one of the “few absolutes” and one of “several non-negotiable conditions” since the inception of the program (*Welcome to Leadership*, 1994, p. 8).

The initial marketing material describes the attendance requirement in this way: “Leadership sponsors an annual conference. Participants convene for several days every summer to make formal presentations, exchange ideas with colleagues, welcome new participants, renew old acquaintances, and [to meet] with advisors” (*How Does Leadership Work?*, n.d., panel 3; *Leadership Builds on Ongoing Communication*, n.d., p. 5). That material further asserts that “because the conference represents the only event during the year in which all Leadership participants meet together, attending the conference is a requirement of the program for all active members” (*How Does Leadership Work?*, n.d., panel 3).
The importance of the annual conference continued to be articulated throughout the years of this study. The initial handbook, published and distributed in 2002, states the purposes of the conferences in more-general terms than earlier descriptions while underscoring the attendance requirement in more-definitive terms.

Attendance at the entire annual conference is a required component of the Leadership program. The goal of the conference is to recast the vision of the program personally and corporately. Each year there is a different emphasis with multiple opportunities to demonstrate, develop and clarify competence. It is a time of inspiration, renewal and refocus. You may only be excused from this conference in the event of a family emergency such as illness or death. In such a case, arrangements need to be made with your advisor before the conference. (Leadership Program Handbook, 2002, p. 18)

The handbook also listed attendance at the annual conference as one of a number of requirements for maintaining active status in the program. (Other conditions for “staying active” are attending a minimum of seven regional-group meetings per year and meeting financial obligations.) Failing to attend the Roundtable may result in inactivation from the program, as described below:

When a participant becomes inactive, the special relationship he or she has with their [sic] program advisor, dissertation committee, or both is suspended. New or currently active doctoral participants will be given preference regarding advisor availability. In addition, the participant’s payment plan is suspended and new charges will not be added. The participant on inactive status may attend regional-group meetings but will not remain on the leadall listserve or have access to Leadership WebCT forums involving chat-rooms and online education experiences. (Leadership Program Handbook, 2002, p. 34)

The following overview provides general descriptions of the annual conferences held from July 1995 (when the first one occurred) through August 2003 (the final deadline for responses to the interviews for this dissertation).
1995 annual conference. The 1995 conference was called simply the “First Annual Leadership Conference,” although the schedule of events indicates that the focus was organizational change. The conference began and ended with “conversations” with Jerry Patterson, superintendent of the Appleton (Wisconsin) Area School District and author of *Upside Down Leadership*. Patterson presented a vision of leadership that requires the adoption of new organizational values. In addition, several participants took active parts in the 2-day conference: (a) Marianne Kirner and Nancy Krafcik-Rousseau, from the Connecticut Special-Education Resource Center, described the statewide leadership initiative that focused on children with learning-problems and behavioral issues; (b) Mark Thogmartin, from the Millersport (Ohio) school system, discussed change at the local level of an organization; and (c) Jack Carey and Marilyn Eggers, from the Model Technology School, in Santa Cruz (California), conducted a workshop on changing learning-systems by integrating technology with the curriculum.

1996 annual conference. In 1996 “The Second Annual Leadership Conference“ featured participants, faculty, and community members who offered sessions in competency-development as it relates to community involvement. The $2\frac{1}{2}$-day conference was incorporated into the 1996 orientation and featured games, performances, discussions, and co-presentations intended to build community among the participants and faculty. As with the 1995 conference, Leadership participants took part in the presentations, but they did so to a lesser extent than did the faculty. The 1996 conference clearly was faculty-delivered.
The planning committees for the 1995 and 1996 conferences had consisted of participants and faculty. Subsequent to the 1996 conference, faculty members reviewed what their role would be for future conferences. Although the minutes provide no reason for the decisions, the faculty determined that for future conferences (a) the faculty would approve conference plans, (b) specific competencies would be addressed, perhaps at the rate of three per conference, (c) the planning-committee would submit a proposal that presented the overview of the conference, and (d) the planning-committee would have available a line-item fund to assist with conference expenses (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, August 5, 1996).

1997 annual conference. The “Third Annual Leadership Conference” was held in 1997. The committee appears to have consisted only of participants—specifically members of the Ohio Regional Group. Based on the August 5, 1996, faculty-meeting minutes, however, one can assume that the events and the budget for implementing them received faculty approval. Whether by design or coincidence, the activities for the 2-day 1997 conference achieved the objective of addressing specific competencies. Dorothy H. Air, a certified facilitator for Covey Leadership Programs, was the keynote speaker. Her topic, “Seven Habits for Highly Effective People: Creating a 'Platform for Service,'” addressed the Leadership Program’s dictum, “Leadership: A Platform for Service.” Faculty and participants addressed several other topics during the conference, including organizational change, research and dissertation processes, and technology in the classroom and in dissertation preparation.
The next discussion of the role of the faculty in the annual conferences occurred at the faculty retreat held in late 1997. Retreat minutes note the following discussion about the upcoming, 1998, conference:

1. Hold poster sessions in order to provide feedback for portfolios.
2. Be certain that advisors are available to advisees all day Sunday.
3. In order to be present at the sessions, faculty should be certain to have no conflicting classes during the Roundtable (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, November 19, 1997).

1998 Roundtable. The 1998 conference was a year of firsts. First, this was the first instance when the annual meeting was called the “Leadership Roundtable,” a name that continues to be used, although sometimes redundantly as “Roundtable Conference.” Second, this was the first instance when the conference was held off campus. The 1995, 1996, and 1997 conferences had taken place on the Andrews University campus, first in a classroom and subsequently in a meeting-room. By 1998, the group had outgrown those locations and the Leadership gathering moved to the Mendel Center, a conference facility in a neighboring town. In addition to accommodating the larger group, one of the rooms in the Conference Center was spacious enough to place tables in a large oval to symbolize the Roundtable philosophy. Third, this was the first instance when post-conference seminars were offered, specifically in introductory statistics and in assessment and evaluation.

The 1998 conference, “Celebrating Community,” featured Jaclyn Kostner, author of *Virtual Leadership*, as the keynote speaker. The remainder of the
Roundtable consisted of Leadership participants who presented portfolios and led poster sessions, as well as faculty who held discussions about research.

**1999 Roundtable.** James A. Tucker delivered the keynote address for the 1999 Roundtable, which focused on “Commitment.” Tables again were arranged in a large oval, and beginning in that year and for several subsequent years, the flag of each participant’s home country was draped from the table in front of his or her corresponding seat. The 1999 Roundtable theme was based on the work of sociologist Parker J. Palmer, author of *The Courage to Teach* and founder and senior partner of the Center for Courage and Renewal. Palmer inaugurated the conference with a 3-hour presentation on the first full day of the gathering. His ideas on education, community, leadership, spirituality, and social change served as the basis for subsequent conference sessions. In addition to such discussions, Leadership participants presented poster sessions and led discussions about technology and the portfolio-completion process.

**2000 Roundtable.** The 2000 Roundtable featured David Hutchens, author of *Shadows of the Neanderthal*, as the keynote speaker. The focus of the conference was “Connectedness,” and a great deal of the remainder of the conference was spent in participant-led plenary sessions dealing with the social-learning theory of Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky. In addition, a 1-hour session called “Grill the Faculty” dealt with program-wide concerns.

Although meeting with advisors had been one of the original reasons for having annual conferences, participants attending the 2000 Roundtable expressed disappointment at not having had time to meet with their advisors.
For the majority of participants, this gathering was the only time when one would have such an opportunity. The faculty determined, however, that it is logistically impossible for everyone to have one-on-one appointments. It will also be difficult to schedule appointments before and after the [2001] conference because of the orientation for the 2001 cohort [which followed immediately]. Perhaps priority for advisee appointments can be given to those who must travel the most distance—for example, the participants from Europe. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, May 24, 2001)

Additionally, as the number of participants grew, so had the challenge of meeting their varied needs and expectations with regard to the Roundtables. First, each participant was at one of several stages of program completion. Consequently, topics that were useful to some participants might be redundant or premature for others. Second, a population that originally had consisted primarily of educators had become a population that included executives of private, civic, and government organizations as well as church leaders at several administrative levels. As a result, some participants regarded what they perceived as the education-focused topics of the conferences to be irrelevant. Third, the demand for a “professional” conference with a series of noted speakers, rather than Leadership participants and faculty, increased (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, September 27, 2000).

**2001 Roundtable.** The focus of the 2001 Roundtable was “Connections, Collaboration and Change.” John Taylor Gatto, author of *Dumbing Us Down: The Hidden Curriculum of Compulsory Education*, *The Exhausted School*, and *A Different Kind of Teacher: Solving the Crisis of American Schooling*, delivered the keynote address. Participants held sessions on organizational change, virtual universities, communication skills in the 21st century, leadership strategies, and web-based portfolios. The event that perhaps made the most impact was the
TACOM-sponsored relatively long PowerPoint® presentation about the purpose of the U.S. Army and the accompanying display of U.S. Army vehicles and equipment. In response to the requests for appointments with advisors, 3 hours were reserved for this purpose.

Minutes from the Leadership retreat held in autumn 2001 indicate that the faculty addressed two recurrent Roundtable issues—time with advisors and placing the focus on program issues. The faculty suggested that “during the day before the Roundtable, veteran participants could offer a question-and-answer period regarding I.D.P.s, or perhaps [they] could offer such a session during the Roundtable. . . . Program concerns could be addressed by contracted faculty” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, September 5, 2001).

It also had become obvious that a number of participants either had not been attending the annual conferences or had picked up their information packets but had not attended the sessions. Minutes from the January 2002 faculty meeting indicate that the faculty executed the following policy with regard to conference attendance:

Reinforce the requirement for Roundtable attendance for the entire session of the annual Leadership Roundtable Conference, as this event fulfills residency requirements required by the Graduate Council. Unexcused absences or missed days will result in inactivation. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 23, 2002)

2002 Roundtable. The 2002 Roundtable, “Celebration of Leadership,” featured two keynote speakers. On the first full day, Betty Wallace, author of The Poisoned Apple, discussed her experiences as superintendent in a rural district of North Carolina, led a question-and-answer period about the impact of local leadership on education, and moderated a panel discussion called “How Can
Leadership Locally Make a Difference Globally?” On the evening of the second day, former airline pilot Al Haynes spoke about his experience crash-landing a Chicago-bound DC-10 on July 19, 1989. The actions of Mr. Haynes and his crew resulted in the survival of 185 of the 297 passengers. For the remainder of the Roundtable, participants and faculty conducted 15 concurrent sessions on a number of program-related topics.


Analysis of Responses

P–13 (2002) dismissed the question by stating, “I am neutral on this subject.” And P–18 (2002) provided general comments without relating to specific components of the conferences: “I have been to one, and I didn’t like it that much. It was overwhelming and not very informative.”
The remaining 38 respondents fell into three major categories: those who addressed only professional aspects of Roundtables (15), those who addressed only program-related aspects of Roundtables (12), and those who addressed professional and program-related aspects of Roundtables (11). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Note: In the following analysis, a number of respondents referred to “the Detroit group” (P–05, 1998; P–25, 1999), “the Detroit cohort” (P–19, 1997), “the Army” (P–28, 2000), or “TACOM” (P–30, 2001). The references are to the 2001 Roundtable, when Leadership participants from the U.S. Army Tank Command, or TACOM, were responsible for the schedule of events. By presenting a promotional film about the Army and providing the opportunity for participants to view a tank, they intended to demonstrate leadership in the organization charged with keeping the peace. Unfortunately, many participants interpreted the presentation as an exhibition of how to conduct war. As a result of the misunderstanding, many Roundtable participants left the presentation during the first 2 hours of what was an all-day event. By afternoon, only a few of the more than 100 participants attending remained.

**Category 1: Respondents Who Addressed Only Professional Aspects of Roundtables (15)**

**Respondents who were generally positive.** Six respondents fit this sub-category. P–21 (1994), for example, found them to be “inspirational.” P–40 (1997) called them her “regular shot in the arm, plus a way to make sure I am up to date on the latest in education and leadership issues.” P–14 (1998) described them as “relevant and valuable” and the speakers and presenters as “interesting
and stimulating.” Two other respondents in this group were equally positive, although both identified “the Detroit group” (P–25, 1999) and “the Army” (P-28, 2000) as exceptions to the otherwise favorable elements of the professional aspects of the Roundtables. By making general observations as well as providing specific examples, P–26 (1999) cited below, submitted the most comprehensive of the statements in this group.

The Roundtable of ’99 was a life-changing experience for me! It launched me into a scholarly community and a realm of personal possibility that far surpassed any personal development “event” before or since. The subsequent years have been unique, diverse, and worldview expanding, but not to the degree that my first year was. . . . [The] 2002 [Roundtable] had the least impact on me, personally, partly because I wasn’t as impressed with Betty Wallace as I had expected to be and partly because I was so far along in the program that there were fewer breakout sessions that applied to my stage in the program. But in general, they have been personal-development activities that I would not be able to get in any other forum that I am aware of. (P–26, 1999)

Respondents who were generally negative. The 9 respondents who focused on the professional aspects of the Roundtables made generally negative comments about the conferences. P–01 (1997) specified the similarity of the events from year to year. P–02 (1998) perceived a “hierarchy of socialization.” P–22 (2000) rated the conferences from “okay” to “a waste of time,” depending on the year. And P–39 (2000) perceived a “disconnect between the expectations/goals of the participants and the capabilities of the planning committee.”

The remaining 4 respondents in this sub-category indicated that the lack of professional or scholarly speakers was disappointing. P–29 (2000) stated simply, “Interesting, but not as tight and ‘meaty’ as I would like.” In the words of P–12 (2001), “If we demand that participants come from all around the world

I would look at quality of instruction, most specifically from my perspective in terms of things like the Roundtable. We should be bringing in some of the most dynamic teachers and presenters that are available in the country. . . . And we’ve brought in people over the last few years, whether it’s Betty Wallace or John Gatto or the fellow who wrote Who Moved My Cheese? . . . This is not anywhere close to the highest level of presentation that we should be able to find. . . . [Betty Wallace] has an interesting book and some good ideas, but she’s not a very polished presenter by a long shot. (P–36, 2000)

I have only been to one and it was somewhat disappointing. It needs better quality keynote speakers and . . . presenters need to be selected who know how to teach and are good public speakers. (P–34, 2002)

Category 2: Respondents Who Addressed Only Program-Related Aspects of Roundtables (12)

Social aspects. Two respondents emphasized the opportunity to interact with other participants.

The use that I’ve always seen for the conferences is a type of homecoming, as a way to connect with the rest of the people in the program. . . . The conference is much more about community and bringing people together and connecting with the place where we go to school, because that’s the only time every year that I would get back to Andrews, for the most part. (P–31, 1994)

I found the Roundtables were good for networking. Some were more valuable than others. At one point, it seemed to be too big, and [it] became impersonal. It was easier for me to disengage. (P–38, 1995)

Participant involvement. Seven respondents specified participant involvement in their comments, calling this aspect inspirational (P–32, 1996),
practical (P–05, 1998), an opportunity to exchange ideas (P–24, 2000). The statements of the following 4 respondents in this group are representative.

My regional group produced the first [Roundtable]. It was huge in my competencies as well as my life skills. Great experience and a great learning experience for all. I’m even going back this year just to see what it is like and to “give back” a bit of what I was given. I’m going to present to new participants. (P–09, 1994)

I really enjoyed those, and I think they’ve been very beneficial to me. . . . I really, really liked the interaction of people from so many varied backgrounds. That was exciting. And to be able to see how they are all dealing with the program and how they’re reaching their competencies in so many ways has been very interesting. (P–17, 1997)

When effective instructor, reflective researcher, and collaborative consultant topics are interwoven. . . . The participant involvement has been vital. (P–23, 1998)

This year was better than last. Increasing participant involvement in the breakout sessions has helped. (P–27, 2000)

**Faculty involvement.** Three respondents addressed the opportunity to interact with faculty members as a benefit of the Roundtables. P–11 (2000), for example, appreciated the “chance to spend quality time with faculty.” P–10 (2001) stated that she “would like to see more presentations by faculty at the RT and also have faculty members there in attendance.” And P–35 (2001) observed,

Some of the best things I’ve gone to at RT [were] presented by the AU faculty. We have so few opportunities to be in classes face-to-face with the faculty, I’d really like to see more sessions being presented by the AU faculty like in orientation. (P–35, 2001)

**Category 3: Respondents Who Addressed Professional and Program-Related Aspects of Roundtables (11)**

**Both aspects generally valuable.** Three respondents found the professional as well as the program-related aspects of the Roundtables valuable. P–06 (1995) stated that the Roundtables were improving, although he did not
regard the perceived change in focus from “completing the program to
presenting content” as “welcome.” The remaining 2 respondents in this group
had graduated, and both would have liked to have continued attending the
conferences:

They definitely were in the early days [when I attended]. I have not
attended them since graduation due to major conflicts with my
employment. The opportunity to interface with internationally known
presenters was valuable, as was the opportunity to showcase our “local”
projects, talents, and interests. (P–37, 1994)

The Roundtables, for me, were the highlight of the program. As a
graduate, I’m regretful that my schedule does not allow me to participate
in this year’s Roundtable. The renowned speakers, participant interaction,
faculty consultation, and big-picture setting have made a phenomenal
impact on my development as a program participant. (P–16, 1996)

**Program-related aspects always valuable; professional aspects**

**sometimes valuable.** Four respondents in this group stated that the program-
related aspects of the program always were valuable, but that professional
aspects ranged from “not valuable with regard to content” (P–33, 1994) to
following comments:

Roundtable has been okay. I’m always glad to see my cohort members
and those in the years surrounding mine. . . . Some of the presentations at
Roundtable have been helpful, others mediocre. (P–07, 1995)

I did not gain very much from the Roundtables themselves. [But] being
on campus had a revitalizing affect, like recharging the battery of
determination. (P–15, 1996)

Two respondents in this sub-category spoke to changes in participant
involvement, changes in the composition of the participant population, and
changes in the size of the participant population:

The first Roundtables were valuable to me, perhaps because we were able
to provide input that might help shape the program. These last few
conferences have been much more like standard conferences. They haven’t been that helpful. Two years ago was the first year of the dynamic with a large, kind of outside, group coming in. That was the year that we had a 2000 cohort and a Detroit cohort. (P–19, 1997)

Yes. One of the few times that I have had to concentrate on a study program. Also opportunities to increase my knowledge base and be exposed to incredible personages and concepts. The larger the group gets, the less the Roundtables are opportunities for team-building for me. (P–04, 1995)

The remaining 2 respondents in this sub-category are interesting in that they represent a juxtaposition with regard to the speakers. P–26 (1999), cited earlier, in category one (“generally positive”) stated that she had not been impressed with Betty Wallace. The respondents cited below also refer to “professional” speakers—if not by name, then by implication—and they present opposing views.

The Roundtables are valuable, although I believe they could be more productive. I think too much time is spent on the camaraderie aspect, owing perhaps to the Christian focus. I would rather see more focused presentations on the mechanics of the program and the how-to’s of the various aspects of the program like portfolio- and dissertation-development. I especially liked the speakers like John Taylor Gatto, and I look forward to Wheatley. I also liked the TACOM presentation with all the items and presentations they did. (P–30, 2001)

I have not found the conferences and seminars very useful. For most of the seminars, I would rather just read the book. What has been useful during that one-week period is meeting with my advisor and attending a dissertation defense. (P–08, 2002)

Question 3: How Much Have You Relied on E-mail and the Internet in the Leadership Program?

Background

Access to electronic communication has been a requirement of the Leadership Program since its inception. In 1994, most of the participants did not live near Andrews University. Indeed, individuals from Massachusetts to
California and from northern Michigan to Georgia comprised the initial cohort. Although still in its technological infancy, telecommunication was expected to be an effective and efficient way to deliver information and to conduct discussions. As participants from Canada, Europe, Africa, and other countries joined the program in subsequent years, e-mail continued to be the primary means of communication. Even participants who worked on or lived near the Andrews campus found telecommunication to be extremely useful.

Early attempts at communicating electronically were sometimes unsuccessful, such as when, in February 1995, participants were unable to access their e-mail accounts. When the technological issues were resolved, electronic communication became a means for delivering courses. In 1996, Foundations in Educational Leadership became the first course conducted online. And in 1997, participants and faculty took part in e-mail discussions on such topics as grading as an assessment tool, block teaching, and servant-leadership.

Currently, participants are able to take a number of courses online. In addition, they can register for classes, check grades, sign off on regional-group members’ competencies, and conduct other academic business via e-mail and the Internet. General discussions involving all participants, however, have ceased.

Analysis of Responses

The 40 respondents fell into two major categories: those who relied on e-mail and other forms of electronic communication (31), and those who did not rely on e-mail and other forms of electronic communication (9). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)
General comments about the usefulness of electronic communication.

Twelve respondents provided answers that were short, non-specific, or both in order to describe the extent of their use of e-mail and the Internet. P–21 (1994) observed, “E-mail more than the Internet, but I think that is because I was an early participant and getting Internet access to the library, ERIC, etc. was not nearly as easy as it is now.” In addition, P–39 (2000) did not elaborate on the basic answer to the question, but she did make the following recommendation:

A tremendous amount. In fact, this is another area to have dialogue about at orientation, as it can create challenges about understanding each other and defining turn-around time expectations. (P–39, 2000)

In addition, 6 respondents used descriptors such as “almost one hundred percent” (P–09, 1994), “quite a bit” (P–23, 1998), “extensively” (P–27, 2000), “a great deal” (P–29, 2000), “very heavily” (P–08, 2002), and “lots” (P–13, 2002).

Four respondents made longer but equally imprecise statements about the use of electronic communication. P–07 (1995) regarded e-mail and the Internet as “invaluable.” P–04 (1995), and P–05 (1998) indicated that they could not have completed the program without either. P–26 (1999) qualifies her comments with regard to when she used e-mail and the Internet in this way: “Very heavily in the beginning of the program, and less the closer I came to finishing. It was a priorities issue—writing became the only priority!”

Specific comments about the usefulness of electronic communication.

Two of the 7 respondents in this sub-category considered e-mail and the Internet to be “critical to communication” (P–33, 1994)—so critical that P–37 (1994) called
it “our lifeblood.” The statements of the remaining 4 respondents in this sub-category speak to the importance of telecommunication for local as well as remote participants, and for fulfilling specific requirements. P–17 (1997) used e-mail to communicate with other Leadership participants (“other than regional-group meetings”) and faculty. She also used the Andrews library databases, via the Internet, for the majority of her literature review. P–40 (1997) used e-mail and the Internet for communication with “group members, instructors, advisors, and committee members,” as well as to conduct a great deal of her research. P–40 asserts, “I couldn’t have done the program without them.” P–10 (2001) stated that she also used e-mail and the Internet to communicate and to conduct research. “I took several courses online,” she said, “and really enjoy that format.”

It is noteworthy that telecommunication is a handy tool for all participants, nearby as well as distant:

Even though I was right on campus for my first 4.5 years in the program, I could not have participated without it. This program cannot exist without e-mail and the Internet. (P–14, 1998)

I am in a remote part of Michigan, so the Internet has been helpful in most aspects of my work. (P–19, 1997)

Specific comments about the value of e-mail. Eighteen respondents stated or implied that they used e-mail more than other aspects of the Internet. Indeed, they relied “mostly [on] e-mail” (P–24, 2000). P–06 (1995) for example, considered e-mail to be “an integral component without which it would have been impossible to be successful in the program.” And P–15 (1996) asserted that “e-mail is paramount, about 95% of the time.”
As with the respondents who made comments about the general use of electronic communication, respondents who specifically noted the value of e-mail used descriptors such as “extensively” (P–25, 1999), “heavily” (P–20, 1995; P–16, 1996), and “a lot” (P–28, 2000; P–30, 2001; P–18, 2002). E-mail allowed respondents to receive up-to-date information about the program as well as to communicate efficiently with other participants, with faculty, and with staff. Six respondents in this sub-group specified how they used e-mail. P–38 (1995), P–36 (2000), and P–12 (2001) communicated via e-mail with faculty. P–16 (1996) relied on e-mail “for receipt of information and to be continually informed regarding new program developments.” P–22 (2000) found e-mail “was most useful to talk with Carol [then program manager].” And P–35 (2001) stated, “It’s my primary means of communicating with the program, but I know that if I need to have a telephone conversation that it’s easily arranged.

Category 2: Respondents Who Did Not Rely on E-mail and Other Forms of Electronic Communication (9)

Five of the 7 respondents in this category regarded some or all aspects of using e-mail and the Internet “ineffective” (P–32, 1996) or “difficult” (P–11, 2000), at least initially. Their level of use ranges from “very little” (P–02, 1998) to “not exclusively” (P–34, 2002) to “completely” (P–03, 2002). P–02 explained that she “[prefers] dealing face-to-face with my advisor and my local group,” and P–11 “[prefers] the traditional classroom experience with the open discussion on a topic vs. trying to follow disjointed ‘topic strings.’” P–32 and P–03 found web-based classes to be “ineffective” and “[not] all that it is cracked
up to be.” And P–34 reported, “My advisor prefers phone and personal meetings.”

P–31 (1994) and P–01 (1997), the remaining 2 respondents in this category, described their initial difficulty with using electronic communication, but they also credited the program with introducing them to the benefits of using technology. As P–1997 describes the experience,

I have had so many problems with using e-mail, the Internet, my WebCT, the library services, [and] on-line courses that I am sick of it. However, I . . . have to say that without this program, I would have given up on technology completely and would not be as knowledgeable as I am now. I had never been on the Internet prior to this program. The only computer program I have used was a word-processor and maybe a spreadsheet. This program has forced me to learn the Internet and e-mail, and I am much better for having learned. (P–01, 1997)

Summary and Conclusions

Discuss your regional group. Did it function well? Why or why not? From its inception, the Leadership Program has incorporated ways for participants to learn with and from each other. Required, regularly scheduled regional-group meetings have been one venue for social learning. Three of the 40 respondents failed to answer the question directly, and 20 respondents reported that their regional groups sometimes functioned well. The 17 remaining respondents stated that their groups were successful and identified five components of successful groups, components that were lacking in the groups of the other respondents. According to these 17 respondents, the five components necessary for a successful group are (a) commitment, accountability, and mutual support; (b) using individual similarities and differences to the groups’ advantage; (c) maintaining a focused agenda and setting common goals; (d) supplementing
academic goals with social activities to develop camaraderie; and (e) meeting regularly, through e-mail if not face-to-face.

It also is noteworthy that issues regarded as detrimental by members of some groups were deemed beneficial by members of other groups, likely because they practiced the five components, enumerated in the preceding paragraph, deemed necessary for success. But do groups need more than a list of attributes to function well? Are participants equipped with the knowledge and practice needed to maintain successful groups? What faculty support would be needed to mentor the group process? How do well-functioning groups adapt to changing group memberships? What action, if any, do members take when one of their group fails to meet expected responsibilities?

Discussion on the Roundtables: Have they been valuable experiences? Why or why not? Responses to the question about the value of the Roundtables, or annual conferences, were at extreme ends of the virtual satisfaction scale. According to the respondents, Roundtables ranged from being “the highlight of the program” (P–16, 1996) to “a waste of time” (P–22, 2000). Some participants looked forward to camaraderie; others, to well-known presenters. Some participants expected to learn more about how to complete program requirements; others, to learn more about current issues in education and leadership. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 3, Question 2.)

The responses indicate that presenting “a mixed bag” (P–03, 2002) of activities would be the most satisfactory approach to the Roundtables. First, give participants the task of organizing and presenting the Roundtables. Because participants are professionals—sometimes with more experience in their areas than do the faculty—they are, for the most part, qualified to take on the
responsibility of organizing and presenting Roundtable activities. Each year, for example, the members of an annual cohort could determine the focus of the conference as well as the best ways in which to support that focus. Participants could conduct workshops, help new participants with I.D.P. development, or lead discussions, thereby exemplifying the social-learning and participant-driven aspects of the program. A recognized author—again, determined by the planning-group—could lead a discussion related to his or her work.

The responses also indicate that pleasing all participants all of the time is unlikely. Given the number of participants, would it be financially and logistically feasible to hold two conferences each year, one more traditionally professional than the other?

*How much have you relied on e-mail and the Internet in the Leadership Program?* When the program began, in 1994, e-mail and the Internet were relatively new concepts, at least for the general population. Respondents indicate that electronic communication has been a useful—if not essential—part of the program. They have used e-mail and the Internet to communicate with other participants and with faculty and staff, to conduct research, and to take courses. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 3, Question 3.)

Initially, the Leadership Program depended on technology only as a means of communication. Currently, technology provides a way to conduct courses and to allow non-local faculty members to attend dissertation defenses. Based on participants’ responses, at least to some degree, e-mail and other forms of electronic communication are effective and efficient tools. But does electronic communication qualify as social learning? If so, how would the program accommodate participants who prefer face-to-face interaction? Would exploring
more-recently-developed social-media options as a way of experiencing desired social-learning outcomes be useful?
CHAPTER 8

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS, PART 4:
PHILOSOPHICAL MATTERS

Introduction

In 1994, four faculty members of the Andrews University School of Education established an innovative graduate program. They called the program “Leadership.” As James A. Tucker recalls, “the word was a popular one at the time. The faculty adopted it because it was timely and because the name fit” (personal communication, November 19, 2010).

The Leadership Program would incorporate a unique approach to graduate education—one that was interdisciplinary and competency-based rather than course-driven. Participants were to prove competency in six non-mutually-exclusive areas considered necessary for effective leadership. Although listed separately, the competency-areas “cannot be segmented in leadership—only in pedagogical theory, and even then they lose impact as well as leadership relevance if there isn’t a constant attempt to integrate them” (Tucker, 2002, p. 56). Participants would be expected to prove competency by using appropriate theoretical frameworks to undergird practical application in each area. Participants also would be able to individualize program requirements in order to enhance their own learning and leadership capacity.
Such individualization resulted in a certain amount of ambiguity as participants worked with faculty to design programs tailored to their specific needs. Whatever the design, participants were to understand the theoretical foundations underpinning practice—and the practice that exemplified theory. In addition, each participant, rather, was expected to develop his or her own theory of leadership.

The questions analyzed in this chapter are listed below. As before, I analyze each separately, then present a summary and conclusion at the end of the chapter.

**Question 1.** What does “leadership” mean to you?

**Question 2.** Have you heard the term “tolerance for ambiguity” in reference to the Leadership Program? If so, what does it mean to you?

**Question 3.** The Leadership Program demands that its participants have a strong theoretical foundation to support its practical application. How has that requirement affected you?

**Question 4.** How have you changed with regard to attitude, habits, or both as a result of the Leadership Program?

**Question 1: What Does “[the Concept of] Leadership” Mean to You?**

**Background**

Although program materials emphasized the development of the concept of leaders and leadership, that concept is amorphous, adaptable, and open to interpretation. The purpose of the program has not been to cultivate a certain type of leader or to promote a certain perspective of leadership. Rather, the
purpose has been to prepare “leaders for service in all professional forums” (Andrews University, 1996a, panel 2; 1996b, p. 6).

In “A Conversation About Leadership,” Tucker and participants Jean Papandrea and Jennifer Dove operationally defined leaders in this way:

What leaders do when leading a group is a process. It is an abstract concept of integrating everything leaders know. It’s an intuitive and creative process that creates the conditions for the leader and the group together as a new thing. It’s synergy, which until this conversation was quite an abstract concept but now seems more tangible. (Papandrea, Dove, & Tucker, 2001, as cited in Tucker, 2002, p. 43)

Tucker concluded that the purpose of the Leadership Program could indeed be defined as one that would develop leaders who are functional synergists and can function effectively within such an abstract concept. . . . We in the Leadership Program believe that it is possible to develop this skill, and we have designed the program in ways that we believe will do just that. (Tucker, 2002, p. 43)

Program materials distributed at the initial, 1994, orientation, grounded leadership in the Christian worldview: “The program is dedicated to the principals of Christian faith and seeks to integrate faith and learning in a way that will prepare its graduates for responsible service. That is our mission!” (“Leadership: A Graduate Program at Andrews University School of Education,” 1994, p. 2). The general Christian connection continued to be articulated in materials distributed through the 1999 orientation, as well as in marketing materials. In addition, the service-oriented concept was described as one that supported the specific mission of Andrews University to provide an education that resulted in what Ellen G. White (1903) calls “the harmonious development of the physical, the mental, and the spiritual powers [of the individual]. It prepares the student for the joy of service in this world and for the higher joy of wider service in the world to come” (p. 11, as cited in Tucker, 2002, p. 37). The
Leadership Program, then, was established in the context of service, which in turn was defined as “active human behavior that recognizes and supports the human dignity and moral well-being of all people on Earth” (Tucker, 2002, p. 37).

Analysis of Responses

P–28 (2000) did not address the question. Despite the use of quotation marks and the lowercase letter “l” in “leadership” in the original question, P–28 responded, “The program or the word? I am not sure what you are asking.” In addition, P–13 (2002) indicated that he was rethinking the meaning of the word and was “unclear on this right now.” The remaining 38 respondents fell into four major categories: those who defined the words in terms of an individual at the forefront (18), those who defined the word in general relational terms (9), those who defined leadership in vague terms (6), and those who regarded leadership as an opportunity to serve (5). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Respondents Who Defined Leadership in Terms of an Individual in the Forefront (18)

General comments. Ten respondents indicated that an individual typically acts in ways to achieve a certain goal or goals, which may be shared by the group. He or she may assume responsibility for “developing an organizational vision and facilitating successful progress toward that vision” (P–06, 1995), furnish “specific directions vs. thought-provoking questions” (P–38, 1995), provide “sound counsel” (P–15, 1996), or “[point] out a vision and [light] the way” (P–19, 1997). Three other respondents stated that the individual may need the ability “to provide . . . support and challenge others” (P–05, 1998), “[infuse]
energy and vision into a team” (P–14, 1998), or to “influence people in a way that benefits everyone” (P–24, 2000). The comments of P–31 (1994) and P–03 (2002), below, are representative of the complete statements of all respondents in this group.

Leadership to me means doing the right thing when no one else wants to. It means having high expectations and thinking outside the box. It means instilling confidence in others about the direction you are going. It means having high morals and standards and taking the hard road if it is the right thing to do. It means one hundred percent commitment and loyalty to those who support you. (P–31, 1994)

Ah . . . leadership . . . . Fundamentally it is about determining a purpose and guiding, directing, and motivating others to join and then collaboratively strive towards that purpose. (P–03, 2002)

P–17 (1997), the final respondent in this sub-category, is the only one of the 40 respondents who alludes to the six competency-areas in the definition of leadership.

Thinking about the great leaders of this world, the words that come to mind are example, inspiring, initiative, risk-taker, deep thinker. I think the six competencies of the Leadership Program say it best. In that respect then, (good) leadership is that set of qualities possessed by individuals who are in a position to move others toward specific goals. (P–17, 1997)

**Named selves as leaders.** Four respondents designated themselves central as to their definition of leadership. In the words of P–26 (1999),

Leadership means a combination of values, passion, vision, people-skills, organizational-development knowledge base, pragmatics, and courage. It means that I know where I want the organization to be in the future, [that] I surround myself with people of great passion and skill, [that] I set expectations and measures, [that] I guide and coach, [and that I] then get out of the way while people create. (P–26, 1999)

The remaining three respondents in this group not only put themselves in the role of leader, but they also determined that they served as models. P–23 (1998) asserts that leadership is “the ability to lead myself well and, as a result, lead

**Role of leadership theorists.** In their descriptions of leadership, four respondents referred to leadership theorists—but in different ways. P–25 (1999) and P–18 (2002) based their definitions in the words of Peter Drucker (management consultant), John C. Maxwell (Christian author and speaker), Robert K. Greenleaf (proponent of servant-leadership), and President John F. Kennedy.

P–01 (1997) and P–30 (2001) regarded leadership as situational, adaptive, and ambiguous, as the following statements indicate:

I am not going to quote anyone famous, because I truly believe it is something from within that each of us shapes in relation to our culture and personality. The exact same leadership style may work for one person given their situation but not another. Therefore, leadership is an adaptive term. (P–01)

Leadership has a whole lot of meanings to me and depends as much on the circumstances than it does on the definition. . . . I like to think of it as a process of responding to differing conditions, issues, matters, and situations. (P–30)

**Category 2: Respondents Who Defined Leadership in Relational Terms (9)**

The 9 respondents in this category described leadership as supporting a system that is beneficial to the individual, the organization, or both. According to 3 of these respondents, the purpose of the individuals in such a system is to “develop, validate, utilize, and maximize the giftedness residing [in] others” (P–37, 1994), “serve and represent a group” (P–11, 2000), and “what individuals do in facilitating the efforts of other people” (P–29, 2000).
For 6 respondents in this category, leadership expedites the attainment of “a mutually positive end” (P–36, 2000), “promotes growth for the individual as well as the organization” (P–10, 2001), “[facilitates] the efforts of other people” (P–39, 2000), and advances “our objective” (P–08, 2002). The comments of the remaining 2 respondents further support those ideas:

I think that leadership is . . . being willing to extend yourself on behalf of a group that you work with, whether in a volunteer situation or in a professional/paid situation. Leadership is the ability to bring people together to work toward a common goal—to help them identify that goal—and to achieve it . . . . The leader is . . . the one who listens and observes, and coaches, and brings out the best in others. (P–21, 1994)

Leadership is a symbiotic relationship between people that allows for the pursuing of a common purpose. It happens only apart from a context of coercion (management) and thus must reflect willing involvement on the part of the participants. (P–27, 2000)

Category 3: Respondents Who Defined Leadership in Vague Terms (6)

Six respondents provided somewhat vague, noncommittal responses to the question. P–33 (1994), for example, stated, “Leadership takes different forms. Leadership takes knowledge and a lot of people skills to really make a difference and lead people.” P–22 (2000) defined leadership as “serving in a specific role.” And P–35 (2001) commented that “leadership involves seeing the future vision, guiding present actions that lead to the vision while honoring the past.” The remaining 3 respondents in this group used strings of words as their responses: “being, knowing, and doing” (P–02, 1998); “administration, followers, vision, ideas” (P–04, 1995); and “supporting, guiding, mentoring, setting an example” (P–12, 2001).
Category 4: Respondents Who Regarded Leadership as an Opportunity to Serve (5)

Five of the 40 respondents fit this category. The comments of P–09 (1994) resonated with the Christianity-related missions of Andrews University and the Leadership Program. To P–09, leadership “means giving up self to Christ and living in such a way that others follow you.” P–07 (1995) listed “servanthood” among several other qualities of leadership. P–16 (1996) defined leadership in terms of “a process of serving others” and of “influencing others as a result of dedicating one’s life to serving individuals, groups, and/or organizations. And P–40 (1997) described leadership as “learning the most I can so that I can always do the best I can in all situations.” It is noteworthy that P–20 (1995) differentiated between leadership and servant-leadership:

Leadership means modeling, being responsible, demonstrating integrity, being close to the issues but far enough ahead to motivate people to move forward. It means taking a vision and making it a reality. Servant-leadership requires selfless giving for the benefit of others. It is through giving that we receive. Leadership to me is about what is in my heart first, then my mind. I am a leader because I have a vision and have taken the steps to make it a reality. (P–20, 1995)

Question 2: Have You Heard the Term “Tolerance for Ambiguity” in Reference to the Leadership Program? If So, What Does It Mean to You?

Background

The phrase “tolerance for ambiguity” was an integral part of Leadership nomenclature at the program’s inception. Those of us in the initial cohort understood the term to reflect our roles in an innovative graduate program. The draft of the program proposal states that role in this way:
As a participant in the pilot phrase of this program, you will have to be comfortable with a relatively high level of ambiguity in terms of program requirements. The faculty program-team will not have worked out all of the details, because there is no way to anticipate all that will be involved. We are entering uncharted academic waters. Such an experience can be both exciting and frightening. For this initial phase of the program’s development, we are only accepting individuals who are comfortable with the degree of flexibility and self-motivation that will be required.

You will not only be learning in terms that are highly tailored to your needs, you [also] will be helping us develop the structure of the program. You will be part of a team of participants [who] include both faculty and students as we learn together about effective graduate education. (Welcome to Leadership, 1994, p. 5)

The preceding paragraph also appeared in the 1995 version of the proposal by the same name (Welcome to Leadership, 1995). In 1996, when the initial promotional material was produced, the term was no longer part of written descriptions of the program but, as I remember, continued to be used in discussions, especially those about I.D.P. development.

In early 2001, the Leadership faculty expressed the need for “a clear and comprehensive participants’ manual.” The manual was intended to reduce the amount of ambiguity that seemed to distress some participants (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, February 27, 2001). The first Leadership Program Handbook was produced in 2002 and was distributed at the July 2002 Roundtable.

Analysis of Responses

Several terms are part of the vocabulary of the Leadership Program. One of these is “tolerance for ambiguity.” Question 9.2 was intended to explore how participants defined the term. Of the 40 respondents, two—P–11 (2000) and P–34 (2002)—stated simply that they had not heard the term “tolerance for ambiguity” used in relation to the Leadership Program. A third respondent, P–15 (1996), answered, “No. I do not know.” And P–37 (1994) called the term “deeply
meaningful” but failed to define it. The remaining 36 respondents fell into two major categories: those who had heard the term (30), and those who had not heard the term (6). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Respondents Who Had Heard of “Tolerance for Ambiguity” (30)

Thirty respondents stated that they had heard the term “tolerance for ambiguity.” In addition, 2 respondents made brief, possibly disparaging comments: For P–36 (2000), the term “means no one has or wants to share a clear answer”; for P–18 (2002), it “means there is no structure.”

Lack of structure. Thirteen respondents related to tolerance for ambiguity as it relates to the way in which it is practiced in the Leadership Program. P–06 (1995) asserted that she has “lived” ambiguity and that it means being able to operate within a system that is “still actively evolving.” P–02 (1998) had heard the term and interpreted it to mean that “a participant must be comfortable with lack of structure.” And P–10 (2001) explained that the term meant that “sometimes we have to be satisfied with not knowing all the details of something. In relation to the program, I think it means that the participants find out about the program as they go along, and even more so create the program for themselves.”

The remaining 4 respondents in this sub-category sometimes had opposing views about this aspect of the program. Although she did not elaborate on the statement, P–09 (1994) asserted, “It made all the sense in the world.” For P–31 (1994), however, “had I not had a personal relationship with
F–04, I think that I would have been a lot more nervous than I was because typically I’m not a person who has a high tolerance for ambiguity. I want things spelled out: This is what you’ve got to do; this is how it works.” And although P–27 (2000) admitted to feeling “much safer in an environment of ambiguity” because, as a result of his experience in the program, “I have tools for navigating through the ‘fog banks’ that life presents that I did not formerly possess,” P–13 (2002) had a different opinion:

Three people in my group submitted a paper for sign-off on the same competency. Two of those papers looked very much alike. Mine on the other hand did not. It was very different. I am clear that many would not like it. I am clear that certain advisors would not have signed off on it or at least would not have wanted to. . . . There are many different ways to do the steps along the way. Certain advisors are more focused on the end than the steps along the way. The program as it was originally conceived was focused on the end. Many are not comfortable with this approach. They want to focus on the steps along the way, like a traditional program does. (P–13, 2002)

Benefits of ambiguity may be negated. The 4 respondents cited below cautioned that the purpose of ambiguity in the Leadership Program may be hampered by a lack of established guidelines, by unanticipated expectations, by lack of understanding by new faculty, and by lack of communication. For P–32 (1996), for example, “I fear the ambiguity is that I don’t know what is expected until I get there and I may have to redo what is expected because it was ambiguous to me!” And P–22 (2000) stated, “I do not mind growing and being open to change (that is always ambiguous). But again, I do not like [ambiguity] if it is the result of poor communication.” In the following statement, P–26 (1999) regarded ambiguity as the lack of certainty and clarity among the faculty:

I have heard the term, and to me it means the ability to work through (instead of resisting) various and conflicting viewpoints. . . . Some of my cohort colleagues with faculty new to the program experienced this in a negative way—getting different answers to questions from different
faculty, based on differences in new faculty members’ differences in paradigm regarding the program. (P–26, 1999)

P–14 (1998) makes the following observation about the way in which ambiguity should be practiced:

I have heard the term from other participants from earlier cohorts. I have never really had an issue with this myself . . . [but] . . . there should be a framework or set of guidelines that can always be referred to. The challenge is to frame the guidelines in such a way that they do not stifle the creativity implicit in this “job-embedded” program. (P–14, 1998)

Creative, participant-driven aspect. Twelve respondents related the term to the participant-driven design of the Leadership Program. P–25 (1999) stated unequivocally that “‘tolerance for ambiguity’ means that the program is participant-driven, and that within certain broad parameters, a participant is able to create (subject to faculty collaboration) a unique, individualized Ph.D. program designed to meet their specific personal and professional needs.” As P–24 (2000) further explained, “the participant is not going to get a lot of formal direction from a ‘teacher.’ Participants should be able to think and make decisions on their own.” P–33 (1994) stated that “tolerance for ambiguity” indicates that “individuals in the program needed to design their own learning . . . [because] . . . learning is an individual thing, and [because] we all come to the program with different needs, agendas, experiences.” P–05 (1998) described the term to mean that “there are many questions for which there is not a definite answer. Each participant’s program will be different and I must ‘trust the process.’” P–20 (1995) believed that the concept “means that each person has his or her own strategies for completing the requirements.” P–19 (1997) defined the term as “me just moving forward with what seems to work for me, with the faith that it will meet the requirements for the program.” And P–08 (2002)
described “the idea . . . [to mean] . . . that my definition of ‘the goal’ is open for questioning and reinterpretation.”

The remaining 4 respondents in this sub-category focused on the benefits and effects of ambiguity. P–16 (1996), for example, observed that she “should expect to have some foggy experiences as a normal occurrence that would stimulate growth. Such experiences would allow me to stretch, explore, and learn.” P–01 (1997) asserted that “you really have to live and breathe it. It takes longer [and] you have to rely on yourself. . . . But in the end, it will be a true accomplishment.” P–17 (1997) stated that, during a regional-group meeting with a faculty member, members agreed that ambiguity was “good. It was beneficial. . . . It made us think. Made us individuals. . . . Don’t take that away.” P–28 (2000) observed that “without the tolerance and a degree of ambiguity the program would not fit the needs of so many people.” And P–29 (2000) compared “tolerance for ambiguity” to the word “disquieted,” pointing out that the condition allows him to grow, that “my tolerance for ambiguity in many ways is the gauge to my ability to truly learn.”

**Leadership-oriented.** Two respondents spoke to ambiguity in terms of leadership development. P–07 (1995) stated that, according to the material that she had been reading, having a tolerance for ambiguity “is a quality that all good leaders need . . . that there is virtue in learning to reside in the ‘spaces’ where answers are not always immediately present. Leaders can wait in the space trustingly, knowing that answers will come in the proper time and way.” And P–38 (1995) explained that “as developing leaders we should be able to ‘find our own way’ within certain general parameters. If every step of the program was
spelled out for us, we would not have the opportunity to fully develop our individual skills and gifts.”

**Representative statements.** The following three comments represent the 30 respondents in this category:

It meant that all of the expectations/requirements of the program were not completely figured out or set in stone. I felt that I was on a journey with the faculty, that we would figure some things out as we went along. It meant I had to be comfortable with asking questions, checking things out, and being willing to wait for an answer sometimes. It also meant that I could take the initiative and see if it met with faculty approval. (P–21, 1994).

I think that is a part of any program that is innovative, that is not institutionalized, that is personalized, and that is going to stay relevant. It means there is going to be change and maintaining my status quo is probably not likely, though I don’t expect to be thrown off balance constantly. If I were walking on a balance beam, there are various positions that I will take: both feet, one foot, two hands, one hand, flips, somersaults in the routine. I’m even going to be waving my arms, sometimes more than others. I might even fall off, but the balance beam is not going to break or be pulled out from under me during the routine. (P–04, 1995)

“Tolerance for ambiguity” means understanding that the theories, concepts, and skills presented in the Leadership Program cut across all fields. In addition, it means that each of us has our own individual learning style/multiple intelligences/mind style . . . [that] . . . impacts our own learning and our own style of teaching. As such, the ambiguity was needed to accommodate a variety of differences within the participants and faculty. Tolerance for ambiguity also meant that the program is highly self-paced, self-structured, and self-determined. Individualized. I.D.P. (P–23, 1998)

**Category 2: Respondents Who Had Not Heard of “Tolerance for Ambiguity” (6)**

Six respondents had not heard of “tolerance for ambiguity” but nevertheless spoke to the term. P–40 (1997), for example, believed that “it allows for creative/critical thinking. If participants cannot tolerate a certain amount of
ambiguity, this is probably not the program for them.” P–12 (2001) stated, “Not that I can recall—but that’s something participants definitely need to have!” P–30 (2001) suggested that ambiguity supports the program’s “ever-changing model.” P–35 (2001) stated that “the program is not being prescribed to you in exact requirements but is a fluid and dynamic process that is controlled and defined by learning in terms of personal interest, areas of desired growth, and job-embedded learning.” P–39 (2001) considered the term one that “allows for individualization and customization” and “is necessary to sustain this program’s success.” And P–03 (2002) observed, “The program seems to thrive on its very ambiguity.”

**Question 3: The Leadership Program Demands That Its Participants Have a Strong Theoretical Foundation to Support Its Practical Application. How Has That Requirement Affected You?**

**Background**

Since the inception of the Leadership Program, participants have been expected to demonstrate proficiency in 20 non-mutually-exclusive competencies organized into six competency-areas. In the program, proficiency is defined as the integration of knowledge (including theory) and practice. The need for a knowledge of theoretical foundations is specifically articulated in competency-area six, “Competent Scholar”; they are (a) a working knowledge of educational foundations (changed to “philosophical foundations” in 1999), and (b) a working knowledge of learning and human development, and (c) a working knowledge of theories of leadership and management (Welcome to Leadership, n.d.; Leadership:
The Leadership faculty considered the issue of theoretical foundations at least three times in faculty meetings from 1994 through 2002, the years encompassed by this study. The first instance took place in October 1996, when the faculty discussed the “missing piece of the I.D.P. puzzle” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, October 2, 1996). “Demonstration of competency,” they determined, “must include a scholarly base rather than simply a skill demonstration. The theories or principals [sic] of each competency should be an integral part of any competency demonstration” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, October 2, 1996).

The faculty first revisited the issue of theory in November 1997 and again in January 2000. In 1997, they considered a framework by which to evaluate competency fulfillment. One of the components of the framework was the philosophy and history of the competency (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, November 19, 1997).

In 2000, the faculty questioned whether or not the program was “teaching Leadership or about Leadership” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, January 24–25, 2000).

If someone gets a Ph.D. in Leadership, should this person know not only the current paradigms of Leadership, but also the historical development and multiplicity of Leadership? Can Leadership be a program in which no one necessarily agrees to what Leadership is, but a participant can choose and explain two theories, i.e.—one theory could be Servant Leadership. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, January 24–25, 2000)

As a result of the latter discussion, the faculty adopted two practices with regard to theory. First, they determined that participants must include in their
portfolios proof of a connection between theory and practice for off-campus work. Second, they determined that beginning with the 2000 cohort a third course in leadership issues would be required. The new course, Lead-634, would “establish Leadership Theory as a content for all participants. Content will be established by the instructors” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, January 24–25, 2000).

Analysis of Responses

P–04 (1995) stated that she did not know how the need to have a strong theoretical foundation affected her, and her response suggests that the issue was not one that she wanted to pursue for its own sake: “I don’t know. And if an answer is useful to you later, I’ll think about it and try to answer, if you remind me.” In addition, P–33 (1994) stated that “the practical application—I had a lot of the theory—is what I got from the Leadership Program.”

Four additional respondents did not answer the question of how the requirement affected them. Two of them commented on what they perceived as a lack in the program. P–07 (1995) expressed the need for more direction from the faculty, and P–24 (2000) stated that the requirement for a theoretical foundation needed more emphasis. P–22 (2000) and P–03 (2002) echoed those opinions, asserting that “some participants underestimate this factor” (P–22) and “many students pass without gaining that required theoretical foundation” (P–03).

The remaining 34 respondents fell into two categories: those who were positively affected by the requirement (31), and those who were negatively affected by the requirement for knowing theoretical foundations (3). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)
Category 1: Respondents Positively Affected by the Requirement for a Theoretical Foundation (31)

**General statements.** The 6 respondents in this sub-category provided somewhat general answers. For them, the requirement for having a theoretical foundation was the most life-changing aspect of the program (P–17, 1997)—and one that was valuable as well as enjoyable (P–39, 2000; P–35, 2001). P–15 (1996) “learned a lot” and P–13 (2002) found that learning theory was useful in completing the competencies. In addition, P–37 (1994) stated somewhat ambiguously, “I can’t tell you how often I reflect on the theory we learned and discussed in my day-to-day work. It is continuous!”

**Provided insight.** Three respondents found that knowing the theoretical foundations of a competency helped them to understand their own thoughts and actions. For P–31 (1994) learning theory “has been affirming for me. I have very strong convictions and morals about what I do.” For P–20 (1995), learning theory provided a way to “understand why I think what I think and I now have new and better ways of understanding others and looking at things from many perspectives and knowing why I choose to take certain paths.” And for P–08 (2002), “learning theory is requiring more reflection on what I’m doing and why with regard to my successes and failures.”

**Theory as it relates to practical endeavors.** Eighteen respondents observed that having a strong theoretical foundation helps to support opinions and to inform decisions. The learning of theory allows the individual to develop “a zest for lifelong learning” (P–16, 1996), “look at an issue or problem from a variety of different theoretical positions” (P–23, 1998), to be “a more skilled
consumer of leadership propaganda” (P–36, 2000), and to use “a more extensive knowledge-base to guide and support my decision-making and give me new options” (P–12, 2001). The comments of the remaining 3 respondents reflected the statements of the entire group:

It has given me the ability to discuss issues from a variety of aspects, to question things more carefully, to read and listen more skeptically, and to look for a framework from which to operate in revising/refining my own department’s programs as well as others at the college. (P–21, 1994)

Having a strong theoretical foundation means one has put their own personal theories up against existing theories as a check for self-understanding. As mentioned, theories offer consistency—and consistency is a major value in my definition of leadership. (P–01, 1997)

From my perspective, building a theoretical foundation means understanding leadership as learning with other people, as well as practicing servant-leadership. It’s hard to combine the theoretical and the practical, to break bureaucracy. We must know before doing. (P–02, 1998)

Eight respondents in this sub-category directly related practice to theory. In order to be successful, practice must be “consistent with the philosophy from which it was developed and operates” (P–06, 1995). Theory represents “the underpinnings” (P–11, 2000), allows individuals “to move beyond the prescriptive approach” (P–27, 2000), and “reinforces the richness of what we do” (P–29, 2000).

The following statements reflect the range of benefits of knowing the theory behind the practice:

That is perhaps the greatest work for many of the participants. I believe that most of us are good practitioners, but we don’t all have the theoretical foundations. For me that has been the journey. One thing leads to another—and where do you stop? How do you know that you have arrived? (P–19, 1997)

It’s been a challenge that’s stretched me in very positive ways. I’m a “practices” person and have functioned a lot from intuition. Much of the time, it has served me well. The demand that I get into the theoretical foundations has been good for me. (P–05, 1998)
Leadership participants are primarily successful professionals with a broad range of skills. The theoretical foundation is the essential connection the university can provide. Since I have years of experience in education, I haven’t changed my viewpoints markedly, but now I better understand why I believe the things I do. Understanding the learning theories (and theorists) involved has given me new insights into my profession, and made me a more credible, effective speaker. (P–25, 1999)

I am looking forward to being able to converse with my peers about not only the practical but [also] the theoretical framework. (P–34, 2002)

The 3 remaining respondents in this sub-category—educators who spanned levels from kindergarten through the baccalaureate—stated that knowing the theoretical foundations of a competency provides credibility, perspective, and balance for the practical application of the competency. Each articulated a different benefit of learning the theoretical foundations of educational practices: the ability to defend the methods that she already used (P–09, 1994), the opportunity to develop new methods based on theory (P–38, 1995), and the ongoing ability to read and apply “the literature to their field” (P–26, 1999).

**Theory affects reading.** Four respondents commented specifically about how the requirement had an impact on their reading habits. In the words of P–28 (2000), “Lets just say that I read a lot more.” P–18 (2002) echoes that comment and adds the research component: “This has been where I have spent the most of my time, learning to research and then reading. And reading. And reading.” P–40 (1997) and P–14 (1998) provided a more-comprehensive response:

Every class I developed or problem I solved, etc. I did based on theory. This requirement forced me to really know and think about what I was doing and why. It is a major strength of the program. Today, wherever I
go in educational circles, I am well versed in most any leadership or educational theory that comes up for discussion. (P–40, 1997)

It has led me to do a lot of reading and research that I would not otherwise have taken the time to do, and [up] to this point in the program, this has probably been one of the greatest benefits I have received from being in the program. As a corollary of the work-embedded nature of this program, the result is that my leadership skills have been enhanced and I feel I am far more valuable and effective as a leader. (P–14, 1998)

Category 2: Respondents Negatively Affected by the Requirement for a Theoretical Foundation (3)

Three of the 40 respondents found the requirement “too theoretical” (P–32, 1996), inappropriate for the program but beneficial (P–10, 2001), or unproductive (P–30, 2001). The following statement from P-30 (2001) represents the emphasis on practicality expressed by these 3 respondents:

I believe that I am exceptionally good at the practical applications and, as a consequence, my theoretical side has been exceptionally weak. An even more important consideration is that the practical side has volumes to say about my success with my “day job,” while the theoretical side is more about reading and memorizing than it is about actually applying it in a real-life situation. The theoretical has more to say about what others have described as the underpinnings of a concept than it does about what really matters in real life and faced with real situations. I have attempted to become more literate from the theoretical side, but my emphasis is on the practical side of addressing things as I see them in the real world. (P–30, 2001)

Question 4: How Have You Changed With Regard to Attitude, Habits, or Both as a Result of the Leadership Program?

Background

This question was intended to elicit post-experience reflections of participants’ involvement in the program. As a result, there is no historical background for the question.
Analysis of Responses

One respondent, P–13 (2002), failed to comment on this question. The remaining 39 respondents fell into two major categories: those who did experience change (35), and those who experienced little or no change as a result of their involvement with the Leadership Program (4). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Respondents Who Reported Experiencing a Change in Attitude, Habits, or Both (35)

Changes in attitude. Nineteen of the 35 respondents in this sub-category reported changes in attitude. Six of them noted general changes in the way they thought. They described their knowledge and thinking as “broader” (P–38, 1995; P–12, 2001), “much more holistic” (P–19, 1997), and “expanded” (P–05, 1998). P–36 (2000) related his statement directly to the issue of leadership: “My conscious awareness of leadership is much greater.”

P–37 (1994) had the most to say about experiencing a change in the way in which he regarded the world:

I think that the program helped me to become more aware of the diversity that exists in various realms like the church, governments, and cultures. I think that I was a fairly dogmatic individual prior to my involvement. I saw that people whom I learned to respect had very different ideas from my own. As I sought to reconcile differences, I learned to appreciate our various backgrounds and points of view. We had numerous e-mail discussions over many topics during those four years. These discussions radically changed my mind in many areas, especially in those relating to my theology. (P–37, 1994)

Five respondents described themselves having undergone changes in their opinions of themselves and in their behaviors. P–09 (1994) stated, “I have a different sense of who I am and why I am here. Neither good nor bad—just
different.” P–31 (1994), however, asserted, “I think I am better in all aspects of my life, not just my work.” P–04 (1995) believes that she is “more assertive, more sensitive, more reflective, more aware of my strengths and weaknesses, more learned and more frustrated.” P–26 (1999) declares, “I am no longer mediocre or satisfied with mediocrity in myself. I am my own person. I have clear vision and purpose, and I am having a positive impact.” And P–03 (2002) states, “I have become fiercely determined to become, as Gandhi said, the change I want to see. I have seen that it is more important to be a practitioner of leadership than a scholar.”

Three respondents in this sub-group made reference to changes in or reinforcement of their attitude toward self-directed and competency-based learning. P–16 (1996) is “much more prepared to be a leader . . . [which] . . . is evident in my performance in all competency areas.” P–28 (2000) now regards his students “with a higher degree of participation in their own learning process.” And P–39 (2000) has a “new and profound respect for research and [for] exploring and understanding theory” and a newly “reinforced . . . passion regarding competency-based, learner-centered education.”

The remaining 3 respondents in this sub-category provided comprehensive statements that reflect the comments of all 15 respondents who experienced changes in attitude as a result of the Leadership Program. Their comments follow:

The Leadership Program enabled me to free myself from my little box—spiritually, emotionally, mentally, and even physically. I now have an insatiable hunger to know God, my fellow human beings, and everything in this world and beyond. And my greatest goal is to serve, in whatever way God directs me. . . . I now love the mystery of the unknown, the process of change, and the thrill of exploration. (P–17, 1997)
As a result of the Leadership Program, I have developed a core set of theoretical frameworks and skills to apply to whatever I do professionally and personally. I am better able to look at things from multiple perspectives and understand people and what motivates them. I have a tremendous appreciation for what real learning is all about. I have really learned how to learn and how to teach through this program. (P–23, 1998)

I am more competent, more confident, and more credible. Exploring the works of various theorists has helped me “smooth the rough edges” of my personal philosophy, rounding out my viewpoints with new insights. Interacting with participants from other disciplines has greatly broadened my perspective. Better understanding the history and philosophy of education has helped me recognize the unstated philosophy underlying such “reforms” as NCLB [No Child Left Behind]. In short, Leadership has given me not only a new “wardrobe” of abilities, but also new “glasses” to view my world. (P–25, 1999)

Changes in habit. Five respondents reported experiencing changes in habit. P–21 (1994), P–33 (1994), and P–15 (1996) stated that research findings have become primary factors in their decision-making. The two remaining respondents in this sub-category commented about the effect that the program has had on their reading habits and on their reflection practices. P–08 (2002) says, “I reflect more on my leadership activities and consider how leadership can be incorporated in my various work-related roles.” P–27 (2000) has become “much more critical in my analysis of leadership in the church, both denominational and local.” She adds, “I voluntarily read more. My reading level is much deeper than it was three years ago. The intellectual quality of my conversations is dramatically improved.”

Changes in attitude and in habits. Twelve respondents in this category reported having experienced changes in perspective as well as practice. Seven of the 12 specified increased self-confidence in addition to other changes. They perceived themselves as “more skilled in conducting collaboration” (P–06, 1995),
“much more reflective about . . . actions, feelings, and thinking” (P–01, 1997), “more willing to try new things” (P–40, 1997), “better able to address situations where there is stress and conflict” (P–14, 1998), learning to “work harder, be more humble, and keep trying to improve” (P–29, 2000) “more disciplined in . . . writing” (P–10, 2001), and “better able to identify leadership philosophies and styles in [the] work environment, which gives insight into [one’s] own work culture” (P–35, 2001).

Three respondents in this sub-category made statements about changes in their attitudes and behavior that affected their relationships with other people. P–02 (1998) stated, “I’m a better listener. I don’t have preconceptions about other people and I’m more interested in helping them to improve.” P–24 (2000) asserted, “I am more tolerant of people. I find myself always thinking of ways [that] we can do better (at work). I understand how quality leadership helps people. My patience has improved, and my abilities to communicate concisely and effectively are vastly improved.” The third, P–30 (2001), directly related his comments to this leadership role. In his words,

I have changed tremendously with regard to the way I operate on a daily basis in my leadership role here. With the extensive readings I have done on leadership and the various aspects that relate to the competencies, my perspective has become much more holistic and I have become passionate about my interactions with people and how I can make them meaningful. . . . I believe this program has been invaluable in teaching me to be a better person and especially in my role as a leader at home with my family and also in the workplace. (P–30, 2001)

The following comments represent the statements of all 12 respondents in this sub-category:

I’m a believer in competency-based education and portfolio methods of documenting learning. I am a more vigorous learner. I read more. I respect a broader breadth of backgrounds and experiences. I possess more
respect for the challenges and responsibilities of leadership. I use my time more efficiently. (P–07, 1995)

I am a leader who has a vision, some good ideas and feel that it is natural for me to execute them. However, I needed to change my behavior and improve my skills, as I tended to come across as sarcastic and arrogant. In my self-assessment early on, I discovered that humility, discipline, and organization were areas that needed improvement, so I worked hard to improve [those] and feel as though I have. As a result of my participation in the program, I learned diplomacy, patience with others, and have a much better understanding of who I am and how I come across to others. People who have known me for a long time have commented on my new and improved skills. I have always thought of myself as positive, but lacked ability to listen well. I am now a better listener and am much more open-minded and humble. (P–20, 1995)

I think that I am more self-motivated and disciplined than I was a year ago. I am learning to pace myself. I have also become more cognizant of my goals and plan little things to do in the day and week to help me reach my goal. I have not done that before. I am proud to be affiliated with a progressive program. Yes, even with its flaws it is still progressive and cutting-edge, particularly with regard to adult-learners who work and go to school. (P–34, 2002)

Category 2: Respondents Who Reported
Experiencing Little or No Change
in Attitude, Habits, or Both (4)

Four of the 40 respondents reported that they had experienced little or no change as a result of their involvement in the Leadership Program. P–22 (2000) seemed ambivalent: “This is hard to tell. The program . . . broadened my perspective, but I am not sure if it really changed me that much.” P–11 (2000) simply stated, “No.” P–18 (2002) commented almost equally succinctly, “I have not changed.” P–32 (1996), however, was more reflective:

I’ve learned that change takes time and is usually ineffective. I see this inertia to avoid change affecting our program. My real life has kept me from progressing in this program and I don’t think that should have happened at least as much as it has. I don’t think I’ve changed as much as some have. I do believe my study has confirmed beliefs and principles that lead my life. (P–32, 1996)
Summary and Conclusions

What does [the concept of] “leadership” mean to you? Other than the 2 participants who supplied either no answer or noncommittal answers, respondents, for the most part, provided somewhat traditional, hierarchical definitions of leadership—one in which a single person serves as a catalyst, a facilitator, or a model for others. The general lack of articulation of the program’s competency-based design as a template for leadership development also is noteworthy. Only one respondent defined leadership in terms of the competencies. Additionally, despite the program’s emphasis on service, only 6 of the 40 respondents incorporated that concept into their definitions of leadership—and it is unlikely that these 6 respondents adopted the concept and incorporated it into their lives. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 4, Question 1.)

As with respondents who were unaware of the self-directive, self-motivational aspects of the Leadership Program, I was surprised by the large number of respondents who seemed unaware of servant-leadership as an integral part of the program. Is this an indication that more emphasis needs to be placed on servant-leadership, perhaps by deliberately building the concept into discussions, orientation activities, and I.D.P. development? With regard to the omission of the competencies in the definition of leadership, under what conditions should faculty suggest ways in which to use them? During the orientation? As part of a purposeful assignment to define leadership? More basically, can we really change the definition—and practice—of leadership from a hierarchical one to a service-oriented one?
Have you heard the term “tolerance for ambiguity” in reference to the Leadership Program? If so, what does it mean to you? With regard to Leadership’s emphasis on “tolerance for ambiguity,” the concept was a primary part of the Leadership Program in the earlier years of the program. The term seems to have disappeared even from spoken use by 2002. Despite the loss of the original, written interpretation of the term, however, participants from the 1994 through 2002 cohorts generally perceived the concept as reflecting the creative, participant-driven nature of the program. P–07 (1995) and P–35 (1995) deemed ambiguity as necessary for developing leaders. Even the six respondents who had not heard the term considered the concept a benefit in an evolving program with evolving participants. Indeed, only 2 respondents viewed the concept as negative because, they believed, it reflected a lack of structure in the program. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 4, Question 2.)

It is obvious that, whether or not they had heard the term in the context of the Leadership Program, respondents appreciated the flexibility and adaptability that the term implies. Has a more-structured program evolved—one that does not allow for ambiguity? If ambiguity no longer is a positive, integral part of the program, should the faculty re-establish it? If the concept is re-established, how can it be defined to assure participants that it reflects the opportunity for creativity rather than the lack of structure?

The Leadership Program demands that its participants have a strong theoretical foundation to support its practical application. How has that requirement affected you? Three of the 40 responses regarded the need for a theoretical foundation as irrelevant and impractical for their purposes and “inappropriate for the program” (P–10, 2001). Five respondents either were non-informative, non-
committal, or non-personal. For the majority of respondents, however—31 out of 40—the requirement for a theoretical foundation for each competency was a positive feature. In many cases, knowing the theory strengthened opinions and informed decisions about, as well as provided credibility for, their professional practices. As a result of the requirement, 4 respondents reported changes in their reading habits: They read more and they read different types of material than they had before. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 4, Question 3.)

The knowledge of theory is expected of doctoral students, and the requirement that Leadership Program participants have a strong theoretical foundation is, according to respondents, beneficial. Theory, they stated, provides insight and helps to support opinions and to inform practice. The Leadership Program also requires the application of theory. For individuals who already are practitioners, such as teachers, having a strong theoretical foundation provides a balance. But what about individuals who are primarily theorists? Should they be required to have a strong practical foundation based on reading? Or do the activities and artifacts in the I.D.P. correct the imbalance?

*How have you changed with regard to attitude, habits, or both as a result of the Leadership Program?* The wording of this question reflects the assumption that individuals enrolled in the Leadership Program experience some type of change, and, indeed, the majority of respondents—35 out of 40—reported having experienced changes in attitudes, habits, or both. Nineteen of the 39 reported a change in attitude. In some cases, respondents’ general outlook became more holistic and their tolerance of and interest in other people increased. In other cases, their self-reflection grew deeper and their sense of self grew stronger. In still other cases, their view of collaborative, competency-based, participant-
driven learning grew more positive. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 4, Question 4.)

This question is directly related to the issues in the preceding questions in this chapter. The Leadership Program at Andrews University—indeed, the concept of leadership—is based upon the philosophy that theory should form the foundation for practice. And in practice, the individualized nature of the program requires a certain amount of ambiguity. In many cases, individuals must change their attitudes, habits, or both in order to be effective leaders. Given that personal change is not a requirement of the Leadership Program, should the program deliberately foster and monitor change, perhaps as a part of the change-agent competency?
CHAPTER 9

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS, PART 5:
FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS

Introduction

The Leadership Program at Andrews University began in September 1994. The description of the program distributed to the members of the initial cohort is the first documentation of the relationship between students and faculty who were, at that point, collectively called participants: “You will not only be learning in terms that are highly tailored to your needs; you [also] will be helping us to develop the structure of the program. You will be part of a team of participants [that] includes both faculty and students as we learn together about effective graduate education” (Welcome to Leadership, 1994, p. 8). Note: Despite the best intentions of the conceptual faculty, using the term participant to refer to both faculty and students is awkward when distinguishing between the two groups of individuals. As a result, throughout this dissertation, I have used faculty to refer to professors and, in order to reflect the student’s involvement in his or her own learning, participants to refer to students.

Philosophically, the Leadership Program was designed to be competency-based, flexible, and collaborative in order to give each self-motivated, self-directed participant the opportunity to take an active role in developing a job-embedded, individualized, graduate-level course of study focused on his or her professional area. In practice, each participant was expected to work with a
program team consisting of an advisor and two or more additional faculty members. The members of the program team were to field policy questions, solve academic problems, and serve as on-campus advocates. In addition, the advisor typically functioned as dissertation chair. Note: In 1994, participants chose team members on the basis of professional suitability. In subsequent years, team members often were assigned on the basis of availability.

In consultation with the program team, the participant drafts an Individualized Development Plan, or I.D.P., that outlines his or her specific plan for degree-completion. The I.D.P. includes a description of proof of fulfillment in 20 non-mutually-exclusive competencies Welcome to Leadership, n.d.; Leadership: A New Concept in Graduate Education from the Andrews University School of Education, n.d., panel 2; Penner, 2002; Tucker, 2002). Loretta Johns, Leadership faculty member and former program coordinator, summed up the program in theory and practice in this way: “A positive aspect of the program is having the participant in the driver’s seat. I like the idea that adults are trusted to direct their own education” (Leadership Program Handbook, 2002, p. 11).

From 1994 through 2002, the years encompassed by this dissertation, the student/faculty relationship continued to be an explicitly stated tenet of the Leadership Program. The initial formal promotional material, for example, produced in 1996, explains the collegial structure of the Leadership Program as one that “fosters collaboration and cooperation among its participants and among participants and faculty” (Andrews University, 1996a, panel 2). In addition, the following description appeared in promotional material: “You and your faculty advisor will work together throughout your program. Your faculty advisor may play a mentoring role as well as a managing and administrative
role, so you should think of your faculty advisor as a professional partner” (Welcome to Leadership, 1994; Tucker, 2002, p. 38). As Tucker (2002) further clarifies,

Learning is not hierarchical. . . . It is inconceivable that the individuals in such a group [of learners] would in any way fit the typical description of what have classically been called “students.” It is sacrosanct in the Leadership Program that we are all students and that we are all teachers. Classically, a “teacher” is viewed as being in some way superior to “student.” Because this view is not consistent with the philosophy of the Leadership Program, all individuals enrolled in the program are called participants, be they faculty or individuals enrolled in the program for the purpose of earning a degree. (p. 39)

This chapter contains six questions that examine participants’ perceptions of how the faculty has operationalized the principles of the Leadership Program as well as how faculty members related to each other and to participants. I analyze each question and provide a summary and conclusion based on the analyses. The specific questions are as follows:

Question 1. Do you believe that the faculty functions as a team?

Question 2. Do you believe that all faculty members operate in ways that are true to the philosophy of the Leadership Program as it is described in printed and website promotional material?

Question 3. The Leadership Program makes the claim that it is participant-driven. In your experience, does this seem to be the case? Why or why not?

Question 4. Do you believe that a partnership exists to the extent that the faculty and students are all equal participants in the Leadership Program?

Question 5. Have you gotten the faculty support that you’ve needed?

Question 6. If you could ask the faculty one question—without fear of reprisal—what would it be?
Question 1: Do You Believe That the Faculty Functions as a Team?

Background

The initial documented discussion of how the faculty should operate took place in late 1995, when the faculty “discussed the need for a model to determine faculty load in the Leadership Program. The committee preferred a ‘team-model’ approach, setting apart the load for the team, allowing the team to delegate responsibilities internally” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, December 13, 1995).

As part of the team-approach perspective, the faculty later considered the role of program coordinator, the individual who exemplified shared leadership rather than authoritarian leadership. As Tucker stated, “Any member of the faculty could call a meeting anytime” (personal communication, July 13, 2003). The program coordinator was “the coordinator of tasks rather than the supervisor of personnel” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, October 14, 1997). In March 2000, the faculty determined that the term shared governance would be more appropriate than shared leadership for the coordinator’s function (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, March 4–5, 2000).

Analysis of Responses

P–01 (1997) had no opinion regarding how the faculty functions: “I have no idea. I do not know the faculty well.” The remaining 39 respondents fell into two major categories: those who stated that, at least to some degree, the faculty does function as a team (23); and those who stated that the faculty does not function as such (16). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)
Category 1: Faculty Functions
as a Team (23)


The remaining 2 respondents in this sub-category used a number of adjectives to describe how the faculty worked together. P–14 (1998) stated that the faculty “present a very caring, supportive, united front . . . [and] . . . I have no reason to think that they do not function well.” And P–29 (2000) commented that everyone with whom he had dealt “wants to be true and consistent. All intentions are good.”

Degrees of teamwork. Seven respondents qualified their responses with regard to degree. P–04 (1995) observed that the faculty demonstrated teamwork “at some times with more coherence than others.” P–10 (2001) stated that she did not see faculty members “always functioning as a team,” implying that they sometimes did so. And P–18 (2002) provided the explanation that “like all teams they have weaknesses and strengths.”
Two respondents in this sub-category spoke to the individuality of the faculty. P–22 (2000), for example, commented, “I am not sure all the time. They are different, but they seem to share the vision.” P–16 (1996) made a more comprehensive statement.

I believe this area has improved over the past six years of my observation of faculty. They are not all the same, and that is a real blessing. Each faculty member provides a unique contribution that can be valued by participants. (P–16, 1996)

The remaining 2 respondents in this sub-category relate to “the good bit of turnover in faculty” (P–05, 1998). Although P–05 simply referred to that turnover, P–39 (2000) recommended intervention:

The faculty, like all teams, continues to evolve and change (new members coming in, others leaving). I’ve had the good fortune to be able to participate as a regional representative at two faculty planning-meetings and also as part of the Roundtable committee, and I think there are times the faculty would benefit from the help of an outside facilitator (someone neutral who could develop dialogue) to expedite issues and problems that get in the way of them performing as [what Katzenbach and Smith call] a “high-performance team.” Because of their responsibility with relation to the Leadership Program, I think it would be beneficial to all if they were modeling the behavior of a high-performance team—not only to the participants, but [also] beyond our program to the rest of the university and beyond that, to the higher education community.

**Category 2: Faculty Does Not Function as a Team (17)**

P–27 (2000) believed that teamwork among faculty members “needs improvement. Good face is generally put on for public, but I know there are issues.” The 16 remaining respondents in this category provided possible reasons for their perceptions.

**Lack of common philosophy and practice over time.** Eight respondents in this sub-category indicated that although the faculty may at one time have
functioned as a team, they no longer did so. Five respondents in this sub-category had graduated at the time of the interviews and used the qualifier “in the beginning” (P–31, 1994; P–33, 1994) to express the opinion that the faculty had functioned as a team in the early years of the Leadership Program. Over time, however, they had perceived “a lot of in-fighting” (P–31, 1994) and changes that made the participant “anxious to finish because there was so much uncertainty” (P–33, 1994). Two other respondents indicated that faculty members had not continued to work together, as they did “during the orientation” (P–07, 1995) and “when it began” (P–32, 1996). In the opinion of P–17 (1997), “once F–04 and F–01 left, that team spirit may have deteriorated.”

P–23 (1998) and P–26 (1999) perceived a change in the faculty dynamic:

Throughout the years, the relationship between the faculty members seemed to change. When I started the program, all of the faculty had questions and all seemed to embrace the idea/theory of the program without a lot of “how-to” information or pragmatic application. Later, this seemed to me to be the cause of friction at times, the gap between theory and application to our specific program. (P–23, 1998)

When I began in 1999, it did. As new faculty members entered, it appeared as though there were more struggles: faculty with different visions from the original team. Evidence of the difference included faculty with more rigid, traditional views, faculty that gave different answers to questions than the original staff would give, and faculty that had less tolerance for “out of the-box” thinking. (P–26, 1999)

Three respondents suggested causes for the perceived lack of teamwork. P–20 (1995), for example, stated that “there have been too many changes in the faculty to allow them to operate as a team. The egos got in the way, and their own agendas overpowered their ability to work as a team.” P–30 (2001) cited “disjointedness” and “fragmentation” among the faculty owing to the lack of “a clear definition of the goals of the program.” And P–03 (2002) perceived “a certain level of disagreement in how the program is being run.” Four additional
respondents noted specific manifestations of the lack of faculty teamwork in conflicts about research methods (P–02, 1998), and traditional classes and self-initiated learning (P–36, 2000).

P–19 (1997) regards the perceived trend toward a more-rigid, more-traditional approach of the current faculty as helping to develop teamwork among the faculty.

For me, at least, teamwork is more a question of maintaining unity within valued diversity while nurturing our passions for the creation of similar visions. (I don’t believe we ever share identical visions.) It seemed to me that at times the early faculty wanted to put on an image of team unity but they struggled to find a common understanding of key growth issues that would promote unity. Perhaps what they lost in unity was made up for in their passion for parallel visions . . .

Is there greater unity under the current faculty? It appears to me that there is greater unity. At the same time there seems to be less passion for the narrowing visions of a maturing program. I appreciate the gains in unity but miss the clear passion for what has become an increasingly university and faculty defined vision. Perhaps it is my own disappointment in finding that the program has wandered away from my parallel vision. (P–19, 1997)

The final respondent in this sub-category, P–34 (2002), made the following observations after taking part in a discussion between participants and faculty:

My answer is based on the interactions I observed [during a discussion] about the length of time it took faculty to respond to students’ e-mails and phone calls . . . At least one faculty member—I think two—appeared to me to have their own agenda and “shut down” . . . and then stonewalled until the issue was dropped.

My concern is that as a result of the stonewall, no one ever fully explored the issue . . . about why this was so important . . . the perception that faculty were not available and that participants felt they inconvenienced a faculty member when really coaching/mentoring is the faculty’s number-one job, in my . . . opinion. (P–34, 2002)
Question 2: Do You Believe That All Faculty Members Operate in Ways That Are True to the Philosophy of the Leadership Program as It Is Described in Printed and Website Promotional Material?

Background

The Leadership faculty regularly considered ways in which to put the philosophy of the program into operation. Faculty discussed what should be contained in portfolios to demonstrate competency (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, February 11, 1998), and they conducted exit interviews with graduating participants (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 6, 1999). As responses to other interview questions indicate, participants, on an individual basis, had been questioning the perceived direction of Leadership. With the distribution of the initial Leadership Program Handbook, in July 2002, they raised general concerns, as a group, about program changes. As documented in the handbook, several changes from the original program had been instituted. Two changes of those fundamentally altered the program.

First, participants often chose to demonstrate proof of competency in research through the successful defense of the dissertation. In those cases, they had the option of presenting their portfolios, and therefore proving competency in every competency-area other than research, prior to the defense. The Leadership Program Handbook (2002) eliminated that option, stating that the research competency could not be presented separately from the others.

Second, the synthesis paper originally was a culminating event that extended each participant’s vision statement, the document that articulated “personal visions to develop beyond the bounds of the mind[s] of the university professor” (Penner, 2002, p. 96). In the 2002 handbook, the synthesis paper was
redefined as an academic discourse that required citations. Additionally, in the initial program design, the synthesis paper had been presented as part of the celebration of program completion. The handbook now required that the synthesis paper be submitted 2 weeks prior to the portfolio presentation in order to be reviewed and accepted as adequate (Leadership Program Handbook, 2002).

The rationale for making those two changes in the Leadership Program was that having consistent guidelines would eliminate possible differences in interpretation among faculty members (Minutes, Leadership Retreat, September 30, 2002). At the 2002 Roundtable, a microphone had been set up for the purpose of fielding attendees’ questions about the revised practices. With the sound of agitated conversation in the background, several participants from pre-2002 cohorts used the microphone to express their concern about the effect that these newly initiated practices might have on their own plans for completion. Note: When David Heise, a participant from the 1998 cohort, assured the audience that, legally, participants were expected to adhere only to the terms in place when they enrolled in the program, the group became somewhat calmer.

During the Leadership retreat that took place later in the same year, the overriding concern was whether or not a traditional hierarchy of professor and student was emerging, a trend that translated into professors who made decisions and then imposed those decisions on students. “The retreat attendees initially began with addressing the Leadership philosophy and core values. However, it was determined that the issue that needed to be addressed was the perceived tension between faculty and participants regarding expectations and the program philosophy of flexibility” (Minutes, Leadership Retreat, September 30, 2002).
At that retreat, the faculty took several steps toward addressing handbook-related participant concerns. First, they acknowledged that participants enrolled in the 1994 through 2001 cohorts could choose to present the synthesis paper as part of the culminating celebration. Second, they determined that including participants in discussions about program changes was critical. Third, they reaffirmed several of the founding principles of the Leadership Program (Minutes, Leadership Retreat, September 30, 2002).

Analysis of Responses

P–09 (1994) failed to respond to this question. P–36 (2000) did not respond directly to the question but instead discussed the incompatibility of the philosophy of Leadership Program with individuals who require more structure. “The fact that some of the candidates to the program and some of the people who are admitted to the program are not that independently motivated—not much of self-starters, perhaps—is problematic.” P–03 (2002) challenged the merit of the philosophy upon which the program is based, saying, “[The faculty] adhere very closely to the philosophy. The philosophy unfortunately is flawed by a lack of clear expectations and standards.” P–04 (1995) had “no strong opinion either way.” And P–06 (1995) was “not sure the ‘promotional material’ existed or was consistent with [that of] today.” And P–05 (1998) made this statement: “Can’t answer, because there are a number of faculty I don’t know.”

The remaining 34 respondents fell into two major categories: those who believed that the faculty operates in ways that are true to the philosophy of the Leadership Program as it is described in printed and website promotional
material (20), and those who believed that the faculty does not do so (14). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

**Category 1: Faculty Operates in Ways That Are True to the Philosophy of the Leadership Program (20)**


*Responses restricted to some faculty members.* The 8 respondents in this sub-category related the question to the specific faculty members. Five of them made general comments. P–21 (1994), for example, did not speak about the entire faculty because she had not “personally worked with all of them” but nevertheless added that “by and large” they did operate in ways that were true to Leadership’s philosophy. P–40 (1997) essentially echoed P–21’s comments: “I did not have relationships with many current faculty, but most of those I worked with did.” P–20 (1995) made more-negative comments, asserting that some faculty members “thought they did, but their behavior was contradictory to the literature and what they professed to do.” *Note:* It is clear from responses to subsequent questions that this participant is describing faculty members who were not members of his or her program team or dissertation committee.
Two additional respondents perceived that some faculty members “struggled” with putting the philosophy of the program into practice, as their comments indicate. P–07 (1995) stated, “The faculty I worked with most definitely did. I can’t speak to others from personal experience, but colleagues reported struggles that stemmed from this issue.” And P–26 (1999) commented, “Those that I have experience with now do. It seemed that there were some faculty who struggled with the different nature of this program and tried to put it into a mold that was familiar to them.”

The 3 remaining respondents in this sub-category related their comments specifically to their advisors. P–30 (2001) said, “For the most part, the faculty does operate true to the philosophy of the program as it has been described. [My advisor] is exceptional in this regard.” P–27 (2000) had “a bad experience with [his] original advisor, but he was going through difficult times.” P–35 (2001) provided a more comprehensive answer:

The faculty members that I’ve had as instructors, advisors, dissertation-committee members, and mentors have been very much in keeping with the spirit of the program and very responsive to my needs as a student. The first advisor that I was assigned to, however, just never felt right but was changed early on. (P–35, 2001)

**Rationales for faculty behavior.** Three respondents fell into this sub-category. P–16 (1996) believed that “issues like remote instruction/facilitation and higher expectations from participants as a result of the same” proved challenging for the faculty. P–22 (2000) perceived that the faculty members “are definitely overloaded. They are not able to spend enough time with each student, and they feel it and suffer.” And P–18 (2002 cohort) rationalized that “they could do better, but all of us could be better at our jobs.”
Category 2: Faculty Does Not Operate in Ways That Are True to the Philosophy of the Leadership Program (14)

**Unexplained and ambiguous responses.** Three respondents fit this sub-category. P–02 (1998) based his response on his unexpressed definition of leadership: “No. I can count on one hand the real leaders in the program.” And P–24 (2000) commented, “Not at all.” P–10 (2001) augmented the interview question by adding, “I also do not see the faculty members remaining true to the program materials used to recruit people to the program.”

**Self-perception of faculty incorrect.** The respondents in this category commented that although the faculty may have perceived themselves as practicing the philosophy of the program, according to the respondents, they did not do so. P–25 (1999) and P–39 (2000) determined that faculty attitudes were the cause for this misconception.

I believe that all faculty members involved with this program think they are doing this. I equally believe that at least one faculty member has an attitude toward participants that is more compatible with the philosophy of a traditional Ph.D. program or [to] an undergrad program. (P–25)

I believe all faculty members believe they are behaving in ways that are true to the philosophy of the Leadership Program, but in some instances it appears as if their egos inadvertently get in the way. Also, some faculty members seem more comfortable with the “non-negotiable” than the “freedom” side of the Wheatley (leadership philosophy) coin. (P–39)

**Trend toward traditional delivery.** Four respondents made general comments about a perceived trend toward traditionalism, without specifying reasons for their statements. P–32 (1996), for example, stated that “it seems we are being pressured back to the traditional approach to getting this degree.” P–17 (1997) commented that “it appears that there is a move to make the
program more structured, which I believe is in opposition to the original design of the program.” And P–23 (1998) observed,

The program [was] becoming more and more regimented. There are more and more rules. There are more and more specifics about ways to do things or what needs to be done. . . . There is definite dichotomy . . . between what I thought I signed on for in ’98 and where the program has gone. . . . The foundation of the program is [that] we’re going to support individual learning-styles in an autonomous way so that each individual has the flexibility and the autonomy to follow their own path from point A to point B, and we’re going to celebrate with them when they get to point B. . . . And now I’m feeling a much tighter-run ship. . . . We’re standardizing. (P–23, 1998)

**Shift in vision.** Six respondents fit this sub-category. P–29 (2000) suggested that changes in delivery of the program might be because of “a shift in vision,” as he explains here:

The original vision for this program was very strongly competency-based and very much [about] learning being driven by the individual. And I see that having shifted some over the years, so that we hear lots more about learning being driven by the requirements of your teacher and/or advisor in a particular program.

Four respondents in this sub-category attributed the perceived shift to a change in faculty. “Some faculty,” stated P–31 (1994), “are definitely committed to and operate in accordance with the philosophy. Others are less inclined towards participant-driven focus and the flexibility of the program.” P–33 (1994) suggested, “Those involved in the vision and the initial program were operating in ways that were true to the philosophy, but . . . toward the end of my program, the program got too rigid and more traditional in its expectations.” And P–19 (1997) predicted that the trend away from flexibility would increase. P–13 (2002) agreed, adding, “I expect and fear that as the founders retire and new people take their place, this will trend more toward a traditional program.”
P-01 (1997) is the remaining respondent in this sub-category. He perceived that the increase in structure may be a response to participant demands. “Some participants just want to graduate and they push the faculty into moving them through by providing the participants with more direction.” This practice, he believed, “seems to leave less time for those who are truly self-directed. . . . It also is a little discouraging for those of us who are taking longer, because we are trying to find our own path, not the path of what will be pushed through because it conforms with the philosophy of one’s chair.”

**Question 3: The Leadership Program Makes the Claim That It Is Participant-Driven. In Your Experience, Does This Seem to Be the Case? Why or Why Not?**

**Background**

The Leadership Program at Andrews University was designed to be participant-driven. Participants were to be partners who worked together in throughout the program. As noted in the introduction to Chapter 10, participants would be “part of a team of participants [that] includes both faculty and students as we learn together about effective graduate education” (Welcome to Leadership, 1994, p. 8). That principle continued to be articulated in promotional print and web materials from 1996 through 2002, the years encompassed by this study.

In reviewing the minutes of meetings, I found several instances from 1997 through 2002 in which the faculty discussed the participant-driven nature of the Leadership program. Two primary suggestions resulted: (a) to invite participants to faculty meetings and retreats and (b) to consider and act upon concerns raised through program evaluations.
Inviting Participants to Meetings and Retreats

In May 1997, the faculty asked several questions, as the following citation from the retreat minutes indicates:

How should participants be involved in faculty meeting and planning? One way would be to ask each regional group to send a representative to the Roundtable to talk about re-visioning. Another way would be to initiate an invitation to students to visit faculty meetings. Should the students have voting power? If so, how many? How do we avoid certain policy issues, such as the competency-based vs. course-based approach of the current program from being voted out with student majority votes? It was suggested that faculty meetings should be open except for admission or accountability issues. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, May 13–14, 1997)

In September 1997, the faculty discussed inviting two participant-representatives to faculty meetings, with the selection of the representatives left up to the participants (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, September 29, 1997). In November 1997, the faculty considered the following option with regard to an upcoming retreat:

[Invite] senior members (participants nearing graduation) to meet with the faculty, give out dates of faculty meetings, and ask the regional groups to send representatives, or to wait for someone to contact us. It was decided by consensus to send an invitation to all participants via e-mail, notifying them of next week’s retreat, asking them to contact us if they would like to be considered for one of the two student spots at that meeting. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, November 12, 1997)

In January 1999, the faculty considered asking the participants in each annual cohort to elect a representative to the upcoming retreat. Whether or not the expenses of representatives would be paid was yet to be decided (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, January 15, 1999).

In April 1999, the faculty again discussed inviting participant-representatives to the September 30, 1999, retreat—but with caveats.

The purpose will be to discuss our vision: where we are and what we are to become. We also need to discuss our research goals and how we can
help each other. The retreat will include all faculty, both on- and off-campus, and participants—one from each cohort. Everyone will need to be informed that travel cannot be covered, and all are to RSVP with no cancellations a week prior. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, April 9, 1999)

**Using Participant Concerns as Guidelines**

In February 1997, Tucker, then program coordinator, asked the rest of the faculty to review a list of questions that he planned to send to Leadership participants. Although the actual list is unavailable, the discussion indicates that the questions were intended to discover “what’s working and what’s not working” with regard to participants’ expectations about the program (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, February 10, 1997).

In July 1997, Thayer presented a summary of the orientation evaluations for the 1997 Roundtables. As a result of information gleaned from the evaluations, the faculty suggested that “more presentations by Leadership students could also provide a higher quality” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, July 30, 1997).

In February 1998, in response to participant requests, the faculty asked Green to provide descriptions of competencies that might be used to develop I.D.P.s and to complete portfolios, then to send the descriptions to “leadall,” the program-wide e-mail list, for feedback (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, February 11, 1998). In January 1999, Johns reported that, as a result of exit interviews with graduates, “program changes have already been recommended and adopted” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, January 6, 1999). And in February 1999, after a review of participants’ responses to summer intensives,
the faculty decided to offer intensives in conjunction with the 1999 Roundtable (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, February 24, 1999).

In July 2002, the initial edition of the *Leadership Program Handbook* was distributed to participants who were attending the annual Roundtable. The handbook contained a number of changes in the execution of the Leadership Program that provoked concern from a number of the attendees. As a result of participant consternation, the faculty resolved to ask Roundtable attendees to provide feedback about the first edition of the Leadership handbook by September 1, 2002. Feedback was to be restricted to “clarification of content.” In addition, the faculty voted that members of annual cohorts predating 2002 would “be allowed to petition for exceptions to the handbook” and that “they be made aware of that fact” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, July 8–10, 2002)

**Analysis of Responses**

Of the 40 respondents, P–02 (1998) neglected to answer the question, even after being reminded to do so. P–15 (1996) provided an indefinite “I am not sure.” And P–32 (1996) expressed dissatisfaction with the participatory aspect of Leadership: “I really don’t know. I’m bogged down and don’t know how to get started and can’t get feedback as to whether my participation is driving anything. It perhaps seemed more so when we were small.”

*Note:* I had a conversation with P–32 in which he stated that he was frustrated because his advisor would not tell him exactly what to do to complete his degree. From his comments, it seemed that he might have fared better in a traditional program, one with prescribed classes and a written comprehensive examination. When his advisor suggested that he transfer his already-earned
credits to another, more traditional program, however, he declined (personal conversation, July 2002). P–32 subsequently developed an I.D.P. and is well on the way to completing the requirements described therein.

The remaining 37 respondents fell into two major categories: those who did not believe so (19), and those who believed that Leadership is participant-driven (18). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: The Leadership Program Is Not Participant-Driven (19)

Faculty-driven vision and criteria. Four respondents observed that a group of faculty members used specific philosophical criteria to design and implement the Leadership Program. P–14 (1998) and P–22 (2000) collectively called these criteria vision. P–05 (1998) added that the program “is driven by competencies that are developed by others.” In addition, P–39 (2000) specified that although the I.D.P. and “main components of the program” are participant-driven, “sometimes it appears that the ‘machine’ of the university is too inflexible and not capable of allowing this type of fluidity.”

The statement of P–26 (1999), cited below, incorporates the perceptions of this group of respondents:

In the organization in which I work, we have four modes of decision-making, all of which are essential. They range from level one, which are matters that must be decided by the administrator with no input from staff (e.g., issues pertaining to law, safety, etc.) to level four, [which are] issues that the administrator delegates completely to a team to decide. In that context, I would say that the program cannot be 100% participant-driven, because there are guiding values, principles, processes and procedures that must be formulated by faculty with varying degrees of input from participants. Because F–04 was my advisor, my experience was highly self-driven, guided by him. Regarding the program-at-large, opportunities and encouragement to get involved and contribute are plentiful. I’m of the belief that if I have expectations, I have the responsibility to get involved. In my experience, when I have had
differences of opinion or vision, and have voiced them, I was heard and had an impact. (P–26, 1999)

**Participants have no authority.** Three respondents noted ways in which the participants lack power. P–06 (1995) described the program as “participant-centered” and “actively participant-participatory, but not participant-driven. Participants were given a voice and were invited to the table, but were not truly given a vote.” P–24 (2000) used his own experience to support his response: “A year ago I would have agreed . . . that [Leadership was participant-driven], but after my experience with the portfolio defense, I believe that there is still a teacher/student mentality.” Both P–06 and P–24 further remarked that the faculty’s conduct is not “a bad thing,” although P–24 advised that “the message should be given out that the portfolio defense is just that—a defense.”

The remaining respondent in this sub-category, P–34 (2002), ascribed the responsibility for the lack of participant power to individual faculty members: “I do believe the heart is there, but it stalls out. Why? Again because one or two [individual faculty members] hold on to their sacred cows.”

**Participants do not have a voice regarding program policies.** Five respondents made statements about the lack of participant influence on the direction of the program. P–04 (1995), for example, commented that although participants may drive “a lot of the specificity of activity . . . overarching requirements are faculty-driven, and certainly at times come as a solution to student-participant feedback, failures, and challenges.” P–03 (2002) seemed to agree, describing the program as “participant driven but . . . faculty steered . . . [with regard to] the direction we are headed—despite the supposed
empowerment.” In addition, P–29 (2000) singled out a perceived policy as the
reason for believing that the program is not participant-driven.

[The members of my regional group] put together pretty exhaustive
courses to push [ourselves], yet we would never be given contracts to be
adjuncts here to help other regional groups because we’re not SDAs
[Seventh-day Adventists] in good standing. That’s flawed. If it’s really
participant-driven, that’s flawed. (P–29, 2000)

P–25 (1999) and P–10 (2001) speak directly to the perceived direction that
the program was taking, as the following statements indicate:

The program was strongly participant-driven when I entered it in 1999. In
fact, it was a little too ambiguous at times. Participants seemed a bit lost
their first year. But in the effort to provide clearer parameters, the current
program is much more prescribed. (P–25, 1999)

I find the program becoming less participant-driven, with more structure
and requirements being placed on us. I do not like how the program is
changing. [It’s] not fair to tell new participants it is one way and then
change it to be something else. (P–10, 2001)

Note: I have found no policy stating that only SDAs are hired as Andrews
University adjunct faculty. Indeed, one of the earlier participants not affiliated
with the Adventist church was hired as an adjunct soon after graduating.

**Program becoming less participant-driven.** The 6 respondents in this
sub-category remarked that Leadership appeared to be becoming more
prescriptive in its approach. P–20 (1995), for example, “made it work” but
cautioned that over time the program “became about the people at Andrews who
needed to be in charge or needed to feed their egos.” As a result, she concluded,
“the essence of the program has weakened over time.” P–38 (1995) observed that
the program “seems to have shifted direction.” P–19 (1997) stated that “at first, I
believe, it was participant-driven, but it seems less so now because of the
pressures for more structure. The key players are all different now. . . . It
wouldn’t surprise me to find out that [the current faculty] are looking for even more structure.” And P–35 (2001) observed, “I seem to discover new classes every year that are ‘required.’”

The remaining 2 respondents in this sub-category made comprehensive statements about the perceived trend toward conventionality.

The thing that was most attractive to me about this program was that I had flexibility, not only in terms of what I wanted to do but the time that I had to do it. The pace that I wanted to do it and what I wanted to do. Learning was about time, but it was also about determining your own path, following your own path and making the program work for you with you being the key emphasis. . . . What I’ve sensed over the years has been more and more loss of autonomy in that. I’m a person who doesn’t need a high degree of this-is-what-you-need-to-do, this-is-how-you-need-to-do-it. I want to experience it on my own, make my own mistakes. . . . (P–23, 1998)

The original vision for this program was very strongly competency-based and very much learning [one of] being driven by the individual. And I see that having shifted some over the years, so that we hear lots more about learning being driven by the requirements of your teacher and/or advisor in a particular program. “No. I want more research cites” or “No. I want more reflection papers.” “You came up with this design for learning and we may have even improved it through an I.D.P., but, you know, we really don’t think that you’ve done enough in this particular area now.” My own strongly held belief is that [the program] ought to stay true to its original philosophy. (P–36, 2000)

Category 2: The Leadership Program
Is Participant-Driven (18)

Unexplained and ambiguous responses. The 3 respondents in this sub-category believed that Leadership is participant-driven. P–28 (2000) answered simply, “Yes.” P–13 (2002) also responded “Yes,” but added that “the faculty is clearly open to our ideas and makes changes based on them.” He did not make it clear, however, whether he was referring to program-wide issues or to his experience fulfilling program requirements. In addition, P–09 (1994) interpreted “participant-driven” in terms of regional-group support, asserting “I would not
have finished or learned what I had to learn if it were not for [my regional group],” but failing to explain the nature of that support as it relates to the participatory aspect of the program.

**Participant influence on program design and delivery.** Two of the 3 respondents in this sub-category—P–21 (1994) and P–37 (1994)—spoke of influencing the “evolution” of the program. Indeed, P–37 indicated that “our ideas and opinions were sought by the faculty and the program was adjusted as a result. I truly felt like I was a part of the Leadership team.” In the comment, P–12 (2001) echoed the comments made by P–21 and P–37: “There is always ample opportunity for participants to voice their opinions and make suggestions for improvement, many of which are incorporated into the program.”

**Ability to design individualized program.** Each of the 9 respondents in this sub-category equated the opportunity to design and complete a program tailored to his or her needs with the program’s claim to being participant-driven. P–33 (1994) observed that the program is “participant-driven with regard to individuals taking control of their own learning and experiences.” And P–07 (1995) further explained that “we each create our own experiences within the boundaries of the competencies.”

Seven participants in this sub-category responded in terms of their own involvement, stating that they were “driving the program so that it meets my personal goals” (P–18, 2002) and that they were doing so by “creating my own I.D.P.” (P–08, 2002). P–40 (1997) stated, “I designed every course I took with the exception of the required courses, so everything I did was directed toward what I wanted to do with my education.” P–16 (1996) listed the opportunities that the
program provides: “to create, explore, research, and more. It provides a perfect environment for individual leadership-development that subsequently makes it participant-driven.” And P–17 (1997) asserted that, owing to the orientation and the freedom to develop the I.D.P. “in a way that made sense to us,” from the beginning, “I was in charge of my own program and charted the direction I was headed.”

**Role of the faculty.** P–31 (1994) credited her advisor, asserting that “F–04 was not going to hold my hand, nor did I want him to. I made decisions about what I wanted to do and [he] was there to advise.” And P–27 (2000) described the relationship between participant and faculty—philosophically as well as operationally. As did P–17, in the preceding sub-category, P–27 emphasizes the importance of the I.D.P.

I believe faculty should be considered participants as well. Faculty is only a category of participant. I can only relate my testimony. I felt in complete control of my program and even the coursework. The prescribed coursework was clearly a necessary launching pad, but I was exhilarated by the opportunity to design my own coursework and I.D.P. (P–27, 2000)

**Stresses of a participant-driven program.** For the 3 respondents in this sub-category, the opportunity to design an individualized program was frustrating as well as rewarding. P–01 (1997), P–11 (2000), and P–30 (2001) indicated that the program was, indeed, participant-driven—but included cautionary comments in their responses. P–01, for example, asserted that he had been “left with the confidence of [his] advisor to complete work without . . . worrying about deadlines” but warned that such confidence required him to maintain his self-directedness—resulting in a program that “takes longer—and that can be frustrating.” For P–11, planning and completing coursework posed
no problem, but that “carving out time to work on the dissertation and then knowing that there is a time lag between submissions/feedback and the cat-and-mouse game with a dissertation committee can leave one low on motivation.” And P–30 commented that “the program is participant-driven.” But he added, “Sometimes I wish it was a little less so . . . because concreteness is more my preference.”

Question 4: Do You Believe That a Partnership Exists to the Extent That the Faculty and Students Are All Equal Participants in the Leadership Program?

Background

In order to support the partnership discussed in Question 3, the members of the Leadership faculty sought ways in which to implement the principle of shared leadership among all participants in the program, as the following citation indicates:

The participant, when accepted, is considered to be a professional, and faculty can learn from participants even as participants learn from faculty. Ethically, there is still a responsibility as a faculty member to guide and provide quality control before a degree is granted . . . . Interaction can still take place on an equality basis. It is largely a matter of attitude. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, May 13–14, 1997)

As a result of that discussion, the faculty advocated (a) student participation in faculty meetings and other events at which program issues were to be discussed and (b) more self-evaluation and peer-evaluation (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, May 13–14, 1997; Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, September 29, 1997). Minutes record that participants representing each annual cohort attended the April 25–26, 1999, retreat.
In mid-2001, a Participant Advisory Council was formed (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, June 11, 2001). The responsibilities of the council were not described, however, and Carol Castillo, then program secretary, indicates that “little activity followed from the . . . group” (personal communication, July 2002).

Two primary factors prevented an all-inclusive partnership between faculty and students. First, although participants—“students” as well as “faculty”—were equal as learners, accreditation standards imposed certain roles and responsibilities on Leadership professors. The University charter charges faculty members with the responsibility of evaluating the achievements of the graduate students in all academic programs. The 1996 promotional material describes that responsibility in this way: “The faculty team judges a participant’s program as completed when he or she has demonstrated achievement of the twenty general competencies” (Untitled full-size booklet, n.d., “Leadership is unusual in several ways,” p. 3).

Second, from 1994 through 2002, several changes occurred in the Leadership faculty (see Appendix F). By 2002, Freed was the only remaining full-time member of the original Leadership faculty. Although for the most part, faculty who resigned continued to fulfill their responsibilities as advisors and on dissertation committees, professors who remained or who had joined the faculty may not have been committed to implementing program principles in the same way as the founding faculty. For example, I was a representative at the April 1999 retreat. At that meeting, F–12, a professor who had recently joined the faculty, asked F–05, a long-term member, “What’s wrong with being called a student?” F–05 shrugged and said, “I don’t know.”
Analysis of Responses

In posing the question about a partnership between students and faculty, I used the modifier “equal” deliberately. By qualifying the degree of the partnership, I intended to encourage respondents to relate their own perceptions of and experiences in the program to one standard. In addition, I intended to encourage them to describe the degree to which they believed that they were in an equal partnership with the faculty. As with other interview questions, I did not define the terms. Two interviewees, however, abstained from answering, stating that their answers would depend on my definitions of partnership (P–30, 2001) and equal P–13 (2002). In addition, P–17 (1997) failed to respond in any way.

The remaining 37 respondents fell into two major categories: those who did not believe so (31), and those who believed that an equal partnership exists (6). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: No Equal Partnership Between Faculty and Students (31)

Unexplained and short responses. Four respondents in this category stated simply, “No.” They are P–33 (1994), P–39 (2000), P–10 (2001), and P–24 (2000). In addition, P–40 (1997) explained that such a relationship was not “entirely possible; after all, it is a faculty-student relationship.”

Specific times, faculty, and program aspects. Seven respondents fit this category. P–31 (1994), for example, stated, “In the beginning, yes. Now, it seems less so.” P–09 (1994) relied on hearsay for her response: “I used to. Now I don't know. I would guess not, from what I’ve heard and seen.”
P–23 (1998) observed that relationships had changed since 1993, when “we had a faculty who called themselves participants, [although] I can’t remember exactly who it was.” And P–08 (2002) made this distinction: “In the development of our own I.D.P.s, yes. In the development of the future of the program, no.”

The reflective responses of the remaining 3 respondents in this sub-category provide different perspectives with regard to the partnership between students and faculty. P–37 (1994), for example, stated that, by “[participating] on the team,” he had contributed to the development of the Leadership Program. And P–06 (1995) and P–19 (1997) believed that being in a partnership with the faculty was the case when they began the program: “[There was] much more of an intimate feeling, an interpersonal feeling.” Both, however, also commented that an increase in the size of the program as well as “the kind of growth and structure” (P–19, 1997) had a negative effect on the student/faculty relationship. P–06 (1995) described his own role in that relationship:

When I first met my advisor, I [saw myself as a student]. . . . It took me a long time to get over that. . . . I never felt like my advisor] was imparting his knowledge. [I felt like] we were in it together—but that was the second, third, and fourth years. Because it took me that long to get over that. Once I did, though, it became a very collaborative approach.

Faculty roles and responsibilities. Three of the 8 respondents in this sub-category noted that although a partnership existed, it did so only to a certain degree. P–05 (1998) observed that “there are still many areas where the participants are expected to fulfill expectations of the faculty.” P–14 (1998) stated that “this is probably true for many aspects of the program . . . [but] there are other aspects that, for reasons of academic standards and procedures of the SED
and AU, are non-negotiable.” And P–11 (2000) stated that participants are “equal philosophically, but the burden of time, proof, etc., is on the student.”

Three respondents in this sub-category, however, believed that an equal partnership between students and faculty was not possible. In the words of P–32 (1996), “There is no way that will ever happen as long as the faculty have the final say as to whether the requirements have been meet.” P–12 (2001) echoed that assertion: “Their word is the final one!” And P–18 (2002) stated, “The fact that we are being graded makes it impossible.”

The 2 remaining respondents in this sub-category made comprehensive comments that incorporate the statements of all respondents in this group:

I believe it is a partnership, but not an entirely equal one. It seems to me that the faculty (and the university) will always hold more power. However, the participants have the power to influence faculty. In addition, I think that both the faculty and the participants have taken the initiative at different times to address various issues, make proposals, etc. Participants offer suggestions as well as respond when invited. I always felt that the faculty valued me as a professional and made ways to work with me and with other participants as “equals.” (P–21, 1994)

I do feel that the faculty are on a more even plane than in most programs, but there is always a power advantage, whether real or perceived, between a student and faculty member. The issues of faculty members being able to assign grades and direct dissertations is a powerful influence, not to mention that in many cases the faculty may be more experienced in some areas. (P–35, 2001)

**Inequality a positive necessity.** Six respondents accepted—even endorsed—the lack of equal partnerships among participants and faculty. Two of the 6 respondents in this group made general comments about the role of the faculty. P–04 (1995), for example, stated that the faculty have “a greater voice than the students . . . [which] . . . actually seems logical and practical.” P–16 (1996) explained, “Faculty members should have unique roles and be
empowered to make value-added decisions” and that “equal partnerships may not be most appropriate for the Leadership Program.”

The remaining 4 respondents in this sub-category identified the responsibilities of the faculty. P–01 (1997) observed that the faculty evaluated competence. P–22 (2000) indicated that the faculty assigns grades, that “in some courses you have to fight for your A as in any other class.” And P–28 (2000) noted that “there needs to be an entity that has the ability to grant the degree.” As P–03 (2002) summarized,

[Equality] is the greatest misnomer. Students seek from their faculty their expertise. Students are beholden to the faculty to earn grades. This is not an equal relationship—nor should it be. With that power (to teach and award grades) comes responsibility (to teach and offer clear standards for earning those grades). (P–03, 2002)

Faculty attitudes. Five respondents believed that some faculty members exhibited an attitude of superiority. P–20 (1995) and P–02 (1998) noted that although their advisors treated them as equal partners, “some faculty were so full of themselves that they are unable to empower their students” (P–20, 1995). P–02 (1998) “sensed a feeling of snobbery.” P–29 (2000) observed that “a number of the faculty has a sage-with-follower model in mind as opposed to a collaborative/peer model.” In the words of P–36 (2000), “There is still a perception of hierarchy and a clearly communicated, ‘You are not yet in the club.’”

The final respondent in this sub-category, P–25 (1999), had a great deal to say about this issue. In his response, which consisted of 9 double-spaced pages (3,921 words!) of commentary, he expressed his opinions in the context of anticipated-but-unwelcome long-term changes in the program. The following
excerpt from his response cites the comments that are most pertinent to the interview question—those that defend the quality of program participants:

Not all faculty and not at this time. . . . I think about [one of the current participants]. Here you have an international business consultant of high caliber. You have people like [the person who] is in the civil-government organizational equivalent of a one-star general. He’s looking at the possibility of a senate confirmation hearings here some day soon. This . . . is the caliber of people that are attracted to the program. . . . These are not undergrad students who haven’t got a clue what they want to do with their lives. These are people who . . . in many cases are way more qualified at certain given areas than the faculty members, which is as it should be. . . . You can’t . . . suddenly start treating those people as though they are undergrad students. You cannot do that and continue to maintain the same kind of program that this started out to be. Eventually what will happen is you simply won’t attract that kind of people anymore.

Category 2: Equal Partnership Between Faculty and Students (6)


Question 5: Have You Gotten the Faculty Support That You’ve Needed?

Background

The Leadership Program began in September 1994. By autumn of the following year, the lack of balance regarding the faculty’s workload became an issue. Although faculty members did not have to deliver classes in the
traditional way, some of them expressed the feeling that the individualized nature of the program imposed a heavier-than-expected burden on their time. As a result, over the years, several attempts were made to measure faculty load. This was a difficult task, however, given the differences in faculty style and the flexible and fluctuating combination of I.D.P.s overseen, independent studies delivered, regional-group visits made, dissertation committees chaired, and recruiting programs presented by the faculty members. In addition, the use of e-mail raised the expectations of students as well as faculty regarding communication (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, October 24, 1995; November 29, 1995). The discussion about how to apportion faculty load continued throughout 1996, 1997, and 1998 (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 10, 1996; May 1, 1996; May 23, 1996; June 12, 1996; December 18, 1996; August 14, 1997; February 11, 1998; Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, May 3–4, 1998).

In 1999, the faculty, who had been considering not taking on another cohort for that year, began to take steps toward solving the load problem. In January, for example, they reassigned several participants in order to alleviate the advisory loads of some faculty members and to augment the loads of others (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 25, 1999). In 2000, they determined that another full-time faculty member was needed to support active participants. In addition, the faculty discussed revenue. Participants who had registered for all coursework credits were not registering for dissertation credits, and participants who had paid for all billable credits, including dissertation credits, no longer were a source of funds. Both groups of participants, the faculty reasoned, were using faculty time without paying for it. As a result, the faculty discussed putting “pressure” on participants who were not registering for dissertation
credits to do so, and proposed that participants be charged a fee for continuing in the program after all other billable credits had been paid (Meeting, Leadership Faculty, May 18, 2000).

Note: The push to “get people done” seems to have begun with that May meeting. Indeed, participants who had taken advantage of the self-paced, “learning takes time” aspect of the program began to be described as “clogging up the pipeline” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, May 18, 2000).

The continuation fee was put into effect, but despite attempts to amortize the charges for credits and to redistribute participants, workload continued to be an issue and the faculty continued to attempt to assign, unsuccessfully, a point system to Leadership responsibilities. The suggestion was made that having 30 advisees—with no additional teaching responsibilities—be considered a full load, without consideration to what stage participants were in in the program (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, May 3, 2001). In addition, the faculty proposed using virtual faculty, increasing the time-proportions of Andrews-based part-time faculty, and adopting a point system calibrated according to the variety of responsibilities (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, June 11, 2001).

Prorating the different faculty responsibilities never took hold. The only resolution about the participant-to-faculty ratio that had been reached by the May 6, 2002, meeting was to continue to assign advisors on the basis of availability rather than suitability. As a result, the roles of advisors and participants became more traditional, and the relationship between participant and advisor became less personal, less permanent, and more absolute.

Upon acceptance into the program, you are assigned an advisor. You will discuss the development of their [sic] and all other matters directly with your advisor. Changes in advisor may be made at your request or [at] the
discretion of the Leadership faculty. The decision of the faculty is final in matters of advisement. *(Leadership Program Handbook, 2002, p. 11)*

Additionally, as the program developed, the advisor/participant relationship became less exclusive. As the 2002 handbook stipulates,

Discussing your ideas for potential dissertation topics with several faculty members helps you in selecting your topic and in choosing a committee. As your ideas about topics and committee members crystallize, you will want to discuss them with your advisor and *department chair*.

From the preceding discussion, it can be concluded that members of the Leadership faculty were overburdened, a condition that likely had an impact on their responsibilities to participants in the program. The comments of the 40 respondents encompass the years from 1994 through 2002. Those years span the years from when faculty could support the idealism of the program through a time when the very success of the program seemed to depend upon a compromise of that idealism.

**Analysis of Responses**

Of the 40 respondents, 38 reported that at least to some degree they had received the faculty support that they needed, at least to some degree. Only 2 respondents had not. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

**Category 1: Received Needed Faculty Support (38)**


The 4 remaining respondents in this sub-category qualified their responses: “about 75% of the faculty that I’ve dealt with” (P–02, 1998), “for the most part” (P–05, 1998), “after an initial flat spot” (P–14, 1998), and “so far, I’m satisfied” (P–22, 2000).

Communicating with the faculty. Thirteen respondents reported or implied that they had generally positive experiences. P–04 (1995) stated that the faculty “have always responded promptly and helped and followed up my requests.” P–31 (1994) stated, “For the most part my communication was really good. . . . My advisor and chair was F–04 for both my portfolio and my dissertation. And my communication with him was excellent. . . . F–07 and F–17 . . . [also] were both great to work with.” And P–23 (1998) asserted that she had “received patience, support, and encouragement.”

P–33 (1994) and P–27 (2000) cited the importance of working with Carol Castillo, then program manager, as well as with responsive faculty members. P–20 (1995) and P–38 (1995) underscored the importance of that statement. P–20 somewhat harshly stated, “I was very fortunate to have all of the faculty that worked with me allow me to do what I needed to do. I avoided some people as if they were lepers!” P–38 made a gentler statement, explaining that she received the faculty support that she needed but “only after I requested a change of advisors to one whose communication style was a better fit for me than the one I was originally assigned.”
Two respondents who were generally positive found that accessing the faculty sometimes was difficult. P–15 (1996) found the faculty available “most of the time” but at times “just not available.” Such unavailability delayed P–36’s (2000) completion time: “The only problem [was] the timeliness of response in the final stages [of completing the dissertation]. Getting everybody scheduled and getting people to have time to address my dissertation issues has been more time-consuming than I would have hoped.”

Three respondents in this subcategory contrasted their experiences with those of other participants in the program. P–17 (1997) had heard complaints about the non-responsiveness of some faculty members. Based on his positive experience, P–30 (2001) stated, “It comes as a surprise to me that I hear complaints from others on how their interactions seem to go.” And P–03 (2002) made a recommendation as part of his response: “[The faculty] must have a standard of feedback for student communications. If an e-mail is received, an e-mail should be returned, even if the only thing returned is an acknowledgement of the first note and a promise of details to follow.”

The final respondent in this sub-category raised program-related philosophical issues by making a distinction between emotional/social support and academic support, as the following statement indicates:

The faculty of the leadership program have always been very supportive, emotionally and socially. . . . Academically, however, it’s a different story. Ask a detailed question about program requirements, and answers from faculty members are often completely different. Many participants have expressed frustration and confusion at this lack of consistent directional support. . . .

All faculty (especially new members) must understand both the philosophic underpinnings and the basic requirements of the program . . . and clearly communicate these to participants. The Leadership program is a unique blend of flexibility and structure, and major problems occur
when faculty are not completely clear on which of these parts fits where. (P–25, 1999)

**Participant responsibility.** The 6 respondents in this sub-category qualified their answers in terms of their own actions and personalities. P–06 (1995), for example, received the faculty support that he needed “mostly through [his] own persistence.” P–07 (1995) stated that she had “generally” received support but added, “I think that I haven’t been as aggressive about identifying my needs and asking for support.” P–01 (1997) provided the most comprehensive response of this group:

At times, yes. At times, no. But the fault is more my own. There have been several times when I have “needed” help but because of who I am, I want to exhaust all possibilities before running by a faculty member. If I had just sought the help, I would have been better off. There have been times that I requested help and did not receive the help I expected, but that could be a result of my not being clear on my expectations for the faculty member as well. (P–01, 1997)


**Category 2: Did Not Receive Needed Faculty Support (2)**

Only 2 of the 40 respondents made entirely negative statements with regard to faculty support. P–32 (1996) responded with an unequivocal and unexplained “No.” In a private conversation, he told me that his advisor, F–04, would not tell him what to do (personal conversation, July 2002). In addition, P–10 (2001) stated that “it [seemed] as though the faculty members are gone a lot from campus. I feel it is difficult to get to talk with or get quick responses from
faculty, and I feel as if the materials I submit for review sit on someone’s desk for a long time.”

**Question 6: If You Could Ask the Faculty One Question—Without Fear of Reprisal—What Would It Be?**

**Background**

The participants with whom I conducted face-to-face interviews made statements and posed questions that they hesitated to ask the faculty. In addition, a participant whom I did not formally interview expressed the opinion that “we are held hostage until we graduate” (personal communication, January 2001). In addition, the perception that faculty members were not approachable with regard to program issues was documented in the minutes of the September 30, 2002, faculty retreat. At that meeting, “concern was expressed that some participants have the perception that they are not safe in expressing concerns or addressing problems they may have with faculty. There is a perception that some participants may want to avoid retaliation before graduation” (Minutes, Leadership Retreat, September 30, 2002).

Regarding first-hand knowledge, a number of participants had asked me (a fellow participant and the wife of one of the faculty members) to pass their worries on to the program coordinator. Participants had made the same request of Carol Castillo, then program secretary. Both Carol and I had advised participants to confide in their advisors or in another faculty member if they felt uncomfortable talking to the coordinator.

I attended the September 2002 retreat as a participant-representative and noted that the faculty’s response was generally one of surprise and concern. One
faculty member, however, was indignant, calling participants’ practice of confiding in non-faculty members “duplicitous”—and, in effect, corroborating some participants’ anxiety.

Analysis of Responses

The 40 respondents fell into two major categories: those who submitted questions for the faculty (28), and those who either provided little or no feedback or stated that the faculty did not intimidate them (12). Given the open-ended aspect of the question, many of the comments overlap with other, more-specific, interview questions. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Respondents Who Submitted Questions (28)

**Finances and time.** Two respondents submitted questions about finances and time. P–27 (2000) asked, “What is the profit margin for Andrews University with regard to the Leadership Program? How much is Leadership subsidizing programs that are not able to pay their own way?” In addition, P–35 (2001) wondered, “When does it end? Am I ever going to get out of this program!”

*Note:* At the time of the interview, when P–35 responded to the question, she had been in the program for only a year.

**Faculty issues.** Twelve respondents focused on faculty issues. Two respondents addressed two sides of the same issue by elaborating on the evolving nature of the program. P–09 (1994) asserts that the positive elements of the “tolerance for ambiguity” are part of the evolution of the program. As the following response indicates, P–09 had strong feelings to express: “Why did you
leave? Why did you leave a program that was so incredibly successful? And I’d ask the current faculty, Why are you destroying the program that I was a part of, which meant so much to me?”

P–31 (1994), however, focused on what she believed were negative aspects of ambiguity. Note: The individuals to whom she refers in the statement below all were members of the original Leadership faculty:

[I did my] dissertation defense and then [my] portfolio. . . . One of the negatives about being in a program that’s new is that certain things were not established. Things were not written in stone. Everyone sort of had a different idea of how things should look. The downside of that is that sometimes people get caught in the crossfire. . . . My plan [for completion] was to come out to Andrews for a week, do my dissertation defense and . . . two days later, do my portfolio defense. . . .

Basically there was discrepancy amongst my portfolio-committee members. . . . The impression that I got was that they just really didn’t have a good formal process for how they were going to do the portfolio, and so I was basically told that I could not defend my portfolio that week and that I would not be able to graduate in December and it would need to be rescheduled for sometime in the spring. I was devastated. I went out [to Andrews] with the impression that I was graduating and going to be done with everything, and I came home very disappointed.

Faculty philosophy. Four respondents in this group posed questions about how faculty members practiced the philosophy of the Leadership Program. Extending the comments that she had made earlier, P–17 (1997) asked, “How structured are you going to make [the program]? I mean, at what point are you going to say we’re not going to add any more structure to it?” P–25 (1999) asked what he called a “two-pronged” question. First, he wanted to know, “what is your philosophy of what this program is and is supposed to be?” Second, he posed a question that he believed “would need to be anonymous . . . not be something you would ask in a group setting.” That part of the question is, “Do you feel that your personal philosophy of this program and the direction
this program needs to go is identical to that of the other faculty members in this program?”

Two additional respondents raised similar questions. P–26 (1999), for example, asked, “In the view of the original faculty, is the Leadership Program still the self-directed, job-embedded, cutting-edge program that was intended?” And P–10 (2001) made several comments, first by making an observation, then by posing the questions, and lastly by rebuking the faculty:

What bothers me the most is that I see the program changing from what it has been advertised as. I see more restrictions being placed on participants, more structure being imposed on the program. If my I.D.P. is mine, why was I told to change the format for the reading lists? Why did some participants get to turn in a two- to three-page I.D.P., with very sketchy information, yet I had to redo parts of mine and it was about 25 pages long? I would like to ask the faculty why more structure is being imposed on the program, as this does not seem to ring true to its philosophy. Stop changing the program!! [sic] (P–10, 2001)

Two respondents in this sub-category focused on the professed collaborative aspect of the program. P–32 (1996) wondered, “Why won’t you spend time brainstorming with us individually and giving feedback and accountability through the process?” P–19 (1997) commented on the lack of communication between faculty and participants:

We’ve all known that [the program] was going to mature. I guess what has bothered me more than anything is the lack of communication of that maturation. And so my real question would be, “You have vested in us the concept that we are co-learners, that we are learning along with you as faculty. . . . Why, then, couldn’t you . . . share with us the reasons—the real reasons—[for changes made]? Be honest and let’s approach the issues in this program with some of the dynamic power of the group as a whole and possible solutions of the group as a whole. And if nothing else, we’ll understand why. We’ll understand why it’s now a [portfolio] defense.”

The 4 remaining respondents in this sub-category questioned the qualifications of faculty members as well as their commitment to the program’s
participants. P–38 (1995) posed a question about the integrity of the faculty: “Why did several Leadership faculty recommend that I select a particular person to be on my dissertation committee when that individual had a reputation for disruptive behavior? (I didn’t know of the reputation until after the fact.)” P–01 (1997) wondered about the faculty commitment to participants: “Did you really take the time to digest what I gave you to see if it works? Are you as invested in this project as much as you should be?”

P–02 (1998) questioned the leadership qualifications of the faculty, stating that “the current faculty seems to be more academic professors than leaders. Only F–04 ever held a real leadership position. I’d like to ask the [other] faculty about their I.D.P.s—to ask . . . when they used any of the competencies.” And P–36 (2000) puts his observations and questions in the context of the quality of the program’s future:

Are we giving the energy to this program so that we can be a really good service agency and give good service to the participants? That means quick response time. It also means a very high level of program design and quality of programming when we have things like the Roundtable. If we are spending on average $30,000 . . . are we getting $30,000 worth of value?”

As a program, I see some quality issues now. I think it’s a real traditional approach: Here’s my faculty. Here are the two things that this person wants to teach. Here are the two things this other person wants to teach. We’re going to create requirements around some of the interests and needs of our faculty. (P–36, 2000)

**Program aspects.** Three of the 40 respondents targeted the individualized, competency-based, self-directive, self-motivational, and job-embedded aspects of the Leadership Program. Three respondents in this group generally related to these aspects. P–05 (1998), for example, requested more direction and asked, “Why are you so reluctant to give guidance and specific direction when we ask?”
P–23 (1998), however, was concerned that faculty were imposing too much direction on participants: “How can we balance the natural need and tendency of humans to organize effectively and prescribe while giving people . . . autonomy and space to continue to learn in their own time at their own pace?” And P–34 (2002) believed that “too much time is wasted trying to find ways to accommodate everyone—rather than making the hard choices and decisions that are necessary for the program to grow.” Her question focused on recurring issues: Why are things so slow to change? I have only been in the program a year, and it is obvious that the same problems keep cropping up without resolution: Regional groups, documentation of I.D.P., quality of portfolio defenses, attendance at Roundtables, and so forth.”

**Program rigor and participant competency.** The 7 respondents in this sub-category posed questions about the rigor of the Leadership Program and the competency of its participants. P–37 (1994) put forth a general question: “Has the program become more or less demanding since the ’94 cohort?”

Three respondents in this sub-category posed questions that called the performance of other participants into question. After stating that she was troubled by other participants’ claims that they were “getting through the program with very little work or commitment,” P–40’s (1997) implied question was whether or not “all instructors and advisors are demanding high-quality work.” P–03 (2002) asked several direct questions that seemed to articulate P–40’s concerns: “When will we have teachers who teach? When will we have academic rigor? When will we have clear standards of performance? When will we focus on the scholarly pursuit of knowledge on the subject of . . .
Leadership?“ And P–18 (2002) asked for an achievement scale, by requesting that the faculty explain how three students—one who meets the standard, one who surpasses it, and one who fails to meet it—differ.

Three additional respondents targeted research and the portfolio in their responses. P–06 (1995) perceived that the focus of the program was on qualitative research rather than quantitative research. He also believed that conducting qualitative research was a condition of earning an Ed.D. and that conducting quantitative research was a condition of earning a Ph.D. Based on that dichotomy, his question was, “Do you think this is a true Ph.D. or is it an Ed.D. program? And defend that.”

The 2 remaining respondents in this sub-category focused on the portfolio. P–07 (1995) first stated that whereas she regarded some portfolios as falling short of representing doctoral-level work, she regarded others as being “amazingly rigorous.” Her question, then, was “How do the faculty justify or ‘equalize’ the levels of rigor expected in the program?” And P–16 (1996) posed this question to the faculty: “Do you really believe the portfolio presentation is essential to the program?”

**Spiritual issues.** Four respondents in this group focused on spiritual matters. Their questions ran the gamut from questioning the faculty’s behavior as Christians to questioning the purpose of the spiritual component. P–20 (1995) challenged the professed Christian foundation of the Leadership Program:

> How is it that you are committed to the concept of servant-leadership when you behave the way you do? Christianity is so unbecoming to me when I see what actually occurs at Andrews University. [I’m] an outsider. Aren’t you concerned about the perception of those of us who are not Adventists? (P–20, 1995)
P–22 (2000) asked for a more clearly integrated “faith factor.” And P–29 (2000) questioned why the program did not use more non-Seventh-day Adventist faculty to provide diversity. P–30 (2001) agreed, asking, “Do you really want to see the Leadership program reach its potential and if so, can it do so in a more secularized fashion?”

**Category 2: Little or No Response or No Feeling of Intimidation (12)**


**No feeling of hesitation.** Four respondents indicated that they would not hesitate to ask the faculty whatever question came to mind. P–14 (1998) and P–39 (2000) already had asked or would ask such questions. P–28 (2000) asserted, “I never fear reprisal, so I don’t have any questions that have not been answered.” And P–13 (2002), stated that “if I want to know something, I have always asked.”

**Summary and Conclusions**

*Do you believe that the faculty functions as a team?* Twenty-three respondents believed that, to varying degrees, the Leadership faculty does function as a team. Although 8 respondents in this category provided no explanation for their answers, the 5 who did so acknowledged the individual strengths and
weaknesses and the varying degrees of coherence that are typical of a group of people who work together. Seventeen respondents believed that the Leadership faculty does not function as a team. Perceived causes include the creative personalities of the original faculty, all of whom, although still involved with the program, have left Andrews University; the current lack of a shared vision; and the changing character of the participant population. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 1.)

The prominent finding in the answers to this question is that respondents perceived that the Leadership Program faculty that existed in 2002 lacked a common philosophy. Because a shared philosophy drove the initial design of the program, the absence of such a philosophy is likely to cause frustration and confusion among faculty members and between the faculty and the participant population. How would each faculty member define the philosophy of the program? If differences do exist, how would the faculty go about determining the defining philosophy of the program? What effect would continued disagreement have on relationships among the faculty members? On program policy and practices?

*Do you believe that all faculty members operate in ways that are true to the philosophy of the Leadership Program as it is described in printed and website promotional material?* Twenty respondents believed that the faculty does act in ways that are true to the philosophy of the program as described in print and website material, although several qualified their answers in terms of their own experience or with regard to specific faculty members. Fourteen respondents did not believe that faculty members are true to the philosophy of the program. It is noteworthy, however, that as with participants who responded positively to this
question, their statements are sometimes qualified in terms of their own experiences or with regard to specific faculty members. Two respondents discussed the philosophy of the program without relating directly to how the faculty put that philosophy into operation. One of those 2 respondents (P–04, 1995) called the philosophy “flawed,” without describing his or her perception of what it was. And 4 respondents provided somewhat noncommittal, indefinite, or unclear responses. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 2.)

It is not surprising that a number of respondents qualified their responses in terms of their own experience in the program and with certain faculty members. It is disturbing that 11 respondents reported a trend from the original vision toward a more traditional one. Two of those 11 respondents went a step further: They asserted that some faculty members were deceiving themselves if they believed that they were acting in ways that were true to the original philosophy of the program. This question is so closely related to the previous one that it raises the same questions. An additional question comes to mind, however: How can the program ensure that new faculty members understand the how to implement the philosophy behind the program?

The Leadership Program makes the claim that it is participant-driven. In your experience does this seem to be the case? Why or why not? Nineteen respondents did not believe that Leadership was participant-driven. Eighteen respondents, however, believed that it is. Three respondents neglected to answer the question directly. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 3.)

It is noteworthy that respondents were almost equally divided on this issue. On the one hand are respondents who believe that Leadership is not participant-driven. They described the program as being designed to fit the
philosophy of program faculty and subject to the requirements of Andrews University administrators. Participants, they stated, have no voice regarding changes in program policies. On the other hand are the respondents who believe that the Leadership Program is participant-driven. They perceive that, at least in the program’s early years, they took part in the evolution of the program. Additionally, participants from the 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 2002 cohorts viewed the I.D.P., which allowed them to take control of their own learning, as an example of participant authority. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 3.)

As with other issues raised in the interview questions, several participants from all cohorts represented perceived a trend toward traditional education, and some participants were frustrated by the responsibility of designing their own program, even in consultation with an advisor. Is this an example of the program being a poor fit for participants who need more direction? Is there a way to accommodate such participants without compromising the philosophy of the program?

Do you believe that a partnership exists to the extent that the faculty and students are all equal participants in the Leadership Program? When addressing the question of an equal partnership between participants and faculty, 1 respondent abstained from commenting and 2 respondents questioned the meanings of “equal” and “partnership.” Only 7 respondents believed that they were engaged in an equal partnership with the Leadership faculty. The remaining 30 respondents believed that, if a partnership existed, it was restricted to certain times, faculty, and circumstances. Several of those 30 respondents had determined that the inequality is justifiable, given mandated faculty roles and
responsibilities. Several others stated that the inequality is a manifestation of elitism. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 4.)

The responses to this question indicate that even though some participants feel that they are peers with the faculty, the ultimate reality is that the faculty do approve I.D.P.s and assign grades—responsibilities that do give faculty members what some respondents view as power. Just as real, however, are two facts. First, the program allows participants to determine, to some degree, what activities and artifacts prove competency and represent the successful fulfillment of coursework. Second, I know of no faculty member who would refuse to work with a participant until that participant achieves I.D.P.-defined goals and course requirements.

What is disturbing is that 5 respondents reported an attitude of superiority on the part of some faculty members. I have observed behavior that results from that attitude in only 2 faculty members. Given the nature of the Leadership Program, however, such behavior is unacceptable.

When I asked this question, I used the modifier “equal.” Would the responses have been different if I had left out that descriptor? Are the qualifications of participants challenging, even threatening, to some faculty members? Are there ways to nurture a peer relationship between participants and all faculty members?

Have you gotten the faculty support that you’ve needed? Because 38 of the 40 respondents answered this question positively, it appears that faculty support is not a major problem. In the case of the two negative responses, one was made by a participant who wanted his advisor to tell him what to do to complete the
program and the other expected quicker feedback on his submissions.
(Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 5.)

If the 40 respondents are representative of the larger participant population, at least between 1994 and 2002, the majority of participants were satisfied with—and in some cases enthusiastic about—faculty support. In spite of that, should a mechanism be put in place to assure that all participants get the support they need? Should participants take advantage of the self-direction and self-motivation encouraged by the program to change advisors to get support? And should participants be made more aware of the reality that the nature of an individualized program may result in allowing more time for faculty response?

If you could ask the faculty one question—without fear of reprisal—what would it be? Finally, when asked about posing a question for the faculty, 11 respondents either provided no substantive response or stated that they had asked or would question the faculty without fear of reprisal. Two respondents posed questions about the program’s financial contribution to the University and perceived completion time for the program. Questions from the remaining 27 respondents addressed the philosophical base, design, and implementation of the Leadership Program, reiterating comments they had made and comments they had posed in other questions. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 6.)
CHAPTER 10

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS, PART 6:
THE PROGRAM IN RETROSPECT

Introduction

In June 1994, the graduate council of Andrews University approved “the proposed pilot doctoral program in Leadership with the understanding that the program will be reviewed and reported to the Graduate Council at the end of the fall and spring quarters of 1994–1995” (Minutes, Andrews University Graduate Council, June 15, 1994). The standards for admission and the number of credits required for graduation from the Leadership Program mirrored those of other doctoral programs at Andrews University. In addition, as in the other Andrews doctoral programs, each Leadership participant also was required to complete and defend a dissertation. The manner in which the doctoral requirements would be fulfilled differed, however.

As the initial print advertising, produced in 1995, explains, the Leadership Program was designed for self-directed, self-motivated professionals. In this delivery system, program participants not only would earn a doctorate while continuing to be employed, they also would incorporate past and current experiences into their programs. In order to accomplish his or her goals while fulfilling program requirements, each participant, in consultation with a program team, drafts an Individualized Development Plan, or I.D.P., tailored to his or her
personal, academic, and professional goals. The I.D.P. outlines the ways in which the participant will document the theoretical knowledge base and the application of that knowledge for 20 separate but non-mutually-exclusive competencies organized into 6 major competency-areas. The measure of achievement in the Leadership Program is demonstration of proficiency in the competencies, and achievement is equated with mastery of theory and practice (“Why Does Leadership Emphasize Competencies Rather Than Courses? n.d.). As partial proof of proficiency, the participant presents a portfolio to the program team for review and approval.

Individual achievement will be evaluated on the basis of mastery of content and demonstration of skills. You will not be evaluated by comparison with other participants. Excellence is the only criterion, and achievement of excellence is the only mark of completion in this program. (Welcome to Leadership, 1994, p. 19)

The members of the program team review the evidence for each of the 20 competencies, then either approve the competency as presented or make recommendations for achieving mastery level. As originally implemented, the portfolio presentation also served as the venue for the participant to critically reflect upon his or her experiences in the program. This reflection could be oral, written, or a combination of both methods (Welcome to Leadership, 1995; Penner, 2002). Successful completion of the portfolio presentation was considered to be equivalent in academic achievement to the written comprehensive examinations of traditional graduate programs (Leadership: A New Concept, n.d., panel 2).

The questions in this chapter were intended to prompt graduates to reflect on their experience in general and on the dissertation, portfolio, and final paper in particular. At the time of the interviews, 24 of the 40 participants interviewed had not graduated; 16 either had graduated or they did so within 6 months of
that time. Although the questions in this chapter targeted the latter group, some individuals from the former group responded. As with other data-analysis chapters, I have analyzed the responses to each question, then provided a summary and conclusions at the end of the chapter. The five questions analyzed in this chapter are as follows:

Question 1. The Leadership Program is sometimes alleged to be less rigorous than a traditional doctoral program. Please comment on that allegation.

Question 2. Which was the most difficult to complete—the dissertation or the portfolio?

Question 3. Discuss the final paper. For example, was the nature of the paper a surprise? Did you find doing it a valuable experience?

Question 4. Did you set a deadline for completing the Leadership Program?

Question 5. Discuss some pros and cons about your experience in the Leadership Program. For example, did you experience any surprises—positive or negative?

**Question 1: The Leadership Program Is Sometimes Alleged to Be Less Rigorous Than a Traditional Doctoral Program. Please Comment on That Allegation.**

**Background**

Given the focus on mastery, Leadership differs from traditional graduate programs in several ways. P–25 (1999) summarized the differences in this way: “Traditional programs are prescriptive and faculty-driven [italics added]. Leadership is customizable and faculty-directed [italics added]. It is driven by the learner (participant).” P–04 (1995) added, “Leadership participants not only
demonstrate a theoretical foundation—as do traditional doctoral candidates, by passing classes and a comprehensive examination—but [they] also document successful application of the theory, [which is] not required of students in a traditional program.” The successful presentation of a portfolio that documents competency fulfillment replaces the written comprehensive examination.

In late 1998, non-Leadership faculty challenged the program’s rigor on the basis of the lack of a conventional written comprehensive examination. As a result, the Comprehensive Examination Task Force (CETF), a school of Education (SED) committee, requested a formal justification of competency-fulfillment as demonstrated in the portfolio presentation. In response, the Leadership faculty proposed that a written component be added to the assessment process and that a value be assigned to it:

The committee studying comprehensives requested that the Leadership faculty provide a written structure of the Leadership Program’s evaluation process equivalent to written comps by January 15, 1999 . . . [that identified] where the rigor is. The comprehensive process covers 16 hours. The committee says all comps must be written. We’re suggesting that the portfolio should be 50% of the examination and the other half either written or oral. For example: 50% final portfolio, 25% synthesis paper, and 25% oral. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, December 9, 1998)

On January 6, 1999, Hinsdale Bernard presented a draft of what might become Leadership’s version of the SED comprehensive-evaluation process. The written comprehensive examination was designed to take 16 hours, divided into four 4-hour sessions. Each session covered a separate topic. I do not have access to the document presented on January 6, but the minutes imply that a value of 25% was assigned to each of the 4-hour segments of the traditional examination. By applying that value, (a) the portfolio was comparable to 50% of the written exam, or 8 clock-hours of the written exam; (b) the oral discussion was
comparable to 25% of the written exam, or 4 clock-hours; and (c) the written portion was comparable to 25% of the written exam, or 4 clock-hours. The minutes also indicate that an “animated” discussion about providing an oral option to the final 4-hour written portion of the process took place (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 6, 1999).

No further discussion of the Leadership comprehensive-evaluation process appears in the minutes until October 13, 1999. On that date, the faculty raised the issue that portfolios should be considered as valuable an assessment tool as a written examination and that programs other than Leadership used portfolios in this way. The faculty also decided against assigning values to the individual components of the portfolio-assessment process. Rather, they determined that the description of competency-assessment should indicate that the combination of a synthesis paper —”a capstone document of 20 to 25 pages . . . [that] is an integrative paper of the competencies”—and the oral presentation of the portfolio provides the level of rigor required for comprehensive-examination standards (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, October 13, 1999). Note: Two substantive changes occurred at the October 13, 1999, meeting. First, the portfolio presentation was recorded in the minutes as a portfolio defense for the first time. Second, what had been called a reflective paper in 1995 (no formal paper was assigned to the members of the 1994 cohort) began to be called a synthesis paper.

The December 1, 1999, minutes indicate that at the SEP faculty meeting that took place earlier that day, the issue of comprehensive examinations had been raised again. The primary concern had been that 25% of the conventional comprehensive exam was required to be taken in a “controlled environment”
(Minutes, Leadership Faculty, December 1, 1999). The discussion continued. At
the Leadership retreat, held on January 24 and 25, 2000, for example, the faculty
charged members of regional study-groups with the responsibility of initially
approving each other’s competencies prior to program-team review. The policy
raised several questions, including, (a) What are the criteria for evaluation? (b)
Does there need to be a “100% pass” regarding the knowledge base of each
competency? (c) Does this policy jeopardize the credibility of the advisor?

The faculty determined that in order to provide general credibility for the
portfolio-assessment process, the participant would (a) provide an annotated
bibliography for each competency, (b) summarize his or her knowledge base,
and (c) maintain and submit a reflective journal. In addition, because the
portfolio approval at the faculty level required the consensus of every team
member, the advisor alone was not responsible for the approval process
(Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, January 24–25, 2000).

In late March 2001, the faculty referred to the portfolio defense as a public
event and suggested that it take 4 hours. In addition, they assigned the following
percentages to the components of the portfolio defense: oral defense of
knowledge bases, 25%; portfolio development and defense, 50%; and synthesis
paper, 25% (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, March 22, 2001).

In late April 2001, the faculty discussed the idea that the portfolio defense
be public rather than private. Their rationale and concerns are as follows:

Since the portfolio defense is a comprehensive examination, the sessions
have always been closed. However, it was acknowledged that the
portfolio defense is conducted under an entirely different format from the
comprehensive examination. Would the participant be set up for embar-
rassment if he or she is unable to answer the questions? This is the risk for
the oral dissertation defense, which is always public. The [participant’s]
advisor should ensure that the participant not schedule the portfolio
defense until the advisor is confident that the participant will not risk embarrassment. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Meeting, April 26, 2001)

Analysis of Responses

I used rigorous in the interview question because that is the word I heard two School of Education faculty members use when criticizing the Leadership Program. In the spirit of making the interview questions as non-restrictive as possible, I did not provide a definition of rigor. As a result, in the following analysis, each respondent related to the word in his or her own way.

Of the 40 respondents, 4 neglected to answer the question directly. P–22 (2000) observed that the life-embedded degree-requirement makes Leadership “more valuable [italics added] than many other doctoral programs.” And P–36 (2000) recommended that “there is the potential for greater rigor in a competency-based program. We need to work on the process and rubrics used to approve I.D.P.s which will represent competency in all the areas.” Two additional respondents—P–05 (1998) and P–39 (2000)—stated that they had no criteria for comparison, 3 stated that Leadership is less rigorous than other graduate programs, and 33 stated that Leadership is equally or more rigorous than other programs. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

The 36 remaining respondents fell into two major categories: those who reported that it is equally as rigorous or more rigorous than other programs (33), and those who reported that Leadership is less rigorous than other graduate programs (3). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)
No personal comparison for rigor but deemed program rigorous or valuable. The 2 respondents in this sub-category made general comments about the rigor of the Leadership Program. P–11 (2000) made no personal comparison but stated that “those I have spoken to with Ph.D.s have told me there is much more required in the Andrews program.” P–30 (2001) asserted that the program “is quite rigorous” but did so without comparing it to other doctoral programs.

Rigor as it relates to the philosophy and execution of Leadership. Three of the 8 respondents in this sub-category related to the competency base as evidence of the program’s rigor but did not compare Leadership to other programs. P–07 (1995) pointed out that the program is no less rigorous than other graduate programs and that it also demands that participants create their experience. P–01 (1997) emphasized that “having to do much of this program on my own . . . fosters greater competence than having to take exams.” P–14 (1998) made the following comprehensive statement with regard to how competencies relate to rigor:

Both the Leadership Program and traditional doctoral programs have coursework requirements and a dissertation. So if there is a distinguishing feature that could be deemed “less rigorous,” I guess it would be in the area of competencies versus comprehensive examinations—comps vs. comp. I have taken comprehensive exams covering two years of full-time study, and I have completed 75% of my competencies in this program. To my way of thinking, the comprehensive-exam approach tests the abilities of recall and recitation. The pressure-cooker nature of the exam suppresses tendencies for creativity, reflection, and synthesis. On the other hand, in the portfolio approach, the theory learned from coursework and from reading is taken on board and becomes a part of the evolving “you.” This application of theory is reflected in the portfolio documentation and in the reflective summaries. I have found that preparing my portfolio has changed me
more significantly and more permanently than sitting comprehensive exams would have done. (P–14, 1998)

Five respondents in this sub-category asserted that the Leadership Program is more rigorous than traditional graduate programs, specifically because participants are actively engaged in designing and carrying out their own plans for fulfilling the competencies. As P–31 (1994) explains, “No one holds you hand. You have to be self-directed. . . . You must be accountable for your own learning. You must integrate your work into the program and vice versa.” P–38 (1995) adds, “In the Leadership Program, I had to develop, plan, and implement my own course of study; set my own goals; and evaluate how well I met them. This seems to be more rigorous than simply following a pre-programmed sequence of courses.” P–16 (1996), who had experienced both in traditional and non-traditional programs, asserted “with certainty” that the Leadership Program is more rigorous because “participants play a big role in developing their program’s plan and must exhibit great initiative in the implementation phase.” And P–17 (1997) pointed out other program aspects that indicate that Leadership is no less rigorous than other programs. Indeed, Leadership “is more time-intensive and more focused on a particular discipline than the traditional program. The fact that Leadership is job-embedded makes it more practical and goal-directed. I also believe that because it is a self-directed program, Leadership nurtures a desire for deeper inquiry and more challenging study.”

P–25 (1999), the final respondent in this sub-category, summarized what makes Leadership more rigorous than traditional programs.

The traditional doctoral programs I’m familiar with are either portfolio-based or require a dissertation. Leadership, of course, requires both. Also,
the emphasis in a traditional program is primarily on research. In the Leadership Program, research is only one of six primary competencies. Traditional programs are prescriptive and faculty-driven. Leadership is customizable and faculty-directed. It is driven by the learner (participant).

**Rigor as the responsibility of participants.** Nine respondents emphasized the participant’s accountability as a factor of rigor. P–24 (2000) stated, for example, “I have worked very hard—and I wouldn’t want it any other way.” Four additional respondents made the following assertions: “Rigor is what you make it” (P–29, 2000), “it depends on how rigorous the participant makes the program” (P–10, 2001), “it depends on how hard you work” (P–12, 2001), and “you get out of it what you put into it” (P–13, 2002). As P–34 (2002) explained,

> Perhaps this perception exists because the learning is happening where I work and not in a formal classroom. I work on school during the day—while I am at work—and at home. . . . I will say that it appears that anything goes with regard to the portfolio defense. . . . I suppose whether the program is rigorous depends on the nature of the participant and the guidance/leadership of the advisor (or lack thereof).

The comments of the 3 remaining respondents in this sub-category indicated that Leadership’s graduates prove the program’s rigor. P–04 (1995) observed, “The jobs and successes of the participants and graduates are evidence for me that there is no significant difference in excellence between traditional [programs] and the Leadership Program.” P–06 advises, “Let’s wait 10 years and see which program’s graduates have made the larger contribution to education and [to] society in general.” And P–19 predicts,

> In the long run the quality of the graduates will speak for itself. . . . For most of us, leadership is a real world experience, not an academic pursuit. What better place to learn it than in a job-embedded program? Beyond that, I feel that comparing supposed rigor is not productive. (P–19, 1997)
Rigor of Leadership as compared to traditional programs. The remaining 14 respondents fit this sub-category. Four of the 14 made general statements. P–09 (1994) stated, “[Leadership is] much, much more rigorous than taking classes.” P–21 (1994) indicated, “A degree that demands demonstration of competencies is more rigorous and demanding.” P–37 (1994) asserted, “Less busy-work and hoop-jumping? Yes! Less rigor and meaningful self-directed work? No!” And P–20 (1995) challenged, “Have someone from a traditional program describe their journey, then have one from the Leadership Program describe their journey. There is much more to this Leadership Program. . . . It is more rigorous and more meaningful or functional.”

Six respondents in this sub-category pointed out the similarities shared by traditional programs and Leadership as well as the differences between the two delivery systems. P–33 (1994) generally observed, “There are many aspects of this program that are the same as others. Portfolio defense, dissertation, and so forth. I think in this program you have to do more to prove your skills and competencies.” Five respondents, however, identified specific elements of the Leadership Program that, for them, serve as evidence of rigor. In Leadership, “the curriculum is established for the student’s vision statement” (P–15, 1996), the purpose of learning is “to influence and lead in life” (P–32, 1996), “every class . . . or problem solved . . . is based on theory” (P–40, 1997), the program’s emphasis is on learning “through self-reflection, with the group” (P–02, 1998), and learning takes place “within the context of [one’s] work” (P–27, 2000).

Three respondents in this sub-category stated unequivocally that the Leadership Program is more rigorous than traditional programs. P–23 (1998) asserted that “a traditional program would be easier. It is one thing to grasp
concepts—even complex concepts—and quite another thing to synthesize and apply them within your real-life work environment to the standard of excellence set by this program.” P–35 (2000) continued in the same vein, asserting, “It’s one thing to be able to reproduce what other scholars have concluded, but entirely different to think for yourself. This demand for integration of knowledge (worldview and theory) and practice requires more than merely hard study. It demands self-examination.” As P–28 (2000) explained, “[Leadership is] a generalist type of degree, so the participant may not walk away as an expert in the mating habits of worms. But the graduate experiences a process that will forever change the way he or she thinks and acts.”

The final respondent, P–26 (1999), answered the allegation by citing a Cornell University professor:

Absolutely not! When a program has the standards for entry that this one does, the people who participate and finish are the kinds of individuals whose own standards for quality are the highest. My external committee member, [who was] from Syracuse University [and] who has chaired doctoral committees there and completed her own program at Cornell University, commented publicly during my dissertation defense that neither of those programs had the level of rigor that the Leadership Program has. (P–26, 1999)

Category 2: Program Less Rigorous Than Other Graduate Programs (3)

P–03 (2002) stated that the allegation “is sadly true,” and P–08 (2002) asserted that the accusation “has some merit.” Both respondents suggested that a greater emphasis on the theory and practice of leadership is necessary. P–08 based his comments on the fact that “just two online classes on leadership (foundations and theory) are required.” P–03, however, based his somewhat derogatory assertions on his own experience as well as on hearsay.
My academic experience has been declining—not increasing—since my bachelor’s experience. Sad. The portfolio and presentation and synthesis paper are supposed to replace comprehensive exams. I have not witnessed a defense yet, but I am told one can pass the defense not having learned anything fundamental about leadership. Sad, indeed. A pass/fail [comprehensive examination] would be a clear, definable, and attainable standard—but that would not fit into the philosophy, now would it? It also might result in students who learn, teachers who teach, or students and teacher who fail miserably when tested comprehensively. (Going on the premise that a student that fails is a result of a teacher who failed to ensure the student was prepared.)

The third respondent in this category—P–18 (2002)—did not compare the rigor of Leadership with other graduate programs but rather with his own expectations: “I feel that it is less rigorous than I imagine a traditional doctoral program would be.” He added, however, that “my master’s was less rigorous than I thought it would be. I think everything you do after your bachelor’s degree is less difficult than you [thought] it would be.”

**Question 2: Which Was the Most Difficult to Complete—the Dissertation or the Portfolio?**

**Background**

In traditional doctoral programs, students must fulfill two requirements in addition to completing coursework: (a) sit for written competency examinations and (b) write and defend a dissertation. In the Leadership Program, participants must write and defend a dissertation, but they are not required to sit for comprehensive examinations. Rather, with a faculty team, each participant designs an Individualized Development Plan (I.D.P.) that outlines how he or she will prove proficiency in 20 individual competencies arranged in six competency-areas. The participant collects the evidence of competency in a portfolio. The faculty team then evaluates the portfolio.
Analysis of Responses

This is the second of three questions in this chapter that targeted respondents who had graduated by 2003, the year in which I conducted the interviews. Of the 16 graduates, P–37 (1994) did not respond to the question. In addition to the 15 remaining graduates, 3 non-graduates responded. Those 18 respondents fell into three major categories: those who stated that the dissertation was more difficult to complete than the portfolio (10), those who stated that the portfolio was more difficult (5), and those who stated that they were equally difficult (3). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Dissertation More Difficult (10)

The three non-graduates who responded predicted that the dissertation would be more difficult. Two of them—P–07 (1995) and P–13 (2002)—said, “I think” that the dissertation will be more difficult. P–22 (2000) was more assertive, stating that “the portfolio took longer than I thought, but the dissertation will be more challenging. Statistics is the reason.”

Two of the 7 graduates who responded stated simply, “Dissertation” (P–38, 1995) and “The dissertation was much harder” (P–24, 2000). The remaining 5 respondents provided more-detailed explanations. For P–16 (1996), “the dissertation was assuredly the more time-consuming and presented some challenges since so much precision was required.” For P–26 (1999), “the dissertation was a greater personal challenge because of the depth of study and degree of perseverance needed.” And for P–39 (2000), the dissertation caused
her life to become “very unbalanced during this time and it was a very solitary process, unlike the other parts of the program.”

The 2 remaining respondents in this sub-category described why the portfolio was easier to complete than the dissertation. P–17 (1997) stated that she had “been collecting stuff for years. I mean, I’m a collector. So I had all kinds of artifacts. I had way more than I needed. So that really was not hard.” P–20 (1995) revealed her frustration with the dissertation process:

Without a doubt, the dissertation was extremely difficult for me to finish. I was able to complete the portfolio portion of the program without a great deal of challenge because the work I do allowed me to apply the requirements of the program quite easily. Although gathering all of the evidence was time-consuming, it was fun to be organized about it and gave me great satisfaction to step back and see my accomplishments. I enjoyed the dissertation topic and process until it came to writing and following all of the minute details of how it should look and how it should be written. In the end, I became extremely frustrated and lost my desire to even finish it.

Category 2: Portfolio More Difficult (5)

Four respondents, all graduates, stated that the portfolio was more difficult to complete than the dissertation. Two of them, P–09 (1994) and P–31 (1994), did not elaborate on their one-word response, “Portfolio”—although P–09 did add an exclamation point. P–06 (1995) asserted that “the I.D.P./portfolio was by far the more comprehensive project and was much more difficult to complete.” And P–40 (1997) was much more reflective in her response.

Being a concrete-sequential [according the Gregorc Mind-Styles Delineator], I found that working on so many parts of my portfolio at once throughout the five years was really difficult. I kept wishing I could just do one thing at a time and then move to the next one. Of course, it didn’t work that way because so much of what I did was intertwined with others, just as the competencies are. But it was a good stretching experience for me, and I am sure I have moved a little way down the scale toward random. (P–40, 1997)
Category 3: Dissertation and Portfolio
Equally Difficult (3)

The remaining 3 respondents, all of whom were graduates, described both the dissertation and the portfolio as difficult. P–21 (1994) added, “I couldn’t really say which was more difficult.” P–33 (1994) stated that both were “equally difficult.” And P–36 (2000) distinguished between two forms of difficulty, saying, “The dissertation was more frustrating, but the portfolio took more work.”

Question 3: Discuss the Final Paper. For Example, Was the Nature of the Paper a Surprise? Did You Find Doing It a Valuable Experience?

Background

As a member of the 1994 cohort, I can attest that no formal paper was assigned to the members of the inaugural group. Statements from interview respondents from that cohort corroborate my memory. Indeed, minutes of the March 13, 1996, faculty meeting indicate that “some members of the ‘94 cohort do not remember a requirement that a final synthesis paper [is due] at the end of their portfolio presentation. This information needs to be distributed to all ‘94 participants” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, March 13, 1996). What I do remember is that, during orientation, the faculty alluded to our writing a reflective account of our experiences. Penner (2002) later described that document as an extension of our vision statements, drafted when beginning the program.

In 1995, a description of Leadership listed the requirement for a document called a “reflective paper”—although without details about what the document should contain (Welcome to Leadership, 1995). I can find no other mention of such
a document in either orientation materials or in other program materials until 2002 (Leadership Program Handbook, 2002).

Beginning in 1996, the minutes of faculty meetings did, however, record references to and discussions about some form of final paper. In January, they determined that two artifacts—a copy of the I.D.P. and a copy of “the reflective paper” [italics added]—be kept on file as evidence of participants’ completing the program (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 31, 1996). In February, they described the purpose of the document in terms of the portfolio presentation in this way:

The portfolio presentation is seen as the culminating experience. Rather than an oral examination, it should be considered “celebration” of what has been learned, a time of sharing together a moment of triumph in a participant’s career. . . . A reflective summary [italics added] given at the portfolio presentation provides a “bookend” to the [participant’s] original vision statement. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, February 28, 1996)

Similar references appear in the minutes of the April 10, May 23, and October 9 faculty meetings of 1996. The minutes of the November 14 meeting indicate, however, that confusion existed among faculty members about the title of the final paper, as well as about its nature and purpose:

The paper . . . has been called several different names (i.e., Final Synthesis Paper, Final Narrative, Reflective Paper, Written Reflective Summary). It was decided by consensus to refer to this paper as the Reflective Summary [italics added]. The nature of this paper is, for the end of the program, the same as the Vision Statement at the beginning. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, November 14, 1996)

Note: Despite the resolve to call the final paper the reflective summary, the document was subsequently called the “exit paper” (Leadership Faculty Retreat, May 3–4, 1998) and the “synthesis paper” (January 6, 1999). The latter term has endured and has been retained.
In January 1999, “an animated discussion” occurred when the faculty added “‘oral’ as an option in addition to ‘written’ for the final 4-hour evaluation (25% of the overall evaluation) that is in addition to the portfolio evaluation (50%) and the synthesis paper (25%)” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, January 6, 1999).

No further discussion pertinent to the nature and purpose of the synthesis paper occurred until 2002, when faculty “decided that the synthesis paper should be turned in two weeks before the portfolio presentation rather than just one week” (Meeting, Leadership Faculty, March 27, 2002). *Note:* I can find no documentation about the due date for the final paper changing from the day of the portfolio presentation to 1 week prior to the presentation. The 2-week requirement first appeared in program materials in the first edition of *Leadership Program Handbook* (2002), distributed at the July 2002 Roundtable. According to the original description, the final paper was a reflective document that formed part of the culminating experience. According to the handbook, the final paper was an academic discourse, complete with citations, that was to be submitted 2 weeks prior to the portfolio presentation in order to be reviewed and evaluated.

Leadership participants attended the September 2002 faculty retreat as cohort representatives. Some of those participants voiced three concerns “based on feedback they had received and in reaction to the announcement of the *Leadership Handbook* at the 2002 Roundtable” (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, September 30, 2002). One concern spoke to changes in the portfolio-presentation process. Two other concerns, cited below, were about the synthesis paper:
The expectations for the synthesis paper appeared to have changed from that of an extension of the I.D.P. written narrative, which integrates the competencies to an academic thesis requiring references.

The handbook states that the synthesis paper is due 2 weeks before the portfolio presentation. The synthesis paper has been presented in the past after the portfolio presentation in a session called “the celebration” so that it can celebrate the complete experience, including the portfolio presentation. Is everyone, including the faculty, considered to be participants in the Leadership program that can all learn from each other or has a hierarchy developed with faculty and “students”? (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, September 30, 2002)

The faculty responded in the following way:

The synthesis paper is now required before the portfolio presentation because policy requires a written component to be filed as the “comps.” However, those in cohorts 1994–2001 can have the option to present their synthesis paper as a celebration following the portfolio presentation. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty Retreat, September 30, 2002)

At the October 2002 meeting, the faculty described the purpose of the synthesis paper and when it would be presented:

The synthesis paper is always a celebration of participant’s progress and completion of the Leadership program. The synthesis paper can be presented with the following options:

a. Schedule the portfolio presentation first, include all 20 competencies, which can then be followed by the dissertation defense. The synthesis paper is then presented as the “celebration.”

b. After the participant defends the dissertation, h/she [sic] presents the portfolio presentation with the synthesis paper. (Minutes, Leadership Faculty, October 9, 2002)

Analysis of Responses

This is the second of three questions in this chapter that targeted respondents who had graduated by 2003, the year in which I conducted the interviews. All 16 graduates as well as 1 non-graduate responded to the question. P–37 (1994), who had graduated in 1998, 5 years before I interviewed him, asked, “I’m not sure what you are asking. What final paper?” In addition,
P–07 (1995), the non-graduate, anticipated that the final paper would have merit: “Writing causes one to have focus and clarity, a valuable exercise to help crystallize the most important growth and change that has occurred from this educational program.” The 15 remaining respondents fell into three major categories: those who did not state whether or not the requirement was a surprise (6), those who expressed surprise about the requirement for a final paper (6), and those who were aware of the requirement (3). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Final Paper May or May Not Have Been a Surprise (6)

Three of the 6 respondents in this category stated that writing the final paper was a valuable experience. For P–20 (1995), the opportunity to reflect on the highlights and personally meaningful aspects of the program helped “to bring closure to my journey.” For P–16 (1996), the paper was a way to “recall many things that I had learned earlier” and stated that she has since “made many references to the information contained in the paper for practical use.” For P–24 (2000), however, the specifications for the final paper were at odds with his own expectations.

The final paper to me was more of a written exam. For instance, my vision of the paper would be all personal reflections. In other words, how did this program help me grow? Instead, it talked about what the “experts” felt about the various competencies. The personal reflection was only a small piece of the paper. Again, this is not a criticism; it is just how it was. (P–24, 2000)

Two respondents in this category stated that writing it had no value for them. P–15 (1996) stated, somewhat resignedly, “The paper did not teach me
anything new. . . . I did what I needed to do to get it approved.” P–36 (2000) made similar comments, stating,

The final paper was not a meaningful activity for me. Within a different construct it could have been. I suggest that far more attention be given to the process of developing and the parameters for approving I.D.P.s. Then the paper could address the realization of your most important competencies and their importance in your life. Or perhaps the content and direction of the final paper should be decided by the self-initiated learner.

The final respondent in this category, P–40 (1997), described how she had approached writing the paper but did not speak either to its value or whether or not it was a surprise, saying only that “Every course had both a theoretical and practical aspect, and for each course, I wrote a paper, so at the end, my final paper was basically a synthesis of the papers I had been writing all along.”

Category 2: Final Paper a Surprise (6)

Four of the 6 respondents in this category were from the 1994 cohort. P–09 (1994) described how she learned about the requirement and how she addressed it, as well as what she recommended as the appropriate due date:

We never discussed [the final paper] in orientation, and I remember hearing about it almost by accident as I was getting ready to graduate. Had I known about it from the get-go, it probably would have been more valuable. But at the end, I was rushed. I did it to get done. I would like to have given it more thought after I was done to really do it and myself justice. You can’t reflect well when so much else is going on. I really think the paper should be due—if possible—six months or so after graduation. Then it would be real. (P–09, 1994)

Three additional respondents from the 1994 cohort found writing the paper a useful activity. P–21 learned about the paper “at some point toward the end,” adding, “It made sense to me. . . . I went back to my vision statement and used it as the starting point. For me, it was truly a way of synthesizing, and I found it brought things full circle.” Both P–31 and P–33 indicated that the paper
helped then to reflect on what P–31 called “the entire experience in the program” and P–33 called “the journey.” And P–33 explained that “there was research in it, but that wasn’t the purpose for me,” adding somewhat cryptically, “If I had to do it now, I am not sure it would have been beneficial.”

Two respondents from the 1995 cohort also were surprised by the requirement for a final paper. P–06 (1995) indicated that no one in his regional study-group knew about the requirement until at least a year after the orientation, when F–04 informed them about “the final synthesis paper, which had never been mentioned at that point,” making the paper “quite difficult to complete.” In spite of his comments about the difficulty, he acknowledged that “reflecting and synthesizing my thoughts at the end of the program was an extremely valuable experience.” P–38 (1995) did not speak to the value of the paper, but she stated that, “after writing all the other things I had already composed, it was not hard to write.”

**Category 3: Final Paper Not a Surprise (3)**

Three respondents were aware of the requirement. P–17 (1997) stated that although she “didn’t realize how formal and extensive it was to be . . . the process was invaluable and the resulting paper an excellent experience in reflection . . . [that] provided the framework for my portfolio defense.” Despite confusion about when the paper was due, P–26 (1999) made a similar comment, asserting that the paper provided an opportunity “for me to integrate the competencies and my personal growth . . . [and] greatly enhanced the quality of my portfolio presentation.” P–39 (2000), however, stated that writing the paper “was not as valuable [as it would have been] had I written it following the
dissertation. I presented my I.D.P. without having defended the dissertation, so my paper was written based primarily on the I.D.P.—not a complete picture of my experience in the program.”

**Question 4: Did You Set a Deadline for Completing the Leadership Program? If So, Did You Meet It? Why or Why Not?**

**Background**

When the Leadership Program began, in 1994, the time limit for completing a doctoral program at Andrews University was 10 years, and it continues to be so. The program information distributed to the initial cohort stated a 6-year limit on pre-dissertation work as one of its non-negotiable conditions (*Welcome to Leadership*, n.d.). The initial Leadership handbook, produced and distributed in 2002, encouraged a 5-year completion schedule while acknowledging the University’s 10-year allowance (*Leadership Program Handbook*, 2002).

**Analysis of Responses**

This is the third and last of three questions in this chapter that targeted respondents who had graduated by 2003, the year in which I conducted the interviews. All 16 graduates responded. In addition, 6 non-graduates responded. Of the 22 total respondents, P–24 (2000), a non-graduate, responded cryptically, “The only deadline I had was one I put on myself.” The remaining 21 respondents fell into 3 major categories: those who failed to meet their deadlines (10), those who either had met their deadlines or had graduated within 6 months of that date (5), and those who finished degree requirements earlier
than anticipated (5). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

**Category 1: Set Deadline but Finished Degree Later Than Anticipated (10)**

**Non-graduates at time of interviews.** The 6 respondents who had not graduated at the time of the interviews had not met their deadlines. Five of the 6 respondents in this sub-category indicated that responsibilities in their personal and professional life prevented them from meeting their deadlines. P–33 (1994), for example, stated, “I didn’t [meet my deadline], but it wasn’t because of the program; it was because of my life.” P–07 (1995) expected to finish in 5 years: “I’m into my eighth year and anticipate finishing by year nine. I wouldn’t be able to do so without a study leave. . . . I begin a leave next month and am so eager for the final push.” (P–07 graduated in 2004.) “P–19 (1997) listed a cross-country move, a job change, and family commitments as reasons. P–13 (2002) chose not to make completing the program “the center of my universe,” further stating that he would not sacrifice reading “non-program books” or time with his daughter in order to finish. P–22 (2000) singled out his job as the reason for his not completing in the time anticipated: “I hope I will finish next year, but it has already taken longer than expected. My job takes much time.” (P–22 graduated in 2006.) And P–29 (2000), who predicted that he would finish in 2 years, stated, “I’m a little bit off, but not much. . . . I’m going to be close. (P–29 graduated in 2007.)

**Graduates at time of interviews.** Four respondents who had graduated by or near the time of the interviews took a year or longer than they had
anticipated. Both P–06 (1995) and P–36 (2000) set deadlines of 2 years. P–06, however, finished in 4 years but provided no reason for the delay. And P–36 needed an extra year beyond his deadline because he “underestimated the time needed to complete the dissertation process.” P–17 (1997) also set a deadline, but did not reveal what it was. In any case, she reported that she “had a deadline—a final deadline—that helped me. I knew that if I was going to graduate in August [2002], I would have to . . . [defend by] . . . the first week in July [2002]. The portfolio—believe it or not—was pretty close to being done. . . . [The dissertation was] pretty much.” Despite her intentions, though, P–17 did not graduate in August 2002 but in May 2003. For P–40 (1997), setting her sights on a date helped her to fulfill degree requirements within a year of her projected date.

I originally hoped to finish in four years, but it took me five. Part of the reason was a regional group issue. . . . That set me back some. Also, as a single parent, teaching full-time, I just couldn’t move as fast as I would have liked. Four years may have been an unreasonable expectation in my circumstances, and I am pleased with what I did. Once I settled on that May 2002 graduation date, I did not take my eyes off that goal. I think it was that goal orientation that kept me moving. (P–40, 1997)

**Category 2: Set and Met Deadline Within 6 Months (5)**

The 5 respondents in this category had graduated at the time of the interviews. P–21 (1994) met her goal of completing the program within 6 years. P–37 (1994) stated, “I think I originally set a goal of six years, but I completed it in four.” And P–38 (1995) describes her strategy in this way: “Every time I got a bill, I signed up for more classes! I just kept plugging away at it.”
The remaining 2 respondents graduated within 6 months of their projected completion date yet seem almost apologetic for not having met their own deadlines:

I said I’d have my Ph.D. by the age of 50. I achieved it 5 months after my 50th. I’d say, in the scope of things, I met my goal! I did it because I wanted to and because my advisors and colleagues encouraged me at every low moment and slump. (P–26, 1999)

[The members of our regional group] set a deadline of two years. I was off by six months because I did not recognize or appreciate the difficulty and process of completing a dissertation. (P–39, 2000)

Category 3: Set Deadline but Finished Degree Earlier Than Anticipated (5)

Five respondents fit this category. None of them specified the deadline, but each spoke to the amount of time needed to complete the program. P–09 (1994) set “several” deadlines. P–20 (1995) and P–16 (1996) set “many.” P–20 further commented, “I met some deadlines and did not meet many more. My family, job, and related responsibilities oftentimes interfered with getting things done. I kept setting new deadlines, however, as I am persistent about some things and this degree was one thing I really wanted to finish.” P–16 added, “Fortunately, this program allows for many life events, planned and unplanned, that require flexibility in scheduling.” And P–15 (1996) succinctly stated, “I made adjustments to the schedule as situations changed.”

The final respondent in this category, P–31 (1994), used what many people regard as one of life’s traumas to her advantage

I probably didn’t have a life other than work and Leadership. . . . I was going through a divorce and so this was a good timing thing for me, because I just immersed myself in my job and school. I wasn’t really interested in doing a lot of social, personal things . . . and . . . all I pretty much did was work and go to school. I didn’t take a vacation the whole three years I was in the program because all my vacation time I used for
regional-group meetings or coming out to Andrews in the summer. . . . I’m glad it’s done now, but it was definitely stressful and difficult at certain times. (P–31, 1994)

Question 5: Discuss Some Pros and Cons About Your Experience in the Leadership Program. For Example, Did You Experience Any Surprises—Positive or Negative?

Background

This question had no specific objective. Rather, it was intended to allow respondents an opportunity to make statements that either augmented their statements about the interview questions or to raise issues that had not been covered by those questions.

Analysis of Responses

Of the 40 respondents, P–37 (1994) referred to her earlier comments, stating, “I mentioned surprises above.” The remaining 39 respondents fell into 3 major categories: those who made primarily positive comments (14), those who made both positive and negative comments (7), those who made non-specific comments (5), and those who made primarily negative comments (13). (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Primarily Positive Comments (14)

Work-related unexpected benefits. Four respondents emphasized the work-related nature of the program as being an unanticipated benefit. P–06 (1995) credits his experiences with preparing him to be an academic. P–27 (2000) was pleased with “how seamlessly [his experiences] integrated with my work.” P–08 (2002) echoes P–27’s sentiment: “I was pleasantly surprised that the I.D.P.
could so intimately be tied to my job.” Of the 4 respondents in this sub-category, P–31 (1994), cited below, made a comprehensive statement:

> I look back now and . . . [realize] . . . I did really well professionally. I mean that was the other thing—is that it really helped me concentrate on some things at work that I wanted to accomplish and because of the interconnectedness between work and school, everything that I was doing at work I somehow parlayed into a school project. So that was a time when I really excelled at work as well. So I think overall the positives outweigh the negatives of doing it that way. (P–31, 1994)

**Participant, faculty, and staff support.** Three respondents in this category related their comments to support from fellow participants, staff, and faculty. P–33 (1994) describes her experiences as “great,” declaring that although she faced a number of personal challenges during her tenure, she “got what I needed from the program . . . [and] loved learning from the faculty and the cohort members.” P–16 (1996) also refers to the “level of administrative and faculty support [such as] during critical times [as] research development and presentation.” And P–24 (2000) describes his experience as “a growing one” in which he learned a great deal about himself. P–24 also adds Carol Castillo, then program manager, to the list of helpful individuals.

**Opportunities for development.** Seven respondents identified the opportunities to meet new people, to learn in a self-directed way, to develop leadership skills, and to increase self-knowledge and self-awareness as benefits of the program. P–38 (1995) expanded her personal network. P–01 (1997) was fortunate to be able to learn at his own pace and to do so “without external pressure.” P–40 (1997) “learned an enormous amount and made wonderful friends” while expanding her world “in a number of ways.” P–23 (1998)

The remaining 2 respondents in this sub-category—P–17 (1997) and P–26 (1999)—couch their statements in terms of the evolution of the program. Their comments are as follows:

The processes of reflective and critical thinking, vital skills for successful completion of Leadership competencies, became the modus operandi in the reassessment and reinvention of my personal, educational, and theological philosophies. As a consequence of these changes, my life journey is taking new and intriguing directions. I find myself in a completely different paradigm that produces endless possibilities and challenges—it exemplifies my concept of lifelong learning. The best way to describe my experience with the Leadership program is “life-changing.”

In the beginning, ambiguity concerning program requirements and procedures was at times perplexing. But as I progressed through the program, it was the ambiguity and freedom that brought the greatest benefits to me personally and professionally. (P–17, 1997)

I came into Leadership at what I believe to be a pinnacle period in the program: 1999. The program had been in development long enough to have clarified some of the early questions and struggles about such things as what job-embedded really looks like in action, and what is the role of the regional group. The changes made to the program until that point were enhancements and clarifications. I believe steady growth occurred in the design and implementation, to a large degree because the original faculty visionaries were still working together. As new faculty came in and the leadership changed, natural growth- and adjustment-pains occurred. But as I look at the quality and productivity of the recent participants, I see evidence that the program is still achieving its intended purposes in gathering an international community of leaders and creating the conditions for them to grow their leadership skills to a high degree and in a unique way. (P–26, 1999)

Category 2: Primarily Negative Comments (13)

Lack of rigor and structure. The 5 respondents in this sub-category regarded a perceived lack of structure and rigor as negative aspects of their experiences. P–04 (1995), P–35 (2001), and P–18 (2002) would have welcomed
more direction. P–14 (1998), who “drifted” when he started the program and, as a result, “lost up to a year of time getting underway,” wished that he had been “pushed the way new participants are to get the I.D.P. written and get started in a concrete way.” And P–03 (2002) expressed surprise “that a program that is highly vaunted and supposedly respected gets away without teaching students, without academic rigor.”

**Time commitment, religious concerns, and regional-group issues.** Two respondents in this category—P–11 (2000) and P–30 (2001)—indicated that the amount of time needed to complete the program was greater than they had expected. P–30 also was “a little dismayed that the regional group has not been as proactive as it could.”

Two respondents in this sub-category cited a variety of reasons for their negative comments: the secular leaning of the program and problems with the regional group. P–32 (1996) was disheartened by what he perceived as deficiencies in two areas. With regard to the “lack of personal leadership given to us,” he comments that the program “has become more theory than practice. And with regard to the lack of value for biblical study, asks, “Isn’t the fear of the Lord the beginning of wisdom?”

P–05 (1998) indicated problems with her regional group. She provided no details, but made the following comment regarding the situation: “Even though some faculty are aware of the problems, there has not been much accountability in expecting us to function well. There seems to be little accountability individually.”
Detrimental program changes. Three respondents in this category indicated that program changes were negative aspects of the program. P–15 (1996) observed that “the program seemed to mutate and requirements were added that were not there when the student registered.” As examples, he cited two perceived changes: the requirement that participants attend the annual Roundtable and the requirement for a synthesis paper. Roundtable attendance has been required since the inception of the program. The synthesis paper as it was described in 2003, however, was added later.

The final 3 respondents in this sub-category spoke to other program changes. P–19 (1997), for example, asserted that “effective communication has been ignored.” He used the portfolio presentation as an example:

Something is going on with this change from a portfolio celebration to a defense. Something is going on with this change and everybody ought to know about it. And to this date I don’t know that that issue has ever been addressed in an open forum with everybody. It’s still under wraps. Why was the change? Communicate to us. I mean, we’re intelligent people. We can understand the dynamics. If there is pressure from outside the university or whatever, let us know. (P–19, 1997)

P–25 (1999) and P–29 (2000) continued in the same vein as P–19 with regard to the issue of communication and program change. P–19 stated unequivocally,

I think to be really straightforward about it, it’s not currently . . . the same program that I signed up for in the beginning. I think most of the people in my cohort feel the same way.

We’ve got some serious concerns about the change of process . . . in the program. . . . There are regulations, there are requirements, there are expectations on the part of the faculty that are different [from those that] were there when we started the program. I don’t want to necessarily [get into] a discussion of whether those are better or not better. But they are changes. They are definite changes. And probably one major concern at this point is the change process.

Too many things are sprung on us. There’s not any discussion. There is, also, up until just recently, a strong push specifically by one faculty member, that you will do these things now, these are the new
rules, you will now follow the new rules. And there’s not a university or college in this country that makes you modify your program as you go along. You’re trying to hit a moving target in that setting, and that is not appropriate for higher ed. My understanding anyway is that from the beginning, when we did our individual development plans or I.D.P.s, that those are a legal binding document with the university. And if we do that, no more no less, that we have met the requirements of the program. (P–25, 1999)

P–29 (2000) made similar comments but added,

What F–04 was able to do with the program was personally add strength . . . [to get] others involved to follow this idea that they all felt good about, so it was clearly collegial in nature. The minute that he wasn’t around to keep cheering for it, they never allowed it to go forward. So what it says from a leadership perspective—it’s a wonderful lesson and it should be written up as a case study, or a dissertation. As a case study it says that all his work to create a good leadership model and to share a good leadership model, there was no interest. . . . I fear for the program because there is no seminal work on the Leadership Program that they all have—whether it’s mission or whatever—that we’re going to make this happen. . . .

These changes seem to center around real differences and belief-structures. There are some people who contributed to the vision of this program who believed that individuals can take great responsibility for their own learning, could create clear visions for themselves, and with good support can follow up and find good resources for themselves. . . . [They] could gather great information and essentially bring that together into their life and show competencies in these areas. That would be a rigorous academic program that would also lead to practical application—that practical application being, I think, an important part of the vision. The alternative to that is a more controlling structure wherein students come to you, you tell them what they should learn and how they should learn it. Well, we’re certainly drifting back toward a more controlling structure based on the general perception that’s out there. (P–29, 2000)

Category 3: Positive and Negative
Comments (7)

P–12 (2001) provided the most concise response to the question:

“Learning. Friendships. First WebCT class was a bit daunting at first—but then great.” P–07 (1995) and P–22 (2000) spoke to the issue by submitting lists:

Positive surprises: the collegial nature of the program, the strong integration of faith into the instructional process, the encouragement to
think and question. Negative surprises: progressive discovery about
requirements such as the final summative paper, the portfolio defense.
(P–07, 1995)

Pros: catching the vision, meeting different people [from a] variety of
their backgrounds. Cons: depth of the program/ participants not always
satisfying, the level of some is not sufficient for a doctoral program.
(P–22, 2000)

P–21 (1994) stated that her “experiences were mostly positive,” especially
the way in which she “was so well supported through the dissertation defense
and portfolio presentation process.” Her only negative comment was that she
did not get faculty feedback as quickly as she hoped, but she tempers her
disappointment by saying, “I don’t think that this is any more true of the
Leadership Program than any other doctoral program. Faculty everywhere are
busy, and I think we have to live with that and learn how to work with the
various faculty assigned to us.”

P–20 (1995) asserted,

I really loved my experience in the program because I felt like I was totally
responsible for what did or did not happen. My advisor couldn’t have
been more supportive or accommodating. I enjoyed meeting people from
all over the world and learning about different cultures, religions, and the
wide range of professional fields that people came from. My regional
group was a wonderful group of diverse women who were committed to
seeing all of us through the program as a support group to everyone.
(P–20, 1995)

She continued her response by describing negative as well as positive
aspects of a number of program elements. With regard to her regional group, for
example, she states that the benefits diminished as the membership changed.
Other than “some minor aspects of it that were irrelevant or incredibly boring,”
she found each Roundtable an “opportunity to refocus [her] energy toward
getting finished,” to see old friends, and to meet new people. She indicated that
the faculty were, initially, “a wonderful group of educators who were impressive” but later determined that as the faculty constituency changed, “the stability of the ‘team effort’ quickly faded” and “was fascinated by the size of egos some people had. Or was it lack of healthy self-esteem?” Her final comment also targeted the faculty:

I think that the skills of the faculty are impressive, but their behavior and leadership skills were lacking. How ironic! The program really changed when F–04 left. . . . His departure prompted me to get done, as I did not trust the program as it was evolving without F–04 at the helm. (P–20, 1995)

P–10 (2001) and P–34 (2002) focused on changes in the program. P–10 regarded the opportunity to “chart my own course of what I want to study and how this is embedded in my work” a benefit but described changes in program structure as “an unpleasant surprise.” P–34 found her regional group to be “motivating and positive,” but, unlike P–10, regarded a lack of direction to be her “biggest surprise (negative).” P–34 continues,

So far, I have taught myself. I would like to be able to glean from their education and experiences. I feel that they stubbornly hold on to the nuggets they have found—you know—to be a teacher. I am not talking about spoon-feeding me. Sometimes I wonder why I pay tuition. I should be paid. I am the one doing the teaching. (P–34, 2002)

Category 4: Non-specific Comments (5)


P–02 (1994), P–09 (1994), and P–13 (2002) found that the Leadership Program yielded generally positive results. For P–02, “Leadership changed my life, my job, my family, my thoughts.” P–09 asserted that how she “accepted and made the most of” both the positive and negative surprises that she encountered
in the program “was what made the most profound change in [her] life.” And P–13 stated, “I am just now getting into it and I like it much better than I thought that I would.” For P–39 (2000), however, the surprise was that the program had little impact on her life.

The final respondent in this category, P–28 (2000), responded somewhat non-committedly, “The program has been much the way I imagined it. I have not been surprised by much and am making my way along.”

Summary and Conclusions

The Leadership Program is sometimes alleged to be less rigorous than a traditional doctoral program. Please comment on that allegation. Seven respondents made non-decisive statements and 2 believed Leadership to be less rigorous than traditional programs. Thirty-one respondents, however, seemed certain that the program’s non-traditional design and delivery system did not jeopardize its standard of excellence. Indeed, many of them identified aspects of the program that they believed contributed to Leadership’s rigor. These components include the need for self-direction, initiative, accountability, and time-intensity. They also include the opportunity for job-embedded, context-appropriate, life-changing experiences. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 1.)

Can quality be quantified? Are individuals who require a great deal of structure able to judge the accomplishment of other individuals only by using a detailed rubric? Are students and professors at a relatively conservative Christian-oriented institution especially uncomfortable with a non-traditional
approach to graduate education, which has, for the most part, been an institution for almost 1,000 years?

Which was the most difficult to compete, the dissertation or the portfolio? In addition to the successful defense of a dissertation, the Leadership Program requires the successful presentation of a portfolio that contains evidence of competency-fulfillment. Three of the 16 graduates found the portfolio more difficult to complete because it seemed more comprehensive and less clearly defined than the dissertation. Four of them found the portfolio and dissertation equally difficult. The remaining 10 respondents included 3 non-graduates; all 10 either found the dissertation more difficult to complete than the portfolio, or they believed that it would be so, because it involved statistics, required high levels of detailed precision and perseverance, and was a non-collaborative process. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 2.)

The elements that constitute an acceptable portfolio are, indeed, less well defined than are the requirements for a defensible dissertation. The portfolio is based on the I.D.P., which many respondents found difficult to produce. The variety of professional areas, interests, and goals that participants represent ensures that no one standard template can be designed to fit all situations. What, then, can be done to facilitate the process of writing a strong I.D.P. and identifying the documentation and artifacts that support it?

Discuss the final paper. For example, was the nature of the paper a surprise? Did you find doing it a valuable experience? Eleven of the 16 graduates found that writing the final paper was a valuable experience, whether or not the requirement came as a surprise to them. Among other reasons, they stated that
the opportunity to reflect on their experiences was insightful and that, in some cases, it provided a framework for their portfolio presentations. One respondent suggested that the final paper would be more valuable if it were oriented toward the process of designing the I.D.P. rather than toward the fulfillment of the competencies. Another respondent recommended that the paper be due after graduation in order to allow more time for reflection. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 3.)

(During the 1994 orientation, as I recall, the need for a final paper was not mentioned. And in checking with other members of the 1994 cohort, as well as with members of 1995 cohort, I found no one who had heard of the requirement until they reached the end of their tenure in the program. I had considered the 20 competencies as interrelated. When I first heard about the final paper, I thought, I just somewhat arbitrarily separated my accomplishments and goals into separate categories in order to write an I.D.P. and now I’m being asked to reintegrate the information to produce yet another document? This is nuts!)

For earlier cohorts, the final paper, when it was assigned, was to be a reflective piece about experiences, discoveries, frustrations, and challenges faced while getting a doctorate—more akin to a journal than a thesis. For later cohorts, the final paper was to be a scholarly piece about the competencies that included references—more akin to a thesis than a journal. Without seeing the final paper of the respondents, I cannot determine what they included that was useful or revelatory. I do wonder, however, if participants couldn’t be asked to write about experiences in the program, but do so in their own, individual style. The competencies would serve as the framework, but the text could be informal or
formal, with the only non-negotiable condition being that the participant relate to his or her experiences.

*Did you set a deadline for completing the Leadership Program?* When asked about deadlines, 19 participants—14 graduates and 5 non-graduates—responded to this question, and most of them had set deadlines for completing the requirements of the Leadership Program. With regard to the 5 non-graduates, none had met their anticipated deadline. With regard to the 14 graduates, P-24 (2000) provided no definite deadline. Of the remaining 13 graduates, 4 met their deadlines to at least within 6 months of the anticipated date, 4 took a year or longer than anticipated, and 1 took 2 years less than anticipated. In addition, 4 respondents postponed their anticipated dates of completion. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 4.)

At the inception of the Leadership Program, Andrews University policy allowed doctoral students 10 years to complete the degree, and the program followed suit. Currently, Leadership participants are given 7 years. Petitioning for more time is an option, but, from my own experience, having to petition is discouraging as well as stressful. The program was initially described as job-embedded. Later the description became life-embedded and job-related, and both personal and professional challenges can interfere with the best of intentions. Several respondents took 2 or more years longer than they anticipated. As of summer 2012, for cohort years 1994 through 2002 (the interval for this study), an informal accounting shows that the length of time needed for Leadership participants to finish the program ranged from 2 years to 16 years, with an average of 7.1 years. The annual averages are as follows: 1994 cohort, 5.7 years; 1995, 9.0 years; 1996, 7.7 years; 1997, 5.0 years; 1998, 9.3 years; 1999,
7.1 years; 2000, 7.1 years; 2001, 5.1 years; 2002, 7.2 years. No other factors, such as how many credits participants transferred in from other graduate programs or whether or not they already had earned a master’s degree, were considered in the calculation (Tucker, personal conversation, June 18, 2012).

*Discuss some pros and cons about your experience in the Leadership Program.*

*For example, did you experience any surprises—positive or negative?* Asking the participants a general question about their experiences in the Leadership Program elicited a variety of responses. As with other interview questions, the same elements of the program—such as the lack of a traditional structure—appealed to some respondents but not to others. And some participants were pleased with the faculty support they received while others were not. Two often-expressed issues emerged, however. First, on the positive side, participants stated that they were pleased with the opportunity to integrate program requirements with workplace responsibilities. Second, on the negative side, participants expressed the concern that unfavorable changes had occurred in the philosophy and practice of the program. (See Appendix G, Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 4.) Comparing the comments made in response to this question to the comments made in other, more specific questions would likely provide a more-comprehensive perspective of the issues that respondents found important.
CHAPTER 11

FACULTY AND STAFF INTERVIEWS

PART 1: FACULTY ISSUES

Introduction

This chapter contains the analysis of faculty and staff responses to questions about the Leadership Program. Comments and questions raised by the 40 participants interviewed were the source of the questions. The purpose of the questions was to discover faculty and staff perceptions of Leadership’s philosophy, design, and implementation—from 1994, the year in which the program began, through 2002, the year during which I conducted the interviews. In many respects, faculty members and staff were as inexperienced with implementing the program as were the participants enrolled in the program. The responses to the questions, I hoped, would provide additional insight into this study of the Leadership Program at Andrews University.

Twelve former and current full-time faculty members and staff were asked to respond to questions 1 through 20. Appendix H contains the list of interview questions. The 10 questions analyzed in this chapter are as follows:

Question 1. How were you approached about joining the Leadership faculty?

Question 2. What attracted you to the Leadership Program?
Question 3. As a Leadership faculty member, have your expectations been met?

Question 4. What faculty changes have occurred since you joined the Leadership Faculty? Why were these changes made? How have these changes affected the program?

Question 5. Do you believe that the faculty functions as a team? Why or why not?

Question 6. Do you believe that all faculty members operate in ways that are true to the philosophy of the Leadership Program as it is described in printed and website promotional material? Why or why not?

Question 7. What criteria do you use to know when a participant had done enough to prove competency?

Question 8. What happens when a participant demonstrates that the program is not a good fit for him or her, either because of personality or academic issues? How does the faculty deal with this situation?

Question 9. Do you believe that a partnership exists to the extent that faculty and students are all equal participants in the Leadership Program? Why or why not?

Question 10. If you could ask the participants one question, what would it be?

**Question 1: How Were You Approached About Joining the Leadership Faculty?**

**Background**

An academic program is made up of faculty and student participants. With the support of the School of Education dean and other administrators, four
Andrews University faculty members created the Leadership Program. Soon after the initial orientation however, original faculty members accepted positions in other departments or at other universities and new faculty members joined the program. The effect of such changes on Leadership and its participants would be a worthwhile study in itself, but this question is intended only to ascertain how faculty members were approached about joining the program.

Analysis of Responses

Ten faculty members responded to the question, as did the program manager. Four of the faculty members had been involved in the Leadership Program since its inception. Their story appears in Chapter 4, “Crisis as a Catalyst for Change.” F–02 simply indicated, “I think I must have volunteered.” The remaining responses fell into three categories: four were from other Andrews departments and programs and were invited by existing faculty members, one was appointed by the dean, and one was hired as a result of the University’s standard search process.

Responses to this question were, for the most part, procedural. F–08’s comment, however, is noteworthy, because it relates to the points addressed in this question’s background and because it is particularly enthusiastic:

It was during the interview process for another position . . . that I was invited to attend a Leadership faculty meeting to see if I would be interested in also working . . . for the Leadership Program. I remember the meeting that was held in the cafeteria, and I fell in love with the concept immediately. It was such a forward-looking approach to graduate education, particularly at the doctoral level.

F–08’s response serves as a fitting segue to Question 2.
Question 2: What Attracted You to the Leadership Program?

Background

Seeing the need for a program such as Leadership is a function of awareness. Helping to create and develop such a program, or joining the faculty of one after it has been in place for several years, requires the practical implementation of that idea. After the fact, what is the faculty’s perception of the basis for the impetus for developing the program and for sustaining involvement in Leadership? This question explores those issues.

Analysis of Responses

All 12 faculty and staff members answered the question. The responses fell into three general categories: the conceptual idea involved, the fact that the program was competency-based rather than strictly course- and credit-based, and the characteristics of the existing faculty. As the duplication demonstrates, a number of respondents expressed their positions by addressing more than one of these categories. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: The Conceptual Idea

For 6 respondents, the appeal of the Leadership Program was, as F–02 states, “A collection of exciting ideas.” F–01 has “always been attracted to new programs and new ways of doing things.” F–01 also believed that the program might help to solve the “crisis in leadership in our schools, in our churches, and in our society in general.” F–06 appreciated the fact that the program was “grounded in sound learning-principles,” F–08 was drawn to “the one-on-one
interaction between faculty and participants and the establishment of collaborative learning-communities through the regional groups” and F–09 stated, “[It was] the philosophy and values of the program and its individualized/self-paced structure.” And F–11 made the following, enthusiastic statement:

I had heard that the program was flexible, job-embedded, and ideal for busy professionals who were already leaders. I found the teaser and brochure to be intriguing. Admittedly, I felt the program had to be “too good to be true,” and I wondered what the “catch” might be. After I experienced a period of employment, I realized that the program’s promotional materials not only accurately described it, but that participants would begin an amazing journey of self-discovery and of leadership potential, backed by sound theoretical principles.

Category 2: Competency-based Program

Three respondents expressed some version of the competency-based nature of Leadership as what attracted them to the program. F–03 said that it was a combination of things, including the competency-based approach. F–05 noted the “emphasis on competencies rather than courses.” And F–10 indicated that a major part of the attraction was “the innovative delivery system—and especially the competency-based assessment of students.”

Category 3: The Quality of the Faculty

F–03 said that having a “creative faculty to work with” was one of the primary attractions. For F–07, a strong attraction was “the comradeship of the faculty.” F–10 also indicated that the faculty was a significant aspect of the attraction.
Question 3: As a Leadership Faculty Member, Have Your Expectations Been Met? Explain Your Answer?

Background

In order to continue the discussion about the appeal of the Leadership Program to faculty members, I wanted to discover if the points of attraction endured. This question is, in a very real sense, a perceptual assessment of the factors that had appealed to incoming faculty.

Analysis of Responses

The responses to this question were more forceful than I had expected. In order to maintain that force while maintaining confidentiality, I have not revealed even the coded identities of the faculty and staff members cited. Because of the exceptional candor in the responses, I have (a) chosen to not reveal in any way which faculty member is responsible for which statement, (b) submitted the comments out of their numerically coded order, and (c) presented the comments in their entirety.

The 11 responses fell into three general categories: those that were both positive and negative, those that leaned to the negative; and those that were unambiguously positive. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

Category 1: Positive and Negative

Yes—and no. Yes, in that we were successful in launching such a program and that our expectations were validated by the response from the participants. The concept worked! There is no question about that. No, in that we didn’t take the time to systematize the principles that undergird the program, and we didn't take the time to orient new faculty so that they moved into the program seamlessly.
Yes and no. I have been gratified at the growth of the Leadership program. I am not satisfied or happy, however, with the current turn of events in the Leadership Program as I understand them. It seems to me that the program has gone backwards. I do not believe the current faculty—the “core” faculty—matches the original group. In research terms, it seems like that there has been a regression toward the mean. When that faculty had a chance to enrich themselves they were too threatened to take advantage of what I consider was a great opportunity. They were much too interested in protecting themselves than in trying to grow. It seems to me, to use a nice word, that they were extremely timid.

Predominantly yes, but many nos. The expectations that I feel have not been met relate to:

1. Providing options for students to use in fulfilling competencies. Students have been left too much on their own to identify options. Experiences/learning modules/seriously-constructed reading lists, etc. could be provided as options.

2. An insular attitude on the part of the faculty has prevented a use of the wide faculty resources on campus. The faculty has been specifically and overtly afraid of allowing other faculty to participate in providing help to students in working on their competencies. As faculty have frequently mentioned, “If we allow faculty to participate in the program who do not have our philosophy, it might compromise what we are doing.” This is sad! All of this wealth of talent going to waste.

3. Lack of collegiality, particularly in the school of education. Many members of the Leadership faculty have felt “persecuted”—and perhaps rightly so, in some cases. But, as a result, whenever they hear criticism, they withdraw, rather than communicate. This is particularly true as it relates to assistance with dissertations. Some of us have been unable to have the Leadership faculty and/or the dean of the school of education communicate with the rest of the SED faculty concerning help that might need to be provided on dissertations in the future. An evidence of this is the lack of communication with the rest of the school of education concerning the program in Detroit and Europe. Most of us know almost nothing about what is happening. I presume that exciting things are happening, but there is never any news communicated to the rest of the school. It is as if they are hiding what they are doing for fear that others may want to get involved or that there may be some criticism of what is happening.

I would have to answer yes and no. I fully expected to be considered one of several participants in a non-hierarchal microcosm that would be representative of the participant philosophy of leadership. I have found that my role has indeed been valued. I am free to express my opinions and concerns at faculty meetings perhaps more so than support staff in another program might feel free to do. However, over the years, I have found that I am often “caught,” as I’ve been told not to unduly worry about key program issues. Yet as a front-line person, I must have access to information on these very issues so that I can communicate them
effectively. I must advocate for the participants by sharing their views, but this can be awkward. Additionally, I was advised by one administrator to take care “not to overstep my bounds.” It would therefore seem that our organization is a hierarchy after all. However, I have recently been encouraged to address the issue of “feeling caught,” with the assurance that this situation will be remedied with more effective communication and collaboration.

Category 2: Leaning to the Negative

In the beginning I was very excited. The program exceeded my expectations.

My biggest concern is that “competency” has never been defined and communicated. It continues to be elusive and politicized. Participants are often caught in a quagmire of differing expectations. Regional groups are asked to sign off competencies and they continue to ask for some guidance in knowing what is sufficient. I believe the faculty’s inability to define “competency” is somehow related to the higher-ed stance to hang on to control of participants’ programs. After all, if the faculty really wanted an individualized program, they would put some parameters into place that would guide the individual and still give them freedom. I don't think this is complex! And I am not aware of any discussion of competency that doesn’t have some definition associated with it. I’m afraid our program will continue to lose credibility without such a definition.

To some extent. Nothing is perfect, and with an evolving program one would expect change to be inevitable. Changes have always been in a positive direction, and I am pleased with this trend. The areas where expectations have not been met are tied to budgetary matters. We have all been stretched as a faculty in the Leadership Program and have learned to live with extra demands on our time. As a result, the quality of service to participants may have been compromised. In addition, I could do with more time for my own professional development and research.

My expectations were met at first, and it seemed to be a good fit for me. Now things seem a little strained—too much control by one or two people.

Category 3: Yes

My expectations for the program have been met beyond my expectations. The program is “perfectly” designed.

Yes. [No elaboration.]
My expectations have been far surpassed. For several reasons: (a) the collegiality of the faculty has been refreshing; (b) there is a passion about the principles that set this program apart. While we have had our struggles to balance the ideas of the founders with the reality of the growth of the program, I think we are a unique program that allows participants to shape their own course of studies. This is a program that not only talks about principles but [also] tries to implement them; and (c) the caliber of participants is amazing.

**Question 4: What Faculty Changes Have Occurred Since You Joined the Leadership Faculty? Why Were These Changes Made? How Have These Changes Affected the Program?**

**Background**

This question builds on the previous two and forms a bridge to Questions 5 and 6.

**Analysis of Responses**

All 12 faculty and staff members responded. One category predominates the responses: “the loss of the original faculty” (F–07). Indeed, 10 of the 11 respondents not only mentioned but also, for the most part, expressed regret over the loss of the creative faculty. It is interesting that the same faculty and staff members who named several aspects of Leadership as attracting them to the program, identify the loss of faculty as an extremely negative development. (Again, is this a conflict of perceptions? Or is it a matter of unstated expectations about the role of the founding faculty?)

When I conducted the interviews, major changes had occurred in the configuration of the faculty. F–09 provided the following well-articulated, concise account of what had occurred:

Three founding faculty members have left the university but not the program. They have continued to be involved with the program to varying degrees on a contractual basis. They are all adjunct faculty members of the Leadership Program, or, to use a more recent terminology, [they are] virtual faculty. Virtual faculty members are kept apprised of
the developments in the program through their input in faculty meetings, where possible, and by receiving the minutes of the proceedings.

In presenting the responses to Question 4, I have included only comments about how the changes affected the Leadership Program. (See Appendix G for a tabular representation of all 40 responses.)

**Category 1: The Departure of the Original Faculty**

Five respondents viewed the changes in a positive light. F–02, for example, observed, “In any maturing program there are changes. The birthing process needs one kind of person; an adolescent organization needs other types of people.” F–03 asserted, “[I] think all additions/changes have been positive. I don’t see much change in the program because of this.” F–08 specifically addresses faculty load as a resulting benefit: “The changes in personnel have caused the faculty to critically examine workload policies and have come up with a formula to address matters of equity among faculty, thereby boosting the overall morale. . . . A system is in place for monitoring the situation so that the program could respond to changes in a timely manner to keep the participants well served.” F–10 focused on the departing faculty’s desire to remain involved in Leadership, as well the need for additional faculty, as evidence of the strength of the program despite personnel changes. “There are more faculty members on external contracts because the program is much bigger. There are also more full-time faculty members at AU campus. It’s got to be a testimony to the program that even when faculty leaves the University, they still want to be attached to this program.”

Three respondents regarded the departure of the original faculty as detrimental to the program. F–01, for example, was unequivocal about the
negative result of the loss of members of the founding faculty: “There has [been], in my opinion, a significant dumbing down of the faculty and the program. . . . The Leadership Program depends more on the faculty guidance and modeling than do other programs. Because of that, I believe that the program has suffered greatly. . . . I don’t believe it’s the same program is the short answer to your question.” And F–04 indicated that new faculty members seem dedicated but indecisive because they “bring various levels of understanding of the principles that undergird the program. This fact often causes the faculty to make decisions that then, upon reflection, must be rescinded. Such ‘waffling’ makes the faculty appear less than ‘competent.’”

In the following comprehensive statement about the effects of faculty departures, F–11 addresses the perceived trend toward a more structured program:

More personnel changes brought forth an encroaching wariness by some faculty of the non-traditional approach of the Leadership program. Some faculty suggested that the Leadership program incorporate more structure and asked that their colleagues remember those “students who like to sit at the feet of professors and learn."

With the original pioneers now employed at other institutions, much of the unrecorded values of the program went with them. Also, with the added employment of faculty from programs that offered traditional classroom deliveries, concern arose for more “structure” (considered long overdue) to ease perceived frustration from the participants. The handbook then emerged with the intent to clear up misconceptions and discourage arbitrary rules imposed by individual faculty on the program’s participants. It is noteworthy that the program’s major component of offering job-embedded competencies with individual flexibility has remained intact as well as the encouragement for participants to experience personal transformation.

Two respondents credited the collaboration of Tucker and Johns as instrumental in upholding the essence of the program during the transitional period between coordinators. F–6 stated,
Dr. Tucker accepted the chair of excellence at the University of Tennessee. This appeared to be a deathblow to the program, but Dr. Tucker and Dr. Johns worked together to maintain a continued relationship for the program. This has been a tremendous accomplishment, evidenced by the outstanding LeadEast cohort.

F–09 added,

Jim left. . . . Jim’s voice, however, continued to be listened to. Loretta became [coordinator] and was the one who convinced me to come on board full time in 2003. In my view, she is responsible for developing a faculty-load system that allowed the program to negotiate successfully for additional faculty and fund my position. But even more important, she managed to make the department function as a real department that had its own full time faculty, rather than one-third- and one-fourth- and one-half-time members belonging to different departments. That helped morale and efficiency.

F–05 acknowledges the impact of the departure of the founding faculty as having both negative and positive components.

People leaving is always devastating: It leaves a huge hole in terms of expertise and a certain comfort level that develops when people know each other well and have worked together. Because the program is fundamentally about “processes,” faculty have to be able to work off of each other’s suggestions and sessions so a building ambiance is created, especially during orientations. But when people leave they also take with them weaknesses like [the] inability to work together [and] lack of expertise, [such as] the willingness to use technology—“colicky” behavior so it’s not all bad when people leave!

New people require some form of orientation, and I think sometimes we have not mentored people well into being faculty members in this program.

**Category 2: Budgetary and Administrative Changes**

F–08 and F–10 also address faculty changes in terms of budgetary and administrative considerations. F–08 notes what appears to be an efficient consolidation of resources—the “gradual merging of the educational administration and leadership programs over a four-year period. Now the two programs operate as one department. This was one response to dwindling
faculty in the face of budgetary constraints.” And F–10 implies that program changes occurred in order to satisfy charges that are represented by questions such as “Who’s really in charge of this program and how do we know students are learning and what is the disciplinary content of this program? Is it okay for a graduate program to actually be fiscally viable without sacrificing academic quality and rigor?”

**Question 5: Do You Believe That the Faculty Functions as a Team? Why or Why Not?**

**Background**

A group of individuals may respond to the need for an innovative program by creating and developing one. After the fact, however, how well do those individuals, as well as new ones who join the program, work with each other? How much do they understand and uphold the philosophy of the program and to translate that philosophy into practice? Question 5 attempts to elicit responses to such issues.

The responses to this question represent a variety of complex and insightful views on the operation of teams in general and on the Leadership faculty in particular on teamwork.

**Analysis of Responses**

F–01 did not answer this question, F–03 stated, “I do not see any problem,” and F–07 simply said, “No,” leaving 8 faculty and staff responses to be further analyzed. The prevailing opinion was that the faculty does in fact operate as a team. Although there are problems that need to be addressed, as is likely when bringing a number of individuals together, the Leadership faculty
reported that a healthy spirit of teamwork exists. The responses to this question indicated that, even with the reported difficulties created by changes in membership, the faculty functioned as a cohesive team.

Three respondents believe that the original faculty functioned as a team. In the words of F–02, “It was a very dynamic group.” F–04 considered this a “difficult” question to answer:

The ‘team’ began to fall apart . . . when several members of the faculty were “assigned” to the faculty . . . and when, [as a result], there was no “buy-in” on the part of those individuals. Since that time, the faculty has not really functioned as a team. It is now more like a traditional department, with a “chair” and subordinate faculty and staff.

And F–11 states,

It seemed that the faculty functioned with ‘shared chair’ responsibilities as a non-hierarchical team. More recently, tensions arose among the faculty because of a perceived lack of safety among some in being able to freely express themselves. . . . Enhanced communication seems to be a shared goal among the faculty.

F–06 observes the team approach in portfolio teams and dissertation committees, adding the caveat, “There is always room for improvement.” F–08 notes that although faculty members do not see eye to eye in every situation, “our overall collaborative spirit . . . becomes quite apparent when the Leadership Program is under attack from the outside (which is common) and the faculty always closes ranks and defends the program together.” And P–09 identifies respect for each other’s strengths and weaknesses, as well as candor with each other, as evidence that faculty members, “to a certain point . . . have a genuine liking for each other.”

F–05 and F–10, cited below, describe a number of factors that affect the functioning of a team:
It’s hard to get ruggedly individualistic people to function as a team, [and] the program has always had those kinds of people. It’s also difficult to function as a team when there are different understandings and expectations, when policies are only in people’s heads and are not written down. It’s hard to get higher-ed people to let go of their own arrogance and listen to participants and other faculty. It’s hard to have a team without adequate time for communication. We struggle! The April orientation felt like a team. We were speaking with “one voice” on a number of program aspects.

A team has to have goals to be effective. I think we have basic agreement on goals, but there [are] plenty of fine innuendoes. Trust is critical to team functioning. Trust rises and falls to the degree that faculty members function within agreed-upon program parameters. Also, when decisions are made by [the] dean or [the] chair apart from [the] faculty, there is a lessening of trust. But I think most of the time faculty members trust one another.

One rather consistent complaint by participants and an evidence of our lack of team is inconsistency in expectations. There is also a sense that some faculty play “favorites” and [that] less is required of their favorites. I don’t know if this is true or not, but if we were functioning as a “team,” participants would “feel/experience” expertise coming from all the faculty members—and I think this perception would fade. (F-05)

I do think the Leadership faculty functions as a team—but it is a team under pressure (sometimes enormous pressure) and so there are evidences of that pressure that explode at times very visibly and publicly on the surface. I prefer to interpret those tense times generously—as the faculty allowing itself to “release the pressure” in the safest environment . . . with their colleagues. Many programs as innovative and “up-stream-brave” as the Leadership program have never gotten this far or lasted this long. They just die a quick death or experience a slow fizzle from lack of team loyalty or program loyalty, and then the team dies as well.

Good teams change composition from time to time. Members come and go. But that doesn’t mean there is not a team. This program has required enormous professional energy (the workload on a daily basis) and enormous courage to believe in its purpose and mission even if it wasn’t acknowledged by the community of scholars. I’m amazed that there hasn’t been more burnout than has occurred.

And actually, there have been specific instances when the faculty addressed differences with one another so courageously that I was convinced even more clearly that they were a team. Those interactions weren’t pleasant and sometimes they didn’t even end up in agreement. But if they had not been a team, they never would even have faced their differences. They would have walked away from each other and simply said “I don’t care enough to go through that conversation.”

There is sometimes little opportunity for a faculty to “fight the steamroller” of bureaucracy and accreditation in higher education. So instead of grappling with the REAL issues and pressure-generators, they
end up transferring those pressures to internal relationships that they can actually see and feel on a daily basis. I think there has been a tendency for external (to the faculty) observers to see those direct and sensitive conversations as disagreement. But in the broader picture I see those conversations as necessary to moving the program forward in development. I see them as risk-taking, committed, and very difficult teamwork. (F–10)

Question 6: Do You Believe That All Faculty Members Operate in Ways That Are True to the Philosophy of the Leadership Program as It Is Described in Printed and Website Promotional Material? Why or Why Not?

Background

This question was intended to explore the validity of the teamwork that might or might not have been reported in Question 5. It is one thing to operate as a team and another to operate in that team in harmony with the core values that exemplify the program.

Analysis of Responses

All 11 of the 12 faculty and staff responded, but the responses are more representative of their understanding of the philosophy of the program than of an understanding of faculty cohesion based on that philosophy. This is certainly interesting in light of the fact that one of the aspects of the program is to support participant individuality. The sometimes lengthy responses to this question seem to represent faculty individuality.

F–01 asserted, “From my perspective, there have been changes in the operation and the philosophy of the program that have moved away from the original ideas that we had proposed and operated by.”

F–03 simply said, “I [did] not see any problems.” The remaining 9 respondents seemed to agree that faculty members, at least to some degree,
operate in ways that are true to Leadership’s philosophy. In speaking to
the issue, F–02 notes that “each person brings something to the Leadership
Program. . . . If the faculty is not reflecting the notes in the printed material,
it may be because it is easy to change vocabulary without changing thinking or
doing.”

F–07 concisely stated, “I believe faculty members operate on their own
interpretation of the philosophy of the program.” F–08 was the most positive in
responding to the issue: “Yes, I truly believe so. If this were not the case, the
program would dry up on the vine.”

Five respondents address the intentions of the faculty to adhere to the
philosophy of the Leadership Program. F–05, for example, stated, “We’re all
individuals, we have our own spin on everything. Printed materials help bring
us together, and so our program is hugely benefited by having a manual.” F–05
also believed that

some faculty members . . . refuse to commit to and follow all-agreed-upon
guidelines/policies. . . . Another part of this is a sense that the program
shouldn’t change. . . . To think that somehow we created a program 10
years ago that is perfect and shouldn’t be revisited/adapted is blatantly
ridiculous! And to “fear” that any change is reverting back to traditional
is also ridiculous.

F–06 believed, “We all want to operate in ways that are true to the
philosophy of the Leadership Program.” P–06 also suggested that “one way to
stay true to the philosophy of the program is to develop some kind of continuous
assessment (quality checks) to evaluate ourselves.” F–10 observed, “Are they
striving toward a common understanding of that philosophy and are they
committed to serving students well—I think so. Are mistakes made?
Absolutely.”
And F–11 described the ways in which Leadership’s philosophy actually may cause academic tension:

I think the desire is certainly there and all of the faculty would freely express their allegiance to the philosophy of the Leadership Program. If asked individually, they would freely state that they adhere to the non-hierarchical participant philosophy. However, there is a constant tension between this philosophy and upholding the academic integrity of the program. With this tension comes the inevitability of an unstated (or sometimes even stated) hierarchy in which faculty is said to possess academic knowledge which the participants do not. The faculty feels obligated to ensure that the program participants meet their criteria for achieving academic integrity, yet they must deal with the tension of knowing that the participants’ job expertise often exceeds the expertise of the faculty. Usually the faculty is able to acknowledge and encourage their advisees’ self-directed academic development very well. However, much of the faculty review seems subjective and varies among the different faculty. Faculty I.D.P. teams are intended to offer a system of checks and balances, but varying communication levels have at times resulted in mixed messages and confusion among the participants.

The comments of F–04 incorporated many of the comments of other respondents, and they also provide another perspective to the manual to which F–05 refers:

All faculty members have never operated entirely in ways that are true to the philosophy of the program. The philosophy of the program is an ideal, and there has been at least a desire on the part of the faculty to model the philosophy in behavior, but the degree to which that ideal has been realized varies. There appears to be a constant tension between the habitual traditions that are expected of faculty and the more progressive ideas that are implied by the philosophy of the program. For example, for the most part, all of the faculty appear to have accepted and practiced the idea that each participant (aka student) is an individual, adult learner who can and does create his or her own learning-reality. Flexibility is encouraged and lauded.

However, there are varying degrees of agreement about how directive a member of the faculty should be in advising/mentoring/coaching the learning-process. Another example is found in the use of the word “participant.” The philosophy of the program appears to espouse the idea that all of the members of the Leadership community are equal participants: everyone learning from everyone. If that is the case, then there is no difference in the learning between “faculty” and “student.” All learn together and at an individual level. Operating under that philosophy would mean that all participants are equal partners in the program, including in the decisions that are made. The faculty has
struggled with this idea, apparently preferring to become more and more like traditional faculty, creating policies to be followed and issuing rules to be followed without obtaining input from the “other half” of the equation.

A good example of the latter is the development of the handbook. A group of “students” volunteered at an annual Roundtable to produce a draft of such a handbook for review, which would have been a true partnership. The faculty, however, apparently believing that it had an oversight responsibility that included such an activity, took the draft, rewrote it, and published it without any further review of the whole community. This action caused dissension among both the faculty members and the rest of the “participants.” The dissension resulted in submission of the published draft for review by a “select” group of participants who recommended revisions, which were made. Basically, if the program is going to have a philosophy and claim that this philosophy is basic to its operation, then all members of the community must spend time reviewing the core values of the philosophy and making sure that not only the published materials but also the behaviors of the participants are presented in a manner that is consistent with that philosophy. The degree to which this has been done is problematic at best. (F–04)

**Question 7: What Criteria Do You Use to Know When a Participant Has Done Enough to Prove Competency?**

**Background**

This question was intended to investigate the application of one of Leadership’s primary principles, that of assessing successful completion through competency fulfillment. The question arose from hearing from several participants that the program was not for everyone—that some learners are more appropriate for the program than others.

**Analysis of Responses**

F–07 did not respond to the question. F–01 and F–03 indicated that they did not have enough information about the issue to address it. F–10 and F–11 were not involved in competency-fulfillment issues. Five respondents—F–02, F–05, F–06, F–08, and F–09—specifically referred to the need for a knowledge base. Each of them, however, added other criteria as proof of competency. Both
F-02 and F-05 listed experience and “eyewitness” accounts as well as “[benchmarks] against good practice” (F-02) and “verification from external people” (F-05). In addition to a knowledge base, F-06 first evaluates the integrity of projects outlined in I.D.P.s, then looks for adequate documentation of the projects as well as the integration of projects across competencies. F-06 also requires evidence of personal growth, the “‘aha’ lessons and change in the person and practice of the leader. Is there evidence of this? I am also interested in integration with other competencies.”

F-08 used a metaphor to answer the question:

I like to use an analogy to respond to this. I would want a commercial pilot to be able to fly at least a twin-engine turbo-prop or jet into a high-traffic area like O’Hare or JFK during the day or night to be able to deem him or her competent as a pilot (not necessarily a captain). Flying a Cessna into South Bend may not qualify one to be a commercial pilot. For the Leadership Program, my duty is to be able to make this distinction [by] using a combination of factors ranging from past experience, skills, dispositions, and, above all, the evidence of an appropriate knowledge-base for a particular competency. (F-08)

F-04 and F-09 described competency-fulfillment in this way:

If truth be told, I think I am probably biased toward what is more of a European tradition of doctoral studies. There, in times past at least, the candidate applies to a professor and attaches himself or herself to that professor for the duration. When the professor feels that the level of expertise (competence) has been achieved, the time is set for the defense. There is a dissertation, of course. In fact, virtually the entire study experience is built around the dissertation, and its successful defense signals the awarding of the doctoral degree. So, let me use that as a metaphor. Think of the I.D.P. as equivalent to a dissertation proposal, and the fulfillment of the competencies as the development of a portfolio of evidence of competence and the performance of the study toward the defense of competence. The presentation of the portfolio then is the equivalent of the presentation of a dissertation for approval and defense. That is the way that I see the program’s development for an individual participating toward the degree. Of course, in our program there is also the formal dissertation, but I see that as only a part of the larger presentation. But I still have not directly answered the question about criteria. It is this: When I feel that the candidate has achieved the level of competence required to represent the traditions of the degree and the
university, I am prepared to add my signature to that effect. It is very subjective, of course, but that is what it is. (F–04)

[The] process starts with the I.D.P. There have to be several—at least three—types of documentation, including evidence of knowledge base and reflection. In the portfolio evaluation, I look for the same multi-dimensional evidence. If the I.D.P. does not contain it I have a problem and I start probing during the oral part of the portfolio presentation. For my own advisees, I make sure that their portfolio matches the I.D.P. Occasionally, I inherit an advisee and problems with the I.D.P. Then I work on improving it before it gets to the presentation. My problem is often that people are trying [to do] too much. (F–09)

**Question 8: What Happens When a Participant Demonstrates That the Program Is Not a Good Fit for Him or Her, Either Because of Personality or Academic Issues? How Does the Faculty Deal With This Situation?**

**Background**

In program discussions, I often heard participants as well as faculty members and staff describe someone as not being suitable for the program. Because there existed no formal policy for determining whether or not a given individual fit the program, I included this question to formalize the issue as part of my study.

**Analysis of Responses**

F–03 did not respond to this question, and F–01 indicated that he or she did not have enough information to respond. The general theme of the 9 remaining responses was that there is no formal process to advise a participant to leave the program. With the support and assistance of the faculty, however, the recommendation has occurred. In the words of F–02, “This program is not good for everyone.” The following comments represent all responses.

I believe the faculty has dealt with this very well. The participant is in the driver’s seat, and respect is given to the individual. What is best for the participant is best for the program. Personal needs and responsibilities
change over time, and we respect the right of the person to make changes. A person writes an e-mail documenting their wish to inactivate or withdraw from the program. This comes to the faculty. I have never heard any criticism of someone who makes this change. (F–06)

We discuss it. If it’s one of my advisees, I discuss it with them and try to figure out what would be good for them, based on our discussion. I may or may not bring it to the faculty. (F–07)

Usually such a participant lags behind and eventually cries out in desperation. After the faculty encourages and offers extra support and the participant still demonstrates frustration, most times it is the participant who decides to opt out. Otherwise, the faculty may suggest an alternative program or, depending on the participant, the faculty may advise the participant to withdraw. The earlier this is done the better, because it could spare the participant valuable time and resources. (F–08)

I have counseled participants out of the program at the time of the orientation. . . . We rarely have such cases any more. I think we try to select [people who] fit the program. (F–09)

Question 9: Do You Believe That a Partnership Exists to the Extent That Faculty and Students Are All Equal Participants in the Leadership Program? Why or Why Not?

Background

One of the primary principles of Leadership is the philosophical position that all of the individuals involved—both faculty and students—are equal partners in the learning process. Although it is readily accepted that the members of each group have different roles and responsibilities, the learning process itself is viewed as a partnership—even reciprocal or symbiotic. This question addresses the degree to which the 12 full-time faculty and staff members interviewed understand, accept, and practice that concept.
Analysis of Responses

Of all the faculty-and-staff questions, this one seemed to elicit the strongest response. Recognizing that there are differences in role and function while accepting a sense of equality in learning opportunity and program direction seems to be the issue. F–03 took issue with the word “participant” but did not answer the question:

I strongly feel that the use of the term “participants” is not wise. It implies an experiential program that is filled with things such as workshops . . . [and] . . . is not appropriate for what Leadership is doing. It is more related to “informal” learning, which takes in things such as non-credit seminars for continuing education. (F–03)

There also appears to be a lack of common understanding of the principle, as is evidenced by the variance in the responses. Because this was such a hot topic among the participants interviewed, I have included at least an excerpt from all responses.

I believe this is true in the cohorts that F–04 works with, but I do not believe it is true in the other cohorts. And, yes, I have heard a few comments about this from people who are in the program. (F–01)

There are some relationships that are very good and work as learning-partnerships. There are others that, [because of the] style of both the faculty-participants and the student-participants, they work out a different relationship—perhaps a mentor, perhaps a guide or a director. If this works for both, then that is fine. However, there is always the temptation to “ownership,” which is the death knell in this program and very dangerous in any other one as well. (F–02)

No. This is an ideal that the founders felt strongly about, but as time has passed, the reality of that partnership has become dimmer and dimmer to a point where the faculty should perhaps either terminate the use of “participant” or re-evaluate the philosophy behind it. Technically, there is a differential role between faculty and “student.” But that difference is not in the learning or the knowing or in the amount of knowledge or in the excellence of skill. Many of the so-called participants (aka “students”) have more experience and knowledge in a given area than any member of the faculty. That being the case, it would be facetious to imagine that the faculty has some sort of “higher status.” We are all truly in the community together as equal learners.
But there is a “faculty” role that is not shared by the participants who would classically be called "students." That role is a perfunctory role of observation and recording in accordance with a systematic evaluation process that is required by the institution to give credibility to the program. It is the role that any person would expect from a faculty member of a credible (aka accredited) university program. However, that role has little if anything to do with the learning, the decisions about quality controls, and the processes of accountability. Ideally, the entire community can participate equally in the determination of the details of how the program is administered and managed. For reasons that are not entirely clear, there has been a drift from the “What do you think?” philosophy that exemplified the faculty in the beginning, to a “You [must] do it this way if you want to graduate” philosophy that now seems to be more common. (F–04)

We are all working toward common goals, [the] broad goals of delivering a non-traditional program and [the] individual goals of graduating. In many cases, participants have more expertise on a competency than faculty. They are unequal. In other cases faculty have more expertise. They are unequal. Faculty is ultimately responsible to the university for quality issues. That maybe makes us unequal. I think different faculty has different notions of what is equal and what is not. This is not a threat to the program as long as one faculty or participant refuses to undermine another faculty or participant. Stories of duplicitous behavior are too common. This undermines the quality of the program. There is a biblical model for bringing all voices into resolution of a conflict/difference, and we could get much better at this! (F–05)

I have thought about this a lot. What I wish we would do is to set a few non-negotiables and then leave everything else to individual preference. I think if we would clarify these, there would be less hurt and disappointment among participants. This may be one area where there have been a lot of misunderstandings. I would also like to set up a process for including participants in decision-making as discussed in [question] number 5 above. (F–06)

I think we try to be equal but I’m not sure it is. I’m also not sure that it is reality to expect it with all students. (F–07)

I tend to believe this to be the case. But it may mean different things to different people, depending on how one defines “equal participants.” In my view, the Leadership Program consists of a community of scholars where faculty may have a slight advantage in that they may have some more experience in programmatic matters and could facilitate the advance of the participant in the program. However, participant input into the process must be valued since they see things from a different perspective. A healthy balance exists when feedback from participants is taken seriously for making adjustments in the program. Fortunately, this is given more than lip service in the Leadership Program. So, yes, the
program could not make the kind of progress seen over the years without treating participants as equal partners. Is there room for improvement? You bet. (F–08)

In some respects, yes; in other respects, no. When we work with participants who are sharing their expertise and competencies, I feel we are truly equal. When I have to hold the line on some issues or send participants back to the drawing-table because the regional group has not done its job to work together till the portfolio is presentable or [because] an individual fails to bring to the table acceptable work, I realize that I have power that the participant does not have. (F–09)

Well . . . I have never seen the “equality” standard of participants/faculty in the Leadership as meaning “same roles” or “same authority” or “same responsibility.” I have seen many instances of equality in learning-environments. . . . All members bring ideas and content and examples to the table for the learning benefit of everyone. And I have seen that equality goes even as far as to debate which theoretical perspectives are more valid or believable. But as long as judgments must be made for awarding of degrees and as long as the faculty is employed by the university to be the determiners of those judgments, there must be a deferral of bottom-line decisions if disagreement exists. I don’t see that as unequal. I see it as fair and appropriate—especially if it is acknowledged at the outset of the program.

Now—some roles are not deferrable. All participates should be shown respect and interest and participation and contribution. Choice and program design is an innovative and justifiable shared role in the program. But evaluation can be shared only to a limit; it’s not a matter of a popular (majority) vote. (F–10)

Participants are seen to be major contributors, but faculty have expressed that they are not equal until they graduate. They are discouraged from presenting in orientations and serving on portfolio presentation teams until they graduate.

There is a constant tension between the participant philosophy and upholding the academic integrity of the program. With this tension comes the inevitability of an unstated (or sometimes even stated) hierarchy in which faculty is said to possess academic knowledge which the participants do not. The faculty feels obligated to ensure that the program participants meet their criteria for achieving academic integrity, yet they must deal with the tension of knowing that the participants’ job expertise usually exceeds the expertise of the faculty. (F–11)
Question 10: If You Could Ask the Participants
One Question, What Would It Be?

Background

Because I asked the participants to identify one or more questions that they would ask the faculty if they had the opportunity, I also asked the faculty what questions they might ask the participants. The responses revealed a consistency with the characteristics that the faculty expressed in response to most of the questions. But perhaps more interesting, they reflected many of the issues that I had explored with the participants.

Analysis of Responses

F–03 and F–10 did not respond to this question. The remaining 9 respondents, however, posed questions for the participants. And as often happens, some posed more than one question, providing additional insight into faculty concerns.

What changes have you made as a result of joining the program? And is it worth it? (F–01)

I presume this is in reference to faculty issues. The question might have to do with the development of a strong supportive faculty “mentor group”—at Andrews, in their work place, etc.—that would help them through the process. I don’t think this early concept has really developed. (F–02)

What perceptions did you have about the program in the beginning that turned out not to be true? (F–04)

What do the faculty do that facilitates dependence on them as experts? What cultural life experiences, etc., have facilitated your willingness to function in a “dependent” state in your relationship to faculty and other participants? Are there some situations where it’s appropriate to be dependent and others when it is not appropriate? (F–05)

Is your advisor fulfilling the role of facilitator? What can we do to facilitate your leadership development? (F–06)

Is this a program that is helping you to grow as a whole person? (F–07)
Are you satisfied with how leadership is operationalized in the Andrews University Leadership program? Defend your position. (F–08)

I am interested in two aspects: (1) How does the Leadership Program actually help you become the person you want to be? (2) If you could change one thing about the program what would it be?

[Of the] graduates I would like to ask, How would your colleagues describe the changes in the way you work as a leader in your work environment? In other words, what is the actual change-impact of the Leadership Program on the attitudes and skills displayed by participants? (F–09)

How has this program transformed you and your concept of leadership? (F–11)

Summary and Conclusions

It is striking, although not surprising, that the elements that attracted participants to the Leadership Program—also attracted faculty and staff members. Individualized instruction. Collaboration. One-on-one interaction. Competency-based instead of course-driven. The quality of the faculty members. The elements that F–08 calls “a forward-looking approach” appealed to all of them.

Regarding other questions about their experience in the Leadership Program, the views of faculty and staff are as widely divergent as participants’ opinions. (I focus here on the negatives, because they are the elements that need to be improved or resolved.) For most faculty and staff members, expectations were not met. Faculty changes, not feeling like part of a team, disappointment with the way in which the philosophy of the program is supported—either because of a trend toward standardization or the need for more standardization—contribute to the unease. What might happen if participants, faculty, and staff took part in regular, open, no-holds-barred discussions about
program concerns and about concerns that they had heard other individuals express? What creative energy might be unleashed if the program were a collaborative one in which participants had an equal voice if not equal authority?
CHAPTER 12

FACULTY AND STAFF INTERVIEWS, PART 2:
PROGRAM DESIGN AND DELIVERY, AND
COMMUNICATION

Introduction

This chapter contains the analysis of faculty and staff responses to questions about the Leadership Program. The purpose of the questions was to discover from the founding and continuing faculty the details of their perception of Leadership’s philosophy, its conceptual design, and its process—from 1994, the year of the program’s inception, through 2002, the time of the interviews. In many respects, the faculty members were as inexperienced with implementing the design as were the participants enrolled in the program. Asking and analyzing the responses to the questions, I hoped, would provide additional insight into this study of the Leadership Program at Andrews University.

All 11 former and current full-time faculty members and staff were asked to respond to questions 11 through 20.

Program Design and Delivery

The six questions analyzed in this section are as follows:

Question 11. How is the process for selecting participants different from what it was when the program was first created?
Question 12. How do you keep continuity in the program and within the faculty when the faculty changes?

Question 13. What program changes have occurred since you joined the Leadership faculty? Why were these changes made? How have these changes affected the program?

Question 14. Briefly describe the portfolio process, from I.D.P. to portfolio presentation.

Question 15. Are the Roundtables valuable experiences for you? Would you like to see changes made in their content? If so, what changes would you propose?

Question 16. Do you believe that the orientations adequately provide participants with a thorough understanding of the Leadership philosophy? Do the orientations equip participants with what they need for completing the program? Why or why not?

**Question 11: How Is the Process for Selecting Participants Different From What It Was When the Program Was First Created?**

**Background**

This question asks 12 full-time faculty and staff members to describe changes made in the participant-selection process during the course of their tenure with Leadership. My purpose in asking this question was to explore with the faculty whether or not such changes had occurred and if so, why or why not. I neglected to ask for the reasons for any change, though. As a result, the responses were incomplete and could not be analyzed to any significant degree.
Analysis of Responses

F–03 did not respond to this question. F–01 was there in the beginning, but was no longer present so was unable to make a comparison. Three respondents indicated that they could not answer the question, because they did not know—usually because they were not there at the beginning so had no basis upon which to compare. Of the remaining six responses, F–04 did not perceive that there had been a change, F–05 also indicated that there had been no change other than that over time, there has been “a bigger pool to choose from,” and that made it possible to “be more selective. F–06 indicated that he or she had not been there in the beginning, but that since joining the faculty, the process “has been consistent. Both F–07 and F–08 described the current process but admitted that they had not been present at the beginning, so weren’t able to make a comparison. Finally F–11 reported that compared to the beginning, faculty had become “more selective and look more for characteristics indicating self-directedness.”

**Question 12: How Do You Keep Continuity in the Program and Within the Faculty When the Faculty Changes?**

**Background**

In order for Leadership to maintain continuity through changes in faculty, a way to ensure the continuity of the program’s core values without losing the essence of the program’s philosophy of tolerance for ambiguity must be in place. Each respondent provided insight into how this has been done or should be done.
Analysis of Responses

F–03 did not respond to this question, and F–01 indicated that he or she did not have enough knowledge to respond. The remaining eight respondents, however, provided insightful comments.

F–02 suggested that the participants who complete the program become part of the program. F–04 and F–08 recommend that new faculty “[participate] fully in one or more orientation sessions” (F–04). F–08 asserts,

In order to become an effective Leadership faculty member, one has to go through the orientation process. There is no exception on this matter. One cannot function effectively in the Leadership Program without knowing the ropes, so to speak. And it takes a while to really understand the paradigm shifts needed for one to buy into the Leadership philosophy. The chair of the department always seeks out opportunities to bring more faculty in the school of education (and other schools at Andrews) on board by exposing them to the orientation. This provides a potential pool to draw from in the event of faculty decisions to relocate. Another strategy is to invite faculty who decide to leave the university to serve in some capacity in the future, so that a total void is not created.

F–04, F–05, and F–07 also recommend continuing to have conversations with new faculty, what F–11 calls “open communication.” The following statement from F–09 corroborates the value of such conversations:

As a new full time faculty member, I have been asking a lot of questions about how my colleagues handle I.D.P., portfolio, [and] regional-group issues. This has led to many discussions about practice and the principles behind the practices. I am impressed with the fact that the faculty team is quite able and willing to take these discussions seriously. Jim has also brought historical perspectives back to the table to make sure we do not betray program principles in an effort to become efficient. The Wheatley principle—a few good rules and otherwise freedom—is becoming more important in my own mind. But it took me a while to realize what the actual principles were that the team felt is central.

F–10 asserts that the way to ensure continuity is

the same as with any program anywhere. Clear policies and procedures continually reviewed and revised in dialogue and discussion among the faculty. In higher education, programs dare not be person-dependent—people are too changeable. The program must be defined within itself
(curriculum and pedagogy) and then the human beings entrusted with that program have to do a lot of talking in order to administer it. F–06 states that “the handbook helps in that it gives guidance on the processes and procedures that apply to all participants. I think we [also] should set up a mentoring plan as the faculty expands.”

**Question 13: What Program Changes Have Occurred Since You Joined the Leadership Faculty? Why Were These Changes Made? How Have These Changes Affected the Program?**

**Background**

This question was intended to discover whether or not the 12 full-time faculty and staff members interviewed perceived changes to have occurred in Leadership during their tenure with the program.

**Analysis of Responses**

F–03 and F–10 did not respond to this question. The remaining 9 respondents covered a range of issues, however. In F–01’s words, “it seems . . . that the program has become more prescriptive. I think that there is less flexibility and creativity in the program now.” F–07 observes, “The program has become more structured. Most changes were made as the result of problems. The changes were seen as a way to solve problems or concerns. I’m not sure, however. People (both participants and faculty) are not as relaxed.”

It is noteworthy that whereas some respondents regard the changes to be solutions to problems caused by ill-defined practices, other respondents consider increased structure as an impediment to the “freedom and . . . sense of adventure and exploration” (F–04) that ambiguity allows.
Three required courses. The concepts were required in the beginning in individualized-study-type stuff for teaching and research.

Why were these changes made? Several reasons. Participants struggled completing these requirements (some still have 12 credits of DGs). This represents the orientation and an independent study in teaching/learning and research. We had participants ready to graduate—defending dissertations—with limited or no knowledge base in philosophical issues and leadership theories. I think this is an effort at adding credibility to the program but it could have been accomplished just as easily by defining competency. But if the faculty is unable or unwilling to define competency, then it’s better to have courses than to have incompetent people!!

How have these changes affected the program? They have resulted in graduates who at least have a basic knowledge in these important areas, but [they] could represent a gradual move to having the same for other competencies if we continue to refuse to define competency in a way that is understood by all. My preference would be to define competency and not have any required courses. (F–05)

There has been some confusion about portfolio presentation whether it comes before or after dissertation and what is included in a synthesis paper. This has caused confusion and disappointment. For the new people, it isn’t a problem but for those who have been in the program, it has been difficult. I only know one way to deal with it—one participant at a time. What was their understanding? How can we fulfill the requirements of the degree and protect their understanding. These courses take the place of what used to be e-mail discussion. (F–06)

F–08 lists the following changes, which “have contributed to a more refined and user-friendly program”:

1. Provision is made for orientations and Roundtables to be conducted in sites other than Andrews University.
2. One-week orientations seem to be working just as effectively as two-week orientations.
3. An M.A. program is now being offered, with recent initiatives for an Ed.S. degree in the near future.
4. A handbook serves to bring more uniformity and predictability to the program.
5. There are more required courses. They are all offered online on WebCT. These courses take the place of what used to be e-mail discussion.
6. The leadership and educational administration (LEAD) department was formed and formally recognized by the school of education, thereby addressing efficiency matters.
7. The program management has become more automated. (Thanks to Carol and David Heise for innovations to make the logistics more bearable.) (F–08)
F–09 explains,

Many of the changes have evolved from practical necessity and are counter-balanced by a relative great freedom of the advisor to apply a possible policy or not. There is a certain routinization that has taken place. . . . For a while, there may have been a tendency to make a rule for every problem. But the faculty has resisted this trend and even reversed some decisions we made earlier to make the advisor/participant relationship primary, backed by the faculty council if necessary.

F–09’s list of changes has very little overlap with F–08’s:

1. The I.D.P. has to be finished by the end of the semester following the orientation.
2. The required experience of LEAD-638 (Issues in Leadership Theory).
3. We have a handbook now.
4. There seems to be more structure in the regional-group process and in the expectations.
5. We have a workload analysis every year.
6. The payment schedule is now on an actual registration and pay-for-credit basis. This has had a huge impact on how the program is financed.
7. Department faculty is now full-time and contributes to the SED, rather than on a percentage basis while working for other programs. This has brought more consistency in advising.
8. We have more consistent review practices.
9. The move to regional Roundtables.
10. The use of regional-group catalysts.
11. The use of graduates in the program.
12. The number of people graduating has become more visible.
13. The new DG policy. You can be put on probation if you have more than five DGs.

F–11 focused on the changes in the role of I.D.P.:

The portfolio presentation used to be a celebration of the participant’s achievement of demonstrating all 20 competencies at the conclusion of the program, which included a written reflection that served as a “bookend” for the written narrative of the I.D.P., written at the beginning of the program. Other programs challenged the Leadership Program, saying that it has no comprehensive examination. To appease those who challenged whether the program truly had a comprehensive examination, the portfolio presentation evolved into a “defense,” which includes a question/answer oral component, a “take-home” component (the portfolio), and a written component (the synthesis paper). The synthesis paper is now an academic paper due two weeks before the portfolio presentation, and [it] includes references.
Question 14: Briefly Describe the Portfolio Process, From I.D.P. to Portfolio Presentation

Background

In the preceding question, F–06 and F–11 note that the portfolio process is sometimes a source of confusion for Leadership faculty, staff, and participants. The following responses provide additional evidence that the portfolio process remained unclear in 2002, at the time of the interviews.

Analysis of Responses

As with the previous question, F–03 and F–10 neglected to respond. F–01, who had “been away from the . . . process for too long,” stated, “I certainly know how we intended it but don’t know how it’s being implemented now.” And F–07’s response seemed to reflect an element of frustration: “Since the process keeps changing, it is hard to describe—frankly, I’m not sure where we are now.” The remaining 7 respondents provided descriptions of step-by-step details about the portfolio process. Because this has been a point of contention for participants and a source of confusion for faculty, I have included all 7 responses for the purpose of comparison.

For F–04,

the I.D.P. is a vision, an action plan and an agreement that provides an individualize program for each participant. It is the basis upon which the mentors, other participants, and the university can support the efforts of the participant. It is also the benchmark for final evaluation-success. The I.D.P. sets out the journey; the portfolio presentation marks a celebration at this stage of the journey. The I.D.P. says, this is who I would like to become; the [portfolio] presentation says this is who I have become. [The process is as follows:]

1. The participant works with his or her advisor to prepare the I.D.P.

2. The participant also works with his or her regional group in the preparation of the I.D.P.
3. The regional group signs off on the I.D.P.
4. The advisor signs off on the I.D.P.
5. The other faculty member of the participant’s I.D.P. team signs off on the I.D.P.
6. The participant carries out the I.D.P. and prepares a comprehensive portfolio demonstrating competence.
7. Either one at a time or all together, the competencies are signed off by the participant’s regional group.
8. Either one at a time or all together, the competencies are signed off by the participant’s advisor.
9. Either one at a time or all together, the competencies are signed off by the other faculty member of the participant’s I.D.P. team.
10. The participant and his or her advisor set the date for the portfolio presentation.
11. A third member of the participant’s faculty team is selected to participate in the final evaluation.
12. The portfolio is presented, and the three-person faculty team evaluates the competence of the participant.

The above-listed process is independent of either the dissertation process (unless the dissertation is part of the I.D.P./Portfolio) or the final “celebration.”  

I.D.P.-writing basically defines the “course of study”—how participants will develop and demonstrate their competency in all 20 areas. The vision [statement] gives a broad sense of direction to the participants. As time progresses, participants gather artifacts from the various experiences.

When they have the competencies signed off by their regional group and advisor and another faculty member, they present their portfolio in either a closed or open session. If they have used their dissertation as part of their research competency, the portfolio presentation takes on a celebration aspect. The synthesis paper can be part of the final presentation and the candidate is done! Or they could do their portfolio—all 20 competencies—then dissertation, then synthesis and celebration.  

Start the portfolio from Day One. Artifacts are collected—original documents, evaluation of others, reflections including connection of theory and practice should be gathered from the very beginning. Along the way, the competencies are reviewed by the regional group and dialogue can take place with the advisor regarding competency and artifacts. The competency is then presented to the advisor for approval and sign-off. There may be some “finishing touches” that need to be done. For the Ph.D., there are three members of the program team. Member 3 is more like an external examiner in that he/she does not have to go carefully through the portfolio in great detail as the other two program team members do. A readiness for portfolio presentation is agreed upon and a date is set for the presentation. A synthesis paper is given to the program team about two weeks before the presentation. The participant can decide whether it is an open or closed session. The
The participant is encouraged to use creativity about “how” the portfolio is presented. (F–06)

The I.D.P. represents the participant’s blueprint for his [or] her program. The participant works closely with his [or] her advisor and regional group in formulating the I.D.P. It is not set in stone and is often refined along the way. It is viewed more as a work in progress. Whenever a major change is to be made to the I.D.P., it must be ratified through an appropriate petition. For example, a change of job may necessitate new activities, and this should be reflected in the I.D.P.

As the participant works on the various projects to address the competencies, the participant seeks feedback from the regional group [the members of which] will eventually sign off on a particular competency. The participant then presents the competency to his [or] her advisor for sign off. Sometimes the advisor seeks additional information before signing off on the competency.

After all 20 competencies have been signed off by the regional group, advisor, and second reader, the participant then prepares to present his [or] her portfolio as the equivalent of the comprehensive examination. A synthesis paper is prepared representing a summary of the competencies in the context of how the participant has grown over the lifetime of the Leadership program. This synthesis paper is sent to the advisor and two other readers at least two weeks prior to the portfolio presentation.

In some cases, a participant may choose to present his [or] her portfolio before defending the dissertation. This option is allowed as long as the participant could demonstrate that he [or] she has had research experience of a level of sophistication akin to the dissertation. The burden of proof usually rests with the participant and [is] ratified by advisor and other faculty readers. In this case, the synthesis paper will not include the dissertation material. After the dissertation defense such participants would have to bring closure to the Leadership experience by summarizing the synthesis paper, this time including the dissertation growth experience.

For Leadership participants who entered the program before these options were nailed down, the portfolio could be presented without the research competency and after the dissertation was completed, a celebration presentation was held when the participant would present the synthesis paper that included the dissertation growth process. It should be noted that the participants who fall in the latter two categories happen to be in the overwhelming minority. (F–08)

The I.D.P. describes how the competencies will be demonstrated in the portfolio. The portfolio is developed by the participant and presented and signed by the regional group. In the process, faculty members and the advisor are also involved along the way to review the emerging portfolio. Once the regional group and the advisor have signed off on all competencies, the portfolio can be presented in a formal way. I do not
allow my advisees to schedule a presentation if I have not reviewed the portfolio completely. (F–09)

1. The I.D.P., the blueprint of the program, has a narrative vision statement, which includes the participant’s core values and goals towards enhancing his or her leadership skills. The I.D.P. has a plan of action to document the competencies with applied theory as well as a list of credits to translate the documentation into a transcript.

2. Once the I.D.P. is approved, the participant works on gathering documentation and a knowledge base to meet the competencies, ever mindful that the documentation must be job-embedded and show how one grows and develops servant-leadership.

3. The participant offers a portfolio presentation at the conclusion of his or her program to celebrate the achievement of meeting all 20 competencies and sharing how the Leadership Program has transformed him or her. (F–11)


Background

Roundtables are the annual conferences where all active participants gather—along with graduates and prospective participants—to share their experiences of the past year and to encourage one another. Roundtables also have been a venue for participants to conduct workshops and seminars in their areas of expertise. More recently, Roundtables have hosted well-known speakers and published authors on the broad topic of leadership.

Analysis of Responses

F–10 did not respond to this question, and F–01 responded from the perspective of a faculty member who no longer was fully involved in the program by saying, “I know what we intended . . . and tried to do but don’t know if that is continuing.” F–09 had “an ambiguous attitude to Roundtables” because “some experiences have been great, but some have been a flop.” F–09’s
comment, “I like the trend towards more participant involvement,” is curious because, at Leadership’s inception, participant involvement was a stated component of the Roundtables. F–08 also referred to participant involvement in “recent times,” explaining that “more emphasis is being placed on breakout sessions on significant topics hosted mainly by participants—as is to be expected, [because] the faculty does not intend to dominate the scene.”

F–02 enjoys the Roundtables because the combination of the international flavor, the speakers, and the opportunity for participants to share their experiences gives the meetings an element of fun as well as an element of professionalism. F–06 “loves” Roundtables: “There is something thrilling when the music starts and all those outstanding people find their places.”

F–06 also indicates, “We need to review the purpose of RT and make sure we are achieving its purpose,” implying that not enough time is dedicated to meeting with advisees. F–11 agrees:

The Roundtables are valuable in helping people in the program reconnect. People are eager for the Roundtable to address more practical aspects of the program and to allow for more advisor time. I think the time is right for there to be mini-Roundtables to address the above concerns. However, the logistics of coordinating several Roundtables can be rather daunting.

F–05 and F–07 suggest more time for program-related goals, such as program basics, I.D.P. development, dissertation writing, and competency sign-off. As did F–11, F–04 brings up the issue of regional Roundtables, a practice that would make them “more manageable in size and contact” and a way in which regional groups would “have more play in the Roundtable planning and operation.” And F–03, the final respondent, suggests that the Leadership Program offer more on-campus experiences than the annual Roundtable:
From the beginning I have felt that the Roundtables have not been handled as well as they could. From my experience in [another] adult degree-program, I have felt that the Leadership Program should require a two-to-four-week on-campus experience each year in which substantive learning occurs. I think ideally this would be one to two weeks twice a year. During this time you could have the normal Roundtable experience plus weeklong seminars/classes/experiences that were specifically related to competencies. Students could prepare for these experiences in advance and have a wonderful time dealing with common issues in an extended time-period. Perhaps one competency in the morning and one competency in the afternoon for the week. With one-week periods twice a year you could deal with four competencies a year. You could bring in world-class guest lecturers in the competency area and have extended discussions/activities related to it. (F–03)

**Question 16: Do You Believe That the Orientations Adequately Provide Participants With a Thorough Understanding of the Leadership Philosophy? Do the Orientations Equip Participants With What They Need for Completing the Program? Why or Why Not?**

**Background**

The initial orientation, in 1994, was a two-week-long experience. Participants spent intensive days learning about themselves as well as about the learning theories behind the program, about conducting and reporting research, and about how to achieve personal, professional, and academic goals while earning a life-related, job-embedded doctorate. Later orientations took place over a shorter period of time, as little as a “short five days” (F–09)—although, it appears, the goal was the same: to launch an individualized course of completion for each participant.
Analysis of Responses

Again, F–10 failed to respond and F–01 stated that he or she had “no current knowledge of the situation.” The comments of the remaining 9 respondents again represent a variety of views.

Orientations are great. It is a chance to nudge our thinking beyond the comfortable. I think that our expectations vary as to what should be done. I like to think of it as a time to plant some new ideas. These may have to grow some before the ideas begin to grow. Perhaps having an I.D.P. by the end is too much too quickly. I would like to see the orientation be a discrete activity at the end of which one can opt out, think about it, and find the best fit for advisor, etc. Then a refresher might happen some time later where the I.D.P. is finalized. (F–02)

When I was in the program I thought that they were good. The only problem was that students expressed the need for more direction, and I agreed. (F–03)

The orientation seminar is, in my view, one of the most elemental and substantive elements of the program. It is at this session that the participants realize and come to grips with what the program is all about. The fast pace of the orientation and the reliance on the power of ambiguity must be maintained. There will be a temptation to allow more and more procedural issues to slip into the orientation. These issues are important but should be dealt with in the follow-up sessions at the regional-group level. It is not the purpose of the orientation to “equip participants with what they need for completing the program,” so the fact that they don’t do that is part of the plan. However, there does need to be a better follow through from the orientation. (F–04)

Orientations in isolation from faculty advisees do none of the above [address these specific questions]. They aren’t expected to do what is suggested. The purpose is to “orient” people to each other, to faculty, [and] to processes. [Their purpose also is] to inspire and challenge. We do that well! (F–05)

Orientation is unbelievable. It changes people. It opens up new ways of thinking and inspires people to take charge of their leadership development. Do the orientations equip participants with what they need for completing the program? Why or why not? I am not sure about this. We are doing the “opening of the mind” in one week, but we need some follow-up sessions to deal with the processes of the program. I believe LeadEast did this very well with the regional group catalysts. We have a new model that we should follow for the future. (F–06)
No [to both questions.] I think participants get an introduction to many things during the event, but the complete understanding comes later. (F–07)

I believe that a fair attempt is made to accomplish this. I have seen many variations of the orientation process, and I have come away convinced that participants do undergo significant metamorphosis during the period. I know that the Leadership philosophy is presented well at orientation, but it is assimilated to varying degrees by participants, depending on their prior knowledge and experience.

The orientation equips participants with what they need for completing their I.D.P.s. This is intentional, because we could not pile on all that they need for completing the program in such a short time. They will pick up the majority of the process along the way. If we try to do too much too soon, participants become overwhelmed and may be inclined to drop out. (F–8)

I . . . coordinated an orientation. I enjoyed it and feel that we were able to get the philosophy across to participants. How thorough? I don't know. As much as they could take in the short five days. It will be reinforced by advisors and regional groups. I feel, however, that the actual understanding of the philosophy is dependent on experiencing the principles and processes of I.D.P., regional groups, and portfolio development in ways that reinforce these principles. (F–09)

I think that over time the faculty have improved in providing a glimpse of the Leadership philosophy, but true understanding of the philosophy comes with the self-transformation experience over time, which the program is intended to facilitate. The orientations by their nature cannot alone equip participants with what they need to complete the program. In fact, participants are often frustrated in learning to deal with a tolerance for ambiguity—a new concept for many. Participants need to develop relationships with their advisors early in the program so that advisors can encourage their participants to look for the “light to come on.” (F–11)

**Communication**

The six questions analyzed in this section are as follows:

Question 17. How are changes in policy and other pertinent news communicated to the participants? Is the current method effective? Are there ways to improve this communication?
Question 18. What effect does the use of technology have on communication? For example, has the use of technology led to deeper discussion? Why or why not?

Question 19. Do you read the minutes of regional-group meetings? Why or why not?

Question 20. Do you respond to faculty discussion questions? Why or why not?

**Question 17: How Are Changes in Policy and Other Pertinent News Communicated to the Participants? Is the Current Method Effective? Are There Ways to Improve This Communication?**

**Background**

This question was posed in response to comments made in participant interviews. Some participants expressed concern that they had little input regarding program changes. In addition, participants noted that when program decisions were made, the reasons for the decisions were not provided.

**Analysis of Responses**

Four interviewees—F–01, F–02, F–03, and F–10—either did not respond to this question or stated that they lacked enough information to respond effectively. The remaining seven that follow may reflect the years of the respondent’s tenure in Leadership.

These are difficult questions. I think that the first question is asking either how it should be or how it has been that has worked, while that question also seems to request information about how it is being done currently, whether it is effective or not. In my view, the most effective communication of important program information was (and still is to a lesser extent) via the “leadall” listserv, with permanent information being maintained at the website, and with really important material even being mailed periodically via U.S. Mail (surface). The abuse of the leadall
list made it necessary (in the opinion of the faculty) to limit access of that list and to create a discussion list called “leadtalk.” I believe that important communication began to suffer first by the abuse of leadall and then by the limitation of that list. Leadtalk has never worked well. There have been two attempts at a newsletter. At the beginning of the program, back in 1994, a newsletter, called “The Fractal” was used for a few months, but it soon became apparent that the time that it took to accumulate the material and get it to the participants was not effective, so it was discontinued. Now an on-line newsletter is being attempted . . . and after two issues, the timeline has already begun to lag. When I asked one regional group what they thought of the current newsletter, there was an immediate and unanimous response that it was just one more thing to delete. So, I don’t think we have yet figured out how to improve on the leadall/website posting mechanism of communication. Probably we could use a more effective method of passing important information through advisors to advisees and through the newly appointed regional-group coordinator to regional groups, but we have not yet put such a system in place. (F–04)

We’re using the newsletter to try to do some of the communication. [I’m] not sure what we used before that—probably leadall. Carol [the program manager] communicates a lot of stuff. Time will tell how effective the newsletter is. There are always ways that could improve communication. I doubt if it is possible to over-communicate! (F–05)

E-mail is the major way, but I think some of the e-mail is deleted without being read. Availability is most important. We need to have evaluations by the participants regarding advisor availability, etc. I am glad to have this question, because I think I need to just start it by having an assessment from my own advisees. (F–06)

Changes are put in the handbook. (F–07)

Yes, participants are all connected to leadall, the listserv that reaches every active participant. There are other means as well, such as WebCT and private e-mail. (F–08)

I think we are struggling with this question. (F–09)

Pertinent information was passed on by the advisors, the handbook, and by e-mails to the leadall listserv. Recently the staff has been discouraged from “inundating” participants with e-mail and instead are advised to communicate through an on-line newsletter as one source of information. However, the newsletter has not yet been available at regular and consistent times—this may change later. (F–11)
Question 18: What Effect Does the Use of Technology Have on Communication? For Example, Has the Use of Technology Led to Deeper Discussion? Why or Why Not?

Background

Technology is one of the competencies that are to be addressed in each participant’s I.D.P. In 1994, e-mail was in its infancy with regard to popular use. Those of us in that cohort were led to the technology lab to sign up for this relatively new form of communication. By 2002, e-mail had become the primary means of communication between faculty/staff and participants, courses were conducted electronically, and several participants had posted portfolios online rather than present them in “real” form. I certainly would not have been able to conduct such a comprehensive study without the convenience that cyber-communication provides.

Analysis of Responses

F–01, F–03, and F–10 either did not respond to this question or stated that they lacked the knowledge to respond. F–01 did make this statement, however: “I would hope that this would happen, but I have no way of determining whether it has.” The remaining 8 respondents express sometimes opposing opinions on this subject; note the responses of F–02, F–06, and F–08, for example, as well as the responses of F–05 and F–11.

I like the e-mail correspondence I have had with my advisees. But that is not a complete substitute for face-to-face. (F–02)

I guess that depends on two things: the facility of the participant with the technology and the willingness of the participant to expose himself or herself in that way online. For me, however, the technology has been the lifeline of the program, and represents the most important form of communication that we have with and among advisees. (F–04)
Deeper discussions in classes. Definitely. Every student who has taken an online class will agree! (F–05)

Research indicates that we still need face-to-face contacts with online communication. E-mail is critical to communication in our program. The key is prompt response. It is overwhelming sometimes, because there is so much e-mail. But we must try to have a reasonable turnaround time with participants. (F–06)

I don’t think so. People use e-mail for some discussion but also for jokes, etc. (F–07)

The use of technology is central to the Leadership program. To not use technology is like trying to take a bath without water. We know that face-to-face discussion is ideal for any learning environment, but the Leadership program is based on the fact that participants operate from their job locations (which sometimes demands that they travel around). Technology makes location a non-issue, thereby leveling the learning-field. To make a commentary on the depth of the discussion may not be appropriate because there is no viable solution to this matter. Participants must use technology to communicate with each other and with faculty and the program manager(s). (F–08)

Sometimes yes. Often not. People seem to suffer overload, so there is a lot of back and forth without necessarily having deep discussions. It seems that when the group was smaller, it worked better—possibly because people realized that they were interacting with people they knew personally. Now there is such a large group that few participate in these discussions. (F–09)

Some faculty have reported that WebCT courses have provided forums for very involved discussion that is forever recorded. However, some participants maintain that they are not comfortable with on-line courses and have much better interaction face-to-face. These participants have expressed a wish that the face-to-face option was more available. (F–11)

**Question 19: Do You Read the Minutes of Regional-Group Meetings? Why or Why Not?**

**Background**

As part of the social-learning component of the Leadership philosophy, participants are required to meet at least quarterly in their regional groups. One
member of the group—members usually rotate the task—submits minutes of each meeting, via e-mail, to other participants and faculty.

Analysis of Responses

F–01, F–02, and F–10 either did not receive the minutes, did not read them, or did not respond. F–04 reported, “I used to read them all and even felt compelled to respond to some of the issues that were being raised. But now there are just too many of them, so, while I occasionally review the minutes, I virtually never respond either formally or informally.” The remaining 6 respondents provided qualified yeses, as follows:

Yes. I want to know what’s happening and what issues are emerging. (F–05)

I sure do read them. I don’t respond to them much anymore, but I really like finding new books to read, devotionals, and exchange on competencies. If someone has a question about the program, I try to reply directly to an individual. (F–06)

Yes. I like to know what’s going on in the regional groups. (F–07)

Yes, I make it a point of duty to read all the minutes from all the regional-group meetings because this is the means by which I keep informed of what transpires in the groups. It’s that plain and simple. (F–08)

This first year I have read mainly those from groups where my advisees participate. I sampled the other ones. Can’t keep up with everything. (F–09)

Yes. Sometimes in depth; other times I at least glance at them. I think faculty should be more conscientious about sending feedback to regional groups. (F–11)
Question 20: Do You Respond to Faculty Discussion Questions? Why or Why Not?

Background

After a program has been designed and implemented, what is the perception of what had been the basis for initial and continued interest in the Leadership program? This question attempted to illicit responses to that question.

Analysis of Responses

F–03 and F–10 did not answer this question, F–01 and F–02 indicated that they did not take part in faculty discussions, and F–07 explained, “Not usually. I just don’t take the time to do it.” The remaining 6 respondents made more-detailed responses:

Yes. Most definitely. I wish every faculty member did. I really don’t understand how we can operate within this program without intense, online discussions of the various issues. At this point, to date, some faculty communicates a lot via e-mail, some occasionally, and some never do. As a faculty, we are not modeling good communication competency. (F–04)

Most of the time. Some of them are repeats of tired arguments by people who refuse to listen to other perspectives, so there’s no point in talking!! We have some faculty who very capably shut everyone else down. [That’s] a huge misuse of technology and suggests that faculty need substantive staff-development around communication issues. (F–05)

Sometimes I do, but I confess that I am so overwhelmed with things to do that I have to prioritize what I attend to. I put my advisees at the top of the list—always. (F–06)

I have read faculty discussion and responded in a very limited manner to date. This is an area that I would like to become more involved with, but this represents a luxury for me, given the lack of any time to devote to my own professional development and involvement in matters other than the essentials. The reason for this is that I straddle the two programs. I’m very aware that participants are already short-changed. But this will change in the near future and, hopefully, I will be able to get in my two cents worth. (F–08)
Yes, when I have something to contribute. I try to be part of the dialogue. But I am not compulsive about having to respond to every question. (F–09)

I used to, but faculty on-line discussion does not take place as much as it used to. Faculty notes that they are just too busy and too inundated. (F–11)

Summary and Conclusions

The responses to the questions in this chapter indicate that all 12 faculty and staff interpret the delivery of program elements and view communication in a variety of ways. For some respondents, maintaining continuity in the face of changing faculty, for example, is a matter of communication; for others it is a question of defined policies, a handbook, and hiring program graduates.

Respondents also ranged in their opinions about the annual conferences. Some found them effective in the way in which they combine an international flavor and speakers; others stated that more participant involvement was needed. (As a participant, I find the confusion about the portfolio process especially unsettling.) What type of faculty members should be recruited in the future? In the face of criticism from University administrators and other sources, how can faculty stay true to the principles on which the Leadership Program was based? Does ambiguity as a creative force have limits?
CHAPTER 13

THE FINAL ANALYSIS

Discussion

The Leadership Program at Andrews University (Leadership) was created and implemented in 1994. In developing and carrying out the program, the faculty members and participants in the initial cohort took part in an adventurous experiment. Indeed, those of us in that initial cohort often referred to ourselves as lab rats. We were involved in the first year of an innovative graduate program, and if the program was not successful, we were involved in the final year of an innovative graduate program. Fortunately, Leadership appears to have been well designed and well received. According to the 40 participants and 12 faculty and staff members interviewed, taking part in the program resulted in experiences and outcomes that were, for the most part, positive demonstrations of both higher education in general and learning among self-directed, self-motived adults in particular.

Given the comments of respondents who were satisfied with and benefited from the Leadership Program, such a program should exist. Indeed, the data show that the design and implementation of the Leadership Program was successful. According to Karen R. Graham, success can be measured in terms of money and in terms of desirability (Graham, personal conversation, November 19, 2013). The program has been financially successful; it solved the 1994 fiscal problem and it continues to generate revenue for Andrews University.
It also has been programmatically successful; it has attracted participants for more than 19 years. The data also indicate that, to varying degrees, participants, faculty, and staff are satisfied with their experiences in the program.

**Recommendations**

1. For balance and hybrid vigor, have a planning team and faculty that represent the four Gregorc mind styles.

2. Early in the development of the program, create a handbook that clearly articulates the philosophy of the program and the way in which each requirement supports that philosophy. The Leadership handbook should supplement the larger college or school handbook and should highlight practices and deadlines specific to the program. Only changes that better support the program’s philosophy should be made, and then only after collaborative consultation among faculty and participants.

3. Conduct an orientation that is designed to equip participants with the philosophical perspective and practical understanding needed to negotiate the program to a successful conclusion.

4. In order to maintain the collaborative aspect of Leadership, involve participants in discussions about program changes, either through cohort representation or by some other means. When a decision has been made, communicate that decision and the reasons behind it to the participants.

5. Develop a process by which to assess the compatibility of faculty and participants to the program in general as well as specific participants to specific faculty.
Recommendations for Further Research

This study of the Leadership Program at Andrews University generated several ideas for further research, from the quantitative as well as qualitative perspectives. Those ideas follow:

*Longitudinal Effects.* As of this writing, in 2013, eleven years have passed since I conducted the interviews with Leadership participants, faculty, and staff. Asking the same or similar interview questions at this point in time is likely to provide a better understanding of the long-term effects of the Leadership Program. What, for example, has been the professional trajectory of the graduates of the program? How are they using the knowledge and skills that they attained in the program?

Furthermore, the Leadership Program has continued at Andrews University. The 20th anniversary of the program’s inception is at hand. My study covers most of the first decade. A further study would reveal how the program has evolved and how participants, faculty, and staff perceive it. (In “Learning While Leading: The Andrews University Leadership Program,” current Leadership faculty members Shirley A. Freed, Duane M. Covrig, and Erich W. Baumgartner [2010] provide a more current description of Leadership by describing the “emerging theoretical understandings on leadership development that [now] guide the program.”)

*Adult Learning.* A theme that emerged in this study is the revelation of the degree to which the Leadership Program, as conceived and developed, was consistent with the characteristics of a concept that Stephen Brookfield (1986) and Malcolm S. Knowles, Elwood F. Holton, and Robert A. Swanson (2011), among others, refer to as *adult learning.*
Time prevented me from exploring the possible relationship between the various constructs of learning in adults and the philosophy and delivery of the Leadership Program. Using adult learning as a conceptual framework, a study of Leadership might provide further insight as to the value of the approach used in the program. The following paragraphs contain a rationale for such a study.

Knowles et al. (2011) state that learners who are 18 and older are more self-directed, have a greater repertoire of experience, and are more internally motivated to learn material that can be used immediately. For these individuals, assert Sharan B. Merriam, Rosemary S. Caffarella, and Lisa M. Baumgartner (2007), learning is “closely related to the developmental tasks of his or her social role” (p. 272). Based on the findings of a team of researchers who reviewed articles, reports, dissertations, and textbooks on adult learning, Waynne B. James (1983) generated a list of characteristics that are common to adult learners. A jury of national education leaders validated the list. The review indicated that

1. Adults maintain the ability to learn.

2. Adults are a highly diversified group of individuals with widely differing preferences, needs, backgrounds, and skills.

3. Adults experience a gradual decline of physical/sensory capabilities.

4. Experience of the learner is a major resource in learning situations.

5. Self-concept moves from dependency to independency as individuals grow in responsibility, experience, and confidence.

6. Adults tend to be life-centered in their orientation to learning.

7. Adults are motivated to learn by a variety of factors.

8. Active learner participation in the learning process contributes to learning.
9. A comfortable, supportive environment is a key to successful learning (as cited in Brookfield, 1986, p. 38).

Many of the characteristics support what Knowles (1980) calls a theory of andragogy, a term that German educator Alexander Kapp coined in 1833, to describe Plato’s teaching of adults. And many of them, if not all of them, are represented in the Leadership Program at Andrews University.

M. J. Manley (1984) conducted a Delphi study of what professors and practitioners of adult education regard as the most effective procedures for facilitating adult learning. Her findings indicate that adult learning is most effective when the following conditions exist:

1. Learners participate in the design of learning.
2. Learners are encouraged to be self-directed.
3. The educator serves as a facilitator rather than as a didactic instructor.
4. The needs and learning styles of the individual learners are considered.
5. A climate conducive to learning is established.
6. The learners’ past experiences are incorporated into the learning.
7. The learning activities are relevant or useful to the learner.

Several of the seven practices overlap with W. B. James’s (1983) list, and all of them are integral components of the Leadership Program. While these characteristics are not idiosyncratic to the learning process of adults, they are certainly extensions of, if not contrary to, traditional teaching.

Although the definitions of adult overlap, they can be generally categorized as age based or developmentally based. The age-based perspective is prevalent in educational settings and in federal and local government. In this perspective, in the United States, an adult typically is an individual who has
reached the age of majority, such as 18 years old or 21 years old, depending on the governmental venue. In 1986, Jan P. Eriksen produced the *National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) Task Force Report*. In 1999, Thomas A. Flint and associates conducted a benchmarking study for the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL). Both reports indicate that educational institutions often define an adult as someone who either is 24 years old and older or 25 years old and older. Eriksen (1986) also reports that the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) defines an adult as an individual who has earned a high-school diploma or General Equivalency Diploma (GED) and has not been involved in formal education for at least 2 years, regardless of age.

With regard to the developmentally based perspective, Knowles and his colleagues (2011) describe an adult from a psychological perspective. An adult, they state, is a person who accepts the responsibility for his or her life and, consequently, becomes self-directing. Merriam et al. (2007) assert, however, that adulthood is based on cognitive development—that maturation and environmental variables cause thinking-patterns to change over time. Peter Jarvis, John Holford, and Colin Griffin (2006) agree that learning takes place in a social setting, but they emphasize the role of experience as the catalyst for learning.

The Leadership Program at Andrews University uses the developmentally based perspective for describing participants, although the criteria imply that applicants have reached a certain age. In order to qualify for the adult-learning program called Leadership, an individual (a) must accomplish a certain level of academic achievement and accrue a certain amount of employment experience, (b) must be self-motivated and self-directed, and (c) must have the desire or need
to earn a graduate degree. As the promotional tri-fold “teaser” states, the program was designed to accommodate individuals with “at least five years of experience in a leadership setting” (*Is Leadership for Me?* 1996, panel 5). Additionally, among several other enrollment requirements listed in Leadership Program promotional material are “a completed bachelor’s or master’s degree, five or more post-bachelor’s years working in education or in a related field, and a résumé of professional experience” (*Admission Requirements for Leadership*, 1996c, p. 10). The adult population, as recorded in program descriptions, seems clear: An adult is an individual who has a certain level of education and a certain amount of experience in a certain setting. Presumably, given the elements of the description, that individual is also financially responsible and socially independent.

**Currency**

As my report of this study is being finalized, additional information continues to emerge about the viability of the type of graduate-education that the Leadership Program represents. Arthur E. Levine (2012), for example, makes the following assertion: “Higher education is becoming more individualized; students, not institutions, will set the educational agenda. . . . The focus of higher education is shifting from teaching to learning” (p. B10).

Judith Stevens-Long, Steven A. Schapiro, and Charles McClintock (2011) explore “the relationships among student-centered doctoral study for scholar-practitioners, adult development, and transformative learning” (p. 1). After surveying graduates from a multi-disciplinary Ph.D. program designed around principles of collaborative adult learning” (p. 7), they conclude that
doctoral students can experience a wide array of learning outcomes, beyond the traditional emphasis on intellectual development, which we have defined as transformative because of their perspective changing character. These outcomes include advance stages of cognitive development, new capacity for emotional experience and conceptions of self, and more reflective professional practice. (p. 13)

In 2010, Lee S. Shulman wrote,

we must encourage thoughtful variations among doctoral programs, especially in the troubled humanities, and inquire into the virtues and liabilities of the options under review. Doctoral education ought to be the most admirable and well-examined Academy for Pioneers we are capable of making. We must design the training purposely and systematically, rather than educate by erecting extensive barriers to completion and then wait to see who survives. (p. B11)

In reviewing such statements, I cannot help but compare the authors’ descriptions of what is needed to the basic characteristics of the Leadership Program that many other participants and I have experienced. The data in this study suggest that, although the initial faculty may have been inexperienced in the development of the program—and that, as a result, may have missed the nuance that not every graduate student needs or appreciates a self-directed, self-motivated, individualized, participant-driven style—they were on track with regard to current trends. What has been learned in the process undoubtedly would be useful for other universities to develop non-traditional doctoral-level programs in leadership.
APPENDIX A

PROFESSIONS AND TITLES OF EXPERTS REFERENCED
Professions and Titles of Experts Referenced


Apple, Michael W.  Professor of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Studies, University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Aronowitz, Stanley.  Distinguished professor of sociology and urban education at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York.  In 2012, awarded the Center of the Study of Working-Class Life’s Lifetime Achievement Award at Stony Brook University.

Babbie, Earl R.  Campbell professor emeritus in behavioral sciences at Chapman University.  On March 21, 2012, the Earl Babbie Research Center was dedicated in at Chapman.

Barzun, Jacques.  Late professor and provost emeritus of History at Columbia University.

Baumgartner, Erich W.  Professor of Leadership and Intercultural Communication, Andrews University.

Baumgartner, Lisa M.  Professor of Adult and Higher Education, Northern Illinois University.

Bernard, Hinsdale.  Professor, College of Health, Education and Professional Studies, School of Education.

Borg, Walter R.  Late executive editor, Journal of Experimental Education; professor of psychology, Utah State University; director, Teacher Education Program, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Borman, Kathryn M.  Professor of Anthropology, University of South Florida.

Brookfield, Stephen D.  Distinguished professor, School of Education, University of St. Thomas, Minneapolis–St. Paul, MN.

Burstein, Alvin G.  Professor emeritus of Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Caffarella, Rosemary S.  Professor of Education, Cornell University.

Chilcott, James H.  Reader of Healthcare Operational Research, University of Sheffield, South Yorkshire, U.K.
Covrig, Duane M.  Professor of Leadership and Educational Administration, Andrews University.

Creswell, John W.  Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Nebraska–Lincoln; founding and current co-editor, *New Sage Journal of Mixed Method Research*.

Cronbach, Lee J.  Late professor emeritus of Education, Stanford University.

Eisner, Elliott W.  Professor of Education and Art, Stanford University.

Erickson, Frederick.  Professor of Social Research and Methodology, UCLA.

Eriksen, Jan P.  Assistant dean of the School of Letters and Sciences and interim department chair in Psychology, Viterbo University (LaCrosse, WI).

Flint, Thomas A.  Vice-president for lifelong learning, CAEL (Council for Adult and Experiential Learning) National Headquarter.

Forbes, Cheryl.  Popular author on religious topics.

Freed, Shirley A.  Professor of Leadership and Qualitative Research, Andrews University.

Gall, Joyce P.  Courtesy assistant professor, College of Education, University of Oregon.

Gall, Meredith (“Mark”) D.  Professor, Department of Educational Leadership, Technology, and Administration, College of Education, University of Oregon.

Geertz, Clifford.  Late professor of Anthropology, Princeton University.

Goetz, Judith P.  Senior associate director of Division of Undergraduate Studies and assistant professor of education, Pennsylvania University.

Goodenough, Ward H.  Late president of the Society for Applied Anthropology, editor of *American Anthropologist*, and member of the National Academy of Sciences. Also served as visiting faculty of Cornell University, Swarthmore College, Bryn Mawr College, University of Rochester, and St. Patrick’s College (Ireland).

Graff, Henry F.  Professor emeritus of history at Columbia University.

Graham, Karen R.  Former vice-chancellor for Faculty Affairs, Chapman University.
**Green, William H.**  Dean, Graduate School, Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, Silang, Philippines.

**Greenleaf, Robert K.**  Late founder, Center for Applied Ethics (now Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership); director of Management Research, AT&T; visiting lecturer, Sloan School of Management, MIT, and Harvard Business School.

**Gregorc, Anthony F.**  President, Gregorc Associates; has also served as associate professor of Educational Administration and assistant dean, University of Illinois; and as associate professor of Curriculum and Administration, University of Connecticut.

**Griffin, Colin.**  Visiting Senior Fellow in the Department of Political, International and Policy Studies.

**Guba, Egon G.**  Late professor emeritus of Education, Indiana University.

**Hammersley, Martyn.**  Professor of Education and Social Research, The Open University.

**Harris, John W.**  No verifiable information.

**Holford, John.**  Robert Peers Professor of Adult Education and Director of the Centre for Research in Higher, Adult & Vocational Education.

**Holton, Elwood F. III.**  Jones S. Davis Distinguished Professor of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

**Hooker, Michael.**  Late chancellor, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

**James, Dean.**  Author. Former Manager of Murder by the Book, in Houston. Now Catalog and Metadata Librarian, Houston Academy of Medicine-Texas Medical Center Library.

**Jarvis, Peter.**  Professor of Continuing Education, University of Surrey, U.K.

**Jurs, Stephen G.**  Professor emeritus, University of Toledo.

**Kirk, Jerome.**  Professor of Sociology, University of California, Irvine.

**Knowles, Malcolm S.**  Late adjunct professor, Vocational and Adult Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

**Kohn, Alfie.**  Independent scholar, lecturer, and author.

**Kolodny, Annette.**  Former dean of Humanities, University of Arizona.
Leap, William L.  Professor of Anthropology, American University.
Leavitt, Harold J.  Late Walter Kenneth Kilpatrick Professor of Organizational Behavior, Emeritus, Stanford University Graduate School of Business.
Levine, Arthur E.  President of the Teachers College, Columbia University.
Lipman-Blumen, Jean.  Thornton F. Bradshaw Professor of Public Policy and Professor of Organizational Behavior at Claremont Graduate University’s Peter F. Drucker and Masatoshi Ito Graduate School of Management.
LeCompte, Margaret D.  Professor of Education, University of Colorado.
Lincoln, Yvonna S.  Distinguished professor of Higher Education Administration, Texas A & M University; fellow of AERA.
Manley, M. J.  No information available.
Maxwell, Joseph A.  Associate professor emeritus of Educational Foundations, Virginia Commonwealth University.
McMillan, James H.  Professor of Educational Foundations, Virginia Commonwealth University.
Merriam, Sharan B.  Professor of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy, University of Georgia, Athens.
Neuman, W. Lawrence.  Department Chair and Professor, Department of Sociology, Criminology, and Anthropology, University of Wisconsin–Whitewater.
Patton, Michael Quinn.  Independent organizational development and program evaluation consultant, and former president of the American Evaluation Association.  Former professor, University of Minnesota; former director, Minnesota Center for Social Research.
Penner, David S.  Assistant professor, School of Public Health, Loma Linda University.
Peshkin, Alan.  Late professor of Education, Stanford University.
Phillips, Denis Charles. Professor of Education and Philosophy, Stanford University.

Roman, Leslie G. Associate professor of Educational Studies, University of British Columbia.

Schumacher, Sally. Professor emeritus of Educational Foundations, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Shulman, Lee S. Professor emeritus of Education, Stanford University; President Emeritus, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Smith, Mary Lee. Internationally recognized as a pioneer in meta-analysis, with a focus on the fields of education, psychology and policy.

Spille, Henry A. Former director of Program Development at the American Council on Education’s center for Adult Learning and educational Credentials.

Spradley, James P. Late professor of Anthropology, Macalester College.

Stewart, David W. Former director of Program Development at the American Council on Education’s center for Adult Learning and educational Credentials.

Sullivan, Eugene. Former director of Program Development at the American Council on Education’s center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials.

Suppes, Patrick Colonel. Lucie Stern professor emeritus of Philosophy, Stanford University. Former director of the Education Program for Gifted Youth, also at Stanford.

Swanson, Robert A. Distinguished research professor of Human Resource Development and Sam Lindsey Chair, School of Human Resource Development and Technology, University of Texas at Tyler.

Thayer, Jerome. Director of the Center for Statistical Service, Andrews University.

Troutt, William E. Chair of the American Council on Education; president, Rhodes College.
**Tucker, James A.**  Professor in the College of Health, Education, and Professional Studies and the McKee Chair of Excellence in Learning, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

**Weiss, Carol H.**  Late professor emeritus of Education, Harvard University.

**Weiss, Robert S.**  Senior Fellow in the Gerontology Institute.  Professor emeritus of Sociology, University of Massachusetts–Boston and lecturer in Sociology, Harvard Medical School.

**Wheatley, Margaret J.**  Associate professor of Management, Marriott School of Management, Brigham Young University and Cambridge College (MA).

**White, Ellen Gould.**  Pioneer of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

**Wiersma, William.**  Late professor emeritus of Educational Research and Measurement, University of Toledo.

**Wolcott, Harry F.**  Late professor emeritus of Anthropology, University of Oregon.
Questions Considered by the Ad Hoc Committee  
on Budgetary Adjustments  
February 8, 1994

I. What is our job?  
   A. Is it how to raise more income?

II. How can we raise income?  
   A. Should we add off-campus instruction?

III. How can we cut expense?  
   A. Should we have fewer faculty?  
      1. Should we have fewer full-time faculty?  
      2. Should we not use retirees and contract faculty?  
   B. Should we have fewer administrators?  
      1. Should we have a leaner structure (current is 36 credits administrative load plus 1-1/2 deans)?  
      2. Should we have administrators over departments, programs, or both?  
      3. Should we have fewer layers of administrators (e.g., dean, asst. dean, chair, asst. chair, program coordinator, graduate coordinator)?  
   C. Should we allow more elective programs?  
      1. Should we have more flexibility in meeting program requirements?  
      2. Should we have fewer foundations courses/requirements?  
      3. Should we have fewer research courses/requirements?  
   D. Should we have fewer distinct programs?  
   E. Should we offer fewer courses each quarter?  
      1. Should we offer fewer elective courses?  
      2. Should we offer courses fewer times?  
         a. Should we have larger courses?  
         b. Should we only offer courses more than once per year or once every other year if we anticipate more than 20 to 40 students?  
   F. Should we have fewer departments?  
      1. Should we merge T & L [Department of Teaching and Learning] and EDAD [Department of Educational Administration]?  
      2. Should we split graduate and undergraduate T & L?  
      3. Where should we place foundations and research?  
   G. Should we give less faculty-lead credit given for non-teaching assignments such as JRCE [Journal of Research on Christian Education] editorship?  
   H. Should we reduce time allotted for faculty research?  
   I. Should we require all faculty to teach no less than eight credits of regular (high-income) classes each quarter?  

IV. How many of the above questions should be dealt with?
APPENDIX C

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION: SEPTEMBER 11-SEPTEMBER 23, 1994
Replication of Leadership Orientation Schedule:
September 11–September 23, 1994

Leadership Orientation

Sunday, September 12

1:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.     Arrival
6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.     Dinner
7:00 p.m. - 7:45 p.m.     Introductions - Rm. 181-183 (WHG)
7:45 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.     Program in Brief (DSP)
8:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.     Who Am I? (SAF)
8:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.     Karl Smith: Agenda (JAT)
9:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m.     Assignment: What to look for at Fall Faculty Fellowship

Monday, September 12

8:00 a.m. - 8:15 a.m.     HUDDLE/Gazebo (WHG)
8:15 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.     Briefing for the day
8:30 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.     Intro to FFF (JAT)
8:45 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.     Karl Smith
10:15 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.    Break
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon   Karl Smith
12:00 noon - 12:15 p.m.   Lunch/Gazebo
12:15 p.m. - 12:45 p.m.   Debriefing from a.m. (WHG)
12:45 p.m. - 1:15 p.m.    Break
1:15 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.     Karl Smith
2:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.     Break
2:45 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.     Karl Smith
4:00 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.     Break
4:15 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.     Bell Hall/Debriefing with Karl Smith (SAF)
5:00 p.m.                 Break/Assignments (Faculty Team Meeting)

Tuesday, September 13

8:00 a.m. - 8:15 a.m.     HUDDLE/Gazebo (WHG)
8:15 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.  Briefing for the day
8:30 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.  FFF Continued  (JAT)
8:45 a.m. - 9:45 a.m.  Karl Smith
9:45 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.  Break
10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.  Karl Smith
11:00 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.  Presidential Address
11:45 a.m. - 12:00 noon  Break
12:00 noon - 12:15 p.m.  Lunch/Gazebo
12:15 p.m. - 12:45 p.m.  Debriefing from a.m.  (WHG)
12:45 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.  Break
1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.  Bell Hall/Faculty team
               on the line:  (JDT)
2:00 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.  Assessment of participant
               learning characteristics
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.  Break
3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.  The Competencies (DSP & JAT)
               and I.D.P. Development
4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.  Advisor Groups
               1. Discuss program
               2. Answer questions
               3. Generate questions
5:00 p.m.  Break/Assignments
               (Faculty Team Meeting)

**Wednesday, September 14**

8:00 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.  Issue for the Day: Christian Education  (JAT)
8:45 a.m. - 9:45 a.m.  There’s research . . .  (JDT)
9:45 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.  Break
**Wednesday, continued**

10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.  ... and there’s “research”
11:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon  Speaking of research (SAF)

- More on the assessment of our learning characteristics

12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.  Lunch
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.  The issue revisited (JAT)
1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.  Instruction (WHG)
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.  Break
3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.  Discussion of *In The Name of Jesus* (DSP)

4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.  Advisor Groups
- 1. Discuss program
- 2. Answer questions
- 3. Generate questions

5:00 p.m.  Break/Assignments
(Faculty Team Meeting)

**Thursday, September 15**

8:00 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.  Issue for the Day: Power and Service (JAT)
8:45 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.  Research (JDT)

- From the Thayeretical to the Heretical

10:30 a.m. - 10:45 a.m.  Break
10:45 a.m. - 12:00 noon  Speaking of research (SAF)

- More on the assessment of our learning characteristics

12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.  Lunch
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.  The issue revisited (JAT)
Thursday, continued

1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m. Instruction (WHG)
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. Break
3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. Discussion of The Religion of Power (DSP)
4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Advisor Groups
1. Discuss program
2. Answer questions
3. Generate questions
5:00 p.m. Break/Assignments
(Faculty Team Meeting)

Friday, September 16

8:00 a.m. - 8:45 a.m. Issue for the Day: The Perils of Change (JAT)
How History Unfolds
8:45 a.m. - 10:15 a.m. Jim Henderson
10:15 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. Break
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon Jim Henderson
12:00 noon RECESS

Monday, September 19

8:00 a.m. - 8:45 a.m. Issue for the Day: Competition vs. Cooperation (JAT)
8:45 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. Research (WHG)
9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Quality vs. Quantity
10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m. Break
10:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon Access to the Information Superhighway:
Library Access (DSP)
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m. Lunch
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m. The issue revisited (SAF)
1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m. Instruction (WHG)
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. Break
Monday, continued

3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. Discussion of No Contest: The Case Against Competition (DSP)

4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Regional Groups
   1. Discuss program
   2. Answer questions
   3. Generate questions

5:00 p.m. Break/Assignments
(Faculty Team Meeting)

Tuesday, September 20

8:00 a.m. - 8:45 a.m. Issue for the Day: Community (JAT)
8:45 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. Research (WHG)
9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Quality vs. Quantity
10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m. Break
10:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon Access to the Information (DSP)
   Superhighway: Internet

12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m. Lunch
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m. The issue revisited (SAF)
1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m. Instruction (WHG)
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. Break
3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. Discussion of The Different Drum (JAT)
4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Regional Groups
   1. Discuss program
   2. Answer questions
   3. Generate questions

5:00 p.m. Break/Assignments
(Faculty Team Meeting)

7:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. Electronic Communication (Micro-lab)
Wednesday, September 21

8:00 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.  Issue for the Day: Organizational Leadership (JAT)
8:45 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Research (JDT)
10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m. Break
10:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon Access to the Information Superhighway: Internet (DSP)
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m. Lunch
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m. The issue revisited (SAF)
1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m. Instruction (WHG)
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. Break
3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. Discussion of Leadership and the New Science (JAT)
4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Regional Groups
   1. Discuss program
   2. Answer questions
   3. Generate questions
5:00 p.m.  Break/Assignments (Faculty Team Meeting)
7:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. Electronic Communication (Micro-lab)

Thursday, September 22

8:00 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.  Issue for the Day: Information Overload (JAT)
8:45 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Research (JDT)
10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m. Break
10:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon Flex time
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m. Lunch
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m. The issue revisited (JAT)
1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m. Instruction (WHG)
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. Break
3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. Discussion of Leadership and the New Science (JAT)
Thursday, continued

4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Regional Groups
1. Discuss program
2. Answer questions
3. Generate questions

5:00 p.m. Break / Assignments
(Faculty Team Meeting)

Friday, September 23

8:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. Issue for the Day: True Education (Confluent Learning (JAT))

9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m. THE CIRCLE (Faculty Team)
Leadership Roundtable
1. Reiterate assignments (e.g., research, instruction, communication, and the completion of the I.D.P.)
2. Announcements (e.g., next qtr. registration)

11:00 a.m. - 11:15 a.m. Break

11:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon 3. Recap goals and objectives
4. Where do we go from here?
THE END
Why Was Leadership Developed?

- To provide a new delivery-system of graduate education that meets the needs of today's professionals.
- To provide a learning community for leaders who want to earn a doctorate while continuing to be employed.
- To give self-directed, self-motivated individuals a way to take charge of their own education.

Is Leadership for Me?

- Have you already earned a bachelor's degree or a master's degree?
- Do you have at least five years of experience in a leadership setting?
- Are you employed where you can apply the skills that you learn as you fulfill the Leadership competencies?

Yes? Do you also:

- Have a clear picture of your goals?
- Feel comfortable with designing the program that will accomplish those goals?
- Thrive on independence and enjoy decision-making and problem-solving challenges?

You do? Are you also able to:

- Attend the two-week orientation held in July at Andrews University?
- Arrange your time and transportation to attend regularly-held regional meetings?
- Take part in the Leadership conference held every July at Andrews University?
- Obtain the equipment and expertise necessary for electronic communication with the other participants in the program?

You can? Then Leadership is for you!

The Leadership Faculty

In order to provide the highest-quality in education and mentoring, the Leadership program uses a cadre of experts from around the world for orientation, intensive seminars, advising, and online learning-experiences. Their specialties include—but are not limited to—the following focus areas:

- Leadership theory
- Teaching and learning
- Individual and program evaluation
- Quantitative and qualitative research
- Educational psychology
- Staff development
- Management and administration
- And applied leadership applications in secular as well as religious settings.

For more information about Leadership, contact

Carol Castillo, Program Secretary
Andrews University School of Education
Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0114
Phone: 616-471-3487; 800-253-2874
Fax: 616-471-6374

Or visit our website:
www.andrews.edu/leadership

A New Concept in Graduate Education from the Andrews University School of Education
What Is Leadership?

- Leadership is an Andrews University School of Education program that leads either to a Master of Arts (M.A.), a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.), or a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree.
- Leadership prepares leaders for service in all professional forums.
- Leadership is established on the idea of developing and demonstrating competency in several key areas.
- Leadership gives each participant the opportunity to design and carry out an individual development plan in order to fulfill competency requirements.
- Leadership actively uses the practical application of skills in the workplace as part of the process of fulfilling the competencies.
- Leadership evaluates competence through a portfolio presentation that takes the place of a written comprehensive examination.
- Leadership fosters collaboration and cooperation among its participants and among participants and faculty.
- Leadership is a community of learners dedicated to service.

How Does Leadership Work?

- Leadership works through ongoing communication. The exchange of ideas forms the foundation for growth and success. The use of e-mail is essential for discussion, keeping in touch, problem-solving, and planning.
- Leadership requires a two-week orientation. During this time, participants experience intense and rewarding interaction that leads to a camaraderie that is vital to the program.
- Leadership promotes regional study groups. The synergy that occurs when participants work together to reach common goals is one of the program's most important tools for success. Quarterly study-group meetings are mandatory; monthly meetings are recommended.
- Leadership sponsors an annual conference. Participants meet for several days every summer to make formal presentations, exchange ideas with colleagues, welcome new participants, renew old acquaintances, and meet with advisors. Because the conference represents the only event during the year in which all Leadership participants meet together, attending the conference is a requirement of the program for all active members.
- Leadership works through a collaborative structure. Each year approximately 20 applicants are accepted into the program. Each participant is assigned to a faculty advisor who will act as a mentor. Leadership participants and the faculty form the program's larger team of professional colleagues.
- The Leadership doctorate is conferred when the participant has completed 90 post-baccalaureate semester-hours, demonstrated proficiency in the 20 competencies, and successfully defended the dissertation.

What Are the Competencies for the Ed.D & Ph.D.?

Each Leadership graduate is an effective teacher/mentor with skills in . . .
- Using, evaluating, and adapting instructional materials in order to accommodate individual variability.
- Various learning-strategies, including group processes.
- Mentoring.

Each Leadership graduate is a dynamic change-agent with skills in . . .
- Planning and implementing change.
- Developing human resources.
- Public-relations.

Each Leadership graduate is an effective organizer with skills in . . .
- Organizational development, management, and resource-allocation.
- Interpreting laws, regulations, and policies.

Each Leadership graduate is a collaborative consultant with skills in . . .
- Effective communication.
- Evaluation and assessment.
- Problem-solving and decision-making.

Each Leadership graduate is a reflective researcher with skills in . . .
- Reading and evaluating research.
- Conducting research.
- Reporting research.

Each Leadership graduate is a competent scholar with a working knowledge of . . .
- Ethics and personal and professional development.
- Leadership foundations.
- Theories of learning and human development.
- Theories of leadership and management.
- Social systems, including family dynamics, community structures, and global development.
- Educational technology and its application.

NOTE: For a list of the Master's-level competencies, contact the Leadership office.
After spending several years in the workforce, it is not unusual for self-motivated, self-directed individuals to find that they would like to earn an advanced degree. Because of personal and professional responsibilities, however, such lifelong learners also discover how difficult it is to take the time to do so. In addition, people who already are in a career may find that traditional graduate programs lack relevance. They need a program that incorporates their professional background into their academic experience. Leadership does just that.

Leadership is an Andrews University School of Education program through which participants earn a Doctor of Philosophy or a Doctor of Education degree. What makes this program different from other graduate courses of study is that it is field-based and competency-based. Each Leadership participant, with the help of a team of faculty members, designs and carries out an Individual Development Plan, or IDP, to demonstrate competency in several key areas.

If you would like to become a member of the Leadership community of learners, return the application packet tucked into the inside back cover of this brochure.

Dr. James A. Tucker
Coordinator, Leadership Program
What is *Leadership*?

*Leadership* is an Andrews University School of Education program that leads either to a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree and prepares leaders for service in all educational forums. This student-driven program is established on the idea of developing and demonstrating competency in several specific areas.
Leadership is unusual in several ways.

• Leadership is field based and flexible. In collaboration with an advisor, each participant develops an Individual Development Plan (IDP) that incorporates the practical application of skills in the workplace as part of the process of fulfilling the competencies. A unique combination of coursework and directed activities ensures that the the program meets the specific educational needs and career goals of every participant.

• Leadership is instruction based. As with other doctoral programs at Andrews University, participants earn 136 credits and complete a dissertation. As part of his or her IDP, each Leadership participant builds in ways to learn—through seminars, workshops, and guided practice—what works in his or her particular educational focus.

• Leadership is competency based. The program is designed around a set of skill-based and knowledge-based competencies. In carrying out the plan outlined in his or her IDP, each participant fulfills the competency requirements.

• Leadership evaluates its participants in three ways:
  ► Throughout the course of study, the faculty team evaluates each participant’s achievement on the basis of mastery of content and demonstration of skills.
  ► The faculty team judges a participant’s program as completed when he or she has demonstrated achievement of the twenty general competencies.
  ► Throughout the program, each participant documents the demonstration of achievement in a portfolio. At the completion of the program, the faculty team will evaluate the portfolio.
How does Leadership work?

The Leadership program is an international one. Although the program’s participants are from all over the world, they take part in planned meetings and conferences to exchange ideas and to provide support for each other. Between meetings, e-mail becomes the method by which they discuss theories, suggest ways for fulfilling competency requirements, and share insights.
Leadership builds on ongoing communication.

- **Leadership requires a two-week orientation.** During this time, participants experience intense and rewarding interaction that leads to a camaraderie that is vital to the program.

- **Leadership promotes regional study groups.** The synergy that occurs when participants work together to reach common goals is one of the program’s most important tools for success. Quarterly study-group meetings are mandatory; monthly meetings are recommended.

- **Leadership sponsors an annual conference.** Participants meet for several days every summer to make formal presentations, exchange ideas with colleagues, welcome new participants, renew old acquaintances, and meet with advisors.

- **Leadership works through a collaborative structure.** Each year approximately 20 applicants are accepted for the program. Each participant is assigned to a faculty advisor as a mentor. Leadership participants and the faculty form the program’s larger team of professional colleagues.
Why does Leadership emphasize competencies rather than courses?

Leadership was developed to meet the needs of today's professionals. This new delivery system of graduate education is designed to provide a learning community for leaders who want to earn a doctorate while continuing to be employed. Although some coursework is necessary to complete the degree, Leadership gives self-directed, self-motivated individuals a way to take charge of their own education while incorporating their past professional experience and their current positions.
Each Leadership graduate is an effective instructor with skills in . . .
- Using, evaluating, and adapting instructional materials.
- Carrying out instructional management to accommodate individual variability.
- Using proven instructional strategies.

Each Leadership graduate is a dynamic change-agent with skills in . . .
- Planning and implementing change.
- Developing human resources.
- Planning and directing public-relations campaigns.

Each Leadership graduate is an effective organizer with skills in . . .
- Organizational development.
- Allocating resources.
- Interpreting laws, regulations, and policies.

Each Leadership graduate is a collaborative consultant with skills in . . .
- Communicating effectively.
- Evaluating and assessing programs and procedures.
- Solving problems and making decisions.

Each Leadership graduate is a reflective researcher with skills in . . .
- Reading and evaluating research.
- Conducting research.
- Reporting research.

Each Leadership graduate is a competent scholar with a working knowledge of . . .
- Educational foundations.
- Theories of learning and human development.
- Theories of leadership and management.
- Social values such as family dynamics, political issues, and bureaucratic structures.
- Educational technology and its application.
How do I apply for Leadership?

As a preliminary step, complete the application packet enclosed in this folder and return it to the Graduate Admissions Office of Andrews University. The packet contains, among other items, requests for a statement of purpose, initial recommendations, and GRE test scores. After reviewing the information, the Leadership program coordinator may request additional recommendations and interviews prior to formal admission to the program.
Admission Requirements for Leadership:

General requirements for Leadership are the same as for other graduate programs in a number of areas:

- A current Graduate Record Examination (GRE) score (within 5 years).
- One hundred twelve credits of graduate course work, plus 24 credits for the dissertation.
- Two-thirds of the requirements met by credits in courses numbered 500 and above.
- Nine credits or more in courses numbered 700 or above.
- A minimum of 48 credits taken at Andrews University after acceptance in Leadership, not including the 24 credit dissertation.
- A cumulative GPA of 3.3 in the degree program and in post-master's* work included in the degree program; a 3.0 cumulative GPA in all graduate work.
- A successfully defended dissertation.
- Pre-dissertation work completed within 6 years; total program completed in 10 years.

* or post-specialist if earned prior to admission

Specific requirements for Leadership include the following items:

- A completed bachelor's or master's degree (a master's degree is recommended).
- Five or more post-bachelor's years working in education or in a related field.
- Evidence of leadership ability and self-motivation.
- A résumé of professional experience.
- A commitment to actively participate in orientation, study groups and other scheduled activities.
- Access to a computer and skills in communicating via e-mail, the Internet, and other forms of telecommunication.
- An Individual Development Plan (IDP), designed by the student and approved by the Leadership team as a part of the program orientation.
- The development of a program portfolio, based on the student's IDP, demonstrating the satisfactory completion of the program competencies.
- Participation in the 12-credit, two-week orientation, Seminar in Leadership.
- Residency of three quarters out of four consecutive quarters after admission to the Leadership program. Each residency quarter shall include half-time or more of study or work directly related to fulfilling the IDP requirements, not including dissertation.
- Regular and active participation in cooperative study groups.
- Satisfactory completion of a comprehensive examination, including written and oral components, which includes the presentation and defense of the student's portfolio.
Leadership: A New Doctoral Program at Andrews
by Priscilla Tucker

The beginning of the fall quarter also marked the beginning of an innovative doctoral program in education. Called "Leadership," the program, which focuses on end results rather than on routine requirements, is designed for self-directed learners who already are in professional career setting but who want to earn a doctorate.

Candidates began their experience by taking part in an intensive two-week orientation. Under the guidance of a team of faculty members, each candidate will follow an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) that will include coursework as well as experience. The faculty team directing the program consists of Shirley Freed, William Green, Donna Habenicht, David Penner, and James Tucker.

As with other doctoral degrees, participants in the Leadership program will earn 136 credits and complete a dissertation. What makes this program different, however, is that each Leadership candidate must document, in a portfolio, that he or she has successfully demonstrated competence in 20 specific areas. The criteria for fulfilling the requirements of each area are defined in detail in the IDPs, and no Leadership candidate will be granted a Ph.D. or Ed.D without fulfilling the criteria for all 20 competencies. The faculty team is responsible for maintaining rigorous quality control.

The Graduate Council of the university has approved the Leadership program on a pilot basis for a limited number of participants. Based on this first year's experience, the council will consider the program for permanent status.
A degree that will
change the world
around you!

Leadership

is an Andrews University
School of Education
program that leads
either to a
Master of Arts (M.A.),
a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.),
or a
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
and prepares leaders
for service in
a number of professional arenas.
This participant-driven program
is established on the idea
of developing and demonstrating
competency in several specific areas
of leadership.

Phone us at 616-471-3487,
or visit our website: www.andrews.edu/leadership/
Leadership Program

Mission
The Leadership Program at Andrews is dedicated to developing Christian leaders who are able to integrate faith and learning in ways that will prepare others for responsible service.

Description of the doctoral degree programs
The Leadership Program at Andrews allows the self-motivated, self-directed student to take part in a dynamic-action agenda devoted to service. The program’s strengths are evident in several ways:

- **The Leadership Program is instruction based.** Through seminars, workshops, and guided practice, the student learns to implement what works in education.

- **The Leadership Program is competency based.** The program, although not listing a prescribed set of courses, is designed around a set of competencies, including both skill and knowledge-based areas.

- **The Leadership Program is student driven.** The student, working with an advisor, develops a plan of study, including course work and directed activities, that will fit his or her individual needs. An extraordinary amount of personal ownership by the student in the individual needs program is critical for satisfactory completion of the degree.

- **The Leadership Program is flexible.** The flexibility of the program allows for the educational needs, career goals, and past experience of the student to play an important part in the development of an individualized plan of study.

- **The Leadership Program builds important bonds between its participants.** Students become partners in learning, both with faculty members and with other students. This process is enhanced by involvement in orientation activities, seminars, and study groups, and through continued contact and discussion by using e-mail, the Internet, and other forms of telecommunication.

- **The Leadership Program evaluates achievements in three ways.**
  - Throughout the course of study, individual achievement is evaluated on the basis of mastery of content and demonstration of skills.
  - The program is judged completed when a student has demonstrated achievement of the twenty general competencies.
  - Demonstration of achievement is documented in a portfolio that is assembled throughout the program. The portfolio is presented to the Leadership team at the end of the program for final validation.

The Leadership Program leads to either a Doctor of Education or a Doctor of Philosophy degree. In the course of study, students for either degree are involved in both research and application, but students pursuing the Ph.D. focus more on research whereas those in the Ed.D. emphasize application. These components are identified from the beginning of the course of study in the student's Individualized Development Plan (IDP).
Degree requirements
Application to the program is initiated by the completion of an Andrews University doctoral application packet, which includes among other items, a statement of purpose and initial recommendations. At the same time, students should also communicate directly to the Leadership Program Coordinator to indicate how they have met or plan to meet the prerequisites for admission to the program. Additional recommendations and interviews may be requested prior to formal admission to the program. Since there are only a limited number of students admitted each year, students are encouraged to make application to the program early.

Prerequisites for admission to the Leadership program include:
• a completed bachelor’s or master’s degree (a masters degree is recommended);
• five or more post-bachelor’s years working in education or in a related field;
• evidence of leadership ability and self-motivation;
• a commitment to actively participate in orientation, study groups and other scheduled activities;
• access to and skills in communicating via e-mail, the Internet, and other telecommunications.

Degree requirements
General requirements for the Leadership program are the same as for other programs in a number of areas:

• 112 credits of graduate course work, plus 24 credits for the dissertation;
• two-thirds of the requirements met by credits numbered 500 and above;
• nine credits or more number 700 or above;
• a minimum of 48 credits taken at Andrews after acceptance in the doctoral program at Andrews (not including the 24 credit dissertation);
• 3.3 cumulative GPA in the degree program and in post-master’s (or post-specialist if earned prior to admission) work included in the degree program; 3.0 cumulative GPA in all graduate work;
• dissertation successfully written and defended; and
• pre-dissertation work completed within 6 years; total program completed in 10 years.

Specific requirements for the Leadership program include:
• an Individualized Development Plan (IDP), designed by the student and approved by the Leadership team as a part of the program orientation;
• the development of a program portfolio, based on the student’s IDP, demonstrating the satisfactory completions of the program competencies;
• participation in the orientation: Seminar in Leadership (12 credits);
• residency of three quarters out of four consecutive quarters after admission to the doctoral program. (Each residency quarter shall include half-time or more of study or work directly related to fulfilling the IDP requirements, not including dissertation);
• regular and active participation in cooperative study groups; and
• satisfactory completion of a comprehensive examination, including both written and oral components which includes the presentation and defense of the student’s portfolio.
The graduate of this program will be . . .

1. An effective teacher/instructor with . . .
   b. Skills in instructional management to accommodate individual variability.
   c. Skills in instructional strategies.

2. A dynamic change agent with . . .
   a. Skills in planning and implementing change.
   b. Skills in developing human resources.
   c. Skills in public relations.

3. An effective organizer with . . .
   a. Skills in organizational development.
   b. Skills in allocating resources.
   c. Skills in interpreting laws, regulations, and policies.

4. A collaborative consultant with . . .
   a. Skills in effective communication.
   b. Skills in evaluation and assessment.
   c. Skills in problem-solving and decision-making.

5. A reflective researcher with . . .
   a. Skills in reading and evaluating research.
   b. Skills in conducting research.
   c. Skills in reporting research.

6. A competent scholar with a . . .
   a. Working knowledge of educational foundations.
   b. Working knowledge of theories of learning and human development.
   c. Working knowledge of theories of leadership and management.
   d. Working knowledge of social systems, including family dynamics, political issues, and bureaucratic structures.
   e. Working knowledge of educational technology and its application.

These competencies are general and are considered minimal criteria for completion of the program.
I want to know more about Leadership. Please send me an application packet and additional information.

Name ____________________________________________
Address __________________________________________
City __________________________ State ______
Country _______________ Postal Code ______________
Home Phone _______________ Office Phone ____________
Fax ______________________ E-mail __________________
APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: PARTICIPANTS
Cover Letter and Interview Questions: Participants

HI!

I have a big favor to ask you. My dissertation is a qualitative one that describes the Leadership Program from its inception to the present. In order to get a complete picture, I am using my own experience, documentation such as minutes from faculty meetings, and faculty ad participant interviews. This is where you come in.

I’ve selected five or more participants from each cohort to send the following list of questions. I’ve purposely chosen people from a variety of regional groups, advisors, nationalities, ethnic backgrounds, and, of course, both sexes. I’ve also made sure to tap the gene pools of active participants in all stages of the program, as well as graduates.

The questions below came about in this way: (1) I conducted live interviews of nine participants and analyzed their responses to discover leading questions and their spontaneous comments; (2) I asked Carol Castillo to supply some of the questions she hears most often about the program; and (3) I asked my own regional group to make suggestions. Then, using a domain analysis, I put the questions into the categories you see below.

Some of the questions require only short responses. Others require more thought. I know how precious time is for all of us, so whatever you can do will become a valuable part of the history of the program. Your input will also serve as a resource for future planning in the Leadership Program.

Please be assured that everything you say will be held in complete confidence. No one will be able to identify you. No one will see the list of interviewees. And when they appear in the appendix of my dissertation, there will be no way to identify them by individual—if anyone even bothers to look at them!

To make this as easy as possible, just fill in your responses after each question and send it all back to me as a reply to my message. If you cannot answer the following questions by Monday, June 30, 2003, please let me know right away. Otherwise, I’ll look forward to your responses.

Thank you in advance from the bottom of my heart.

Cilla Tucker

1. BECOMING A PARTICIPANT

How did you find out about the Leadership Program?

What made you decide to apply?

Did the fact that the Leadership Program is based at a Christian institution have an influence on your decision?
2. GETTING STARTED

How well did the orientation make you aware the general requirements of the Leadership Program? What aspects were valuable? What aspects could be improved?

Did you realize how much self-direction and self-motivation you were expected to have?

Have you heard the term “tolerance for ambiguity” in reference to the Leadership Program? If so, what does it mean to you?

3. THE I.D.P.

Was drafting the I.D.P. a difficult task? How did you approach this activity?

Have you made revisions to your original I.D.P.?

How well have you been able to take advantage of the job-embedded aspect of the Leadership Program?

Of the six major competencies, which one has been the most useful, or valuable, for you to develop?

Of the six major competencies, which one has been the least useful, or valuable, for you to develop?

List the types of physical evidence that you are using—or, if you are done, have used—to demonstrate competency.

4. THE FACULTY

Do you believe that the faculty functions as a team?

Do you believe that all faculty members operate in ways that are true to the philosophy of the Leadership Program as it is described in printed and website promotional material?

Do you believe that a partnership exists to the extent that faculty and students are all equal participants in the Leadership Program?

Have you gotten the faculty support that you’ve needed?

If you could ask the faculty one question—without fear of reprisal—what would it be?

5. OTHER COMPONENTS OF THE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Discuss your regional group. Did it function well? Why or why not?

Discuss the Roundtables (annual conferences). Have they been valuable experiences? Why or why not?

How much have you relied on e-mail and the internet in the Leadership Program?
6. PHILOSOPHICAL MATTERS

What does “leadership” mean to you?

The Leadership Program is sometimes alleged to be less rigorous than a traditional doctoral program. Please comment on that allegation.

The Leadership Program demands that its participants have a strong theoretical foundation to support its practical application. How has that affected you?

The Leadership Program makes the claim that it is participant-driven. In your experience, does this seem to be the case? Why or why not?

7. LOOKING BACK

Discuss some pros and cons about your experience in the Leadership Program. For example, did you experience any surprises—positive or negative?

How have you changed with regard to attitude, habits, or both as a result of the Leadership Program?

Would you recommend the Leadership Program to someone else? Why or why not?

8. IF YOU HAVE GRADUATED

Did you set a deadline for completing the Leadership Program? If so, did you meet it? Why or why not?

Which was more difficult to complete—the dissertation or the portfolio?

Discuss the final paper. For example, was the nature of the paper a surprise? Did you find doing it a valuable experience?

9. PLEASE FEEL FREE TO MAKE OTHER COMMENTS. REMEMBER, WHAT YOU SAY IN YOUR INTERVIEW WILL BE HELD IN COMPLETE CONFIDENCE. NO ONE OTHER ME WILL SEE ITS CONTENTS.
APPENDIX F

CHANGES IN LEADERSHIP FACULTY, 1994 THROUGH 2002
Changes in Leadership Faculty, 1994 through 2002

1. David Penner was a member of the original Leadership faculty. Dr. Penner served as coordinator of the Leadership Program from its inception, in 1994, to 1995. In 1995, Dr. Penner accepted the position of registrar of Andrews University but continued to advise Leadership students and to serve on dissertation committees.

2. William Green was a member of the original Leadership faculty. In 1998, Dr. Green left Andrews to become Director of the Center for Academic Innovation and Instruction at Southern Adventist University. He continued to advise Leadership students and to serve on dissertation committees.

3. Jerome Thayer was a member of the original Leadership faculty. Dr. Thayer served on a part-time basis, with dual obligations in Leadership and in the Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling (EDPC), in the Andrews University School of Education (SED). In 2002, Dr. Thayer resigned from his position on the Leadership faculty in order to concentrate on his responsibilities in EDPC.

4. James Tucker was a member of the original Leadership faculty. In 1995, when Dr. Penner’s resigned as coordinator of Leadership, Dr. Tucker assumed that role. In 2001, Dr. Tucker left Andrews to accept the position of the McKee Chair of Excellence in Learning at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. Dr. Tucker continued to advise Leadership students and to serve on dissertation committees.
5. Shirley Freed was a member of the Leadership charter faculty. She became chair of the program in 2003 and continues to serve in that capacity.

6. In 1996, Elsie Jackson, became a part-time member of the Leadership faculty, with dual obligations in Leadership and in the Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling (EDPC), in the Andrews University School of Education (SED). In 2002, Dr. Jackson became a full-time member of the Leadership faculty. Dr. Jackson resigned in 2005 in order to accept the position of Coordinator of the Leadership Specialization at Northern Caribbean University. Dr. Jackson continued to advise Leadership students and to serve on dissertation committees.

7. In 1997, Dr. Karen Graham became dean of the SED. Simultaneously, Dr. Graham became a part-time member of the Leadership faculty and remained so until her departure in 2002, when she accepted the position as dean of Chapman University College. Dr. Graham continued to serve on Leadership dissertation committees.

8. In 1998, Hinsdale Bernard became a part-time member of the Leadership faculty, with dual obligations in Leadership and the department of Educational Administration. In 2005, Dr. Bernard left Andrews to accept a position on the faculty the College of Health, Education, and Professional Studies at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. Dr. Bernard continued to advise Leadership students and to serve on dissertation committees.
9. In 1998, Loretta Johns became a part-time member of the Leadership faculty, with dual obligations in Leadership and the School of Arts and Sciences. In 2001, Dr. Johns became co-coordinator, with Dr. Tucker, of the program. In 2002, she became a full-time member of the Leadership faculty and coordinator of the program. She resigned in 2003 in order to accept the position of assistant dean for Program Development and Evaluation at Loma Linda University but continued to serve on Leadership dissertation committees.

10. In 1999, Eric Baumgartner became a part-time member of the Leadership faculty, with dual obligations in Leadership and the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary. Dr. Baumgartner became a full-time member of the Leadership faculty in 2003 and continues to serve in that capacity.

11. In 2000, Lyndon Furst, dean of graduate studies, became a part-time member of the Leadership faculty. Dr. Furst resigned from his Leadership position in 2003.

12. In 2000, James Jeffrey became dean of the SED and a part-time faculty member. Dr. Jeffrey resigned from his Leadership position in 2002
Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 1

How did you find out about the Leadership Program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unable to recall</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td>P–02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-affiliated sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional material</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-program-affiliated sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews students, faculty, administrators</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>P–15</td>
<td>P–17</td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Andrews faculty and administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–11</td>
<td>P–03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–24</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 2a

*What made you decide to apply?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-specific or factors other than 8 identified in analysis</td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td>P–15</td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td>P–24</td>
<td>P–28</td>
<td>P–23</td>
<td>P–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision based on 1 of 8 factors identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability to professional needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of time and place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>P–17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other one-factor determinants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–11</td>
<td>P–08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 2b

*Individual factors by respondent.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1994 cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-09</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No specific reason given.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1995 cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-06</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1996 cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1997 cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1998 cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999 cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 2b, continued

*Individual factors by respondent.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Selection factors are as follows:
- **Factor 1.** The ability to adapt the program to specific professional needs.
- **Factor 2.** The opportunity to be actively involved in a cutting-edge program.
- **Factor 3.** The advantage of being in an interdisciplinary program.
- **Factor 4.** The expediency of a program that provides flexibility of time and place.
- **Factor 5.** Respect for particular faculty members.
- **Factor 6.** The opportunity for personal and professional growth.
- **Factor 7.** The appeal of a competency-based program.
- **Factor 8.** The attraction of a Christian university.
**Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 3**

*Did the fact that the Leadership Program is based in a Christian institution have any influence on your decision?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drawn to Christian setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–14</td>
<td>P–28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–17</td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not drawn to Christian setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh-day Adventists</td>
<td>P–38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–22</td>
<td>P–12</td>
<td>P–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 4

How well did the orientation make you aware of the general requirements of the Leadership Program? What aspects were valuable? What aspects could be improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did not address the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comments about orientation</td>
<td>P-32</td>
<td>P-31</td>
<td>P-05</td>
<td>P-06</td>
<td>P-02</td>
<td>P-25</td>
<td>P-20</td>
<td>P-11</td>
<td>P-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptually prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comments</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td>P-38</td>
<td>P-37</td>
<td>P-36</td>
<td>P-39</td>
<td>P-07</td>
<td>P-35</td>
<td>P-34</td>
<td>P-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for ambiguity</td>
<td>P-17</td>
<td>P-16</td>
<td>P-13</td>
<td>P-12</td>
<td>P-19</td>
<td>P-10</td>
<td>P-24</td>
<td>P-11</td>
<td>P-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific suggestions</td>
<td>P-21</td>
<td>P-20</td>
<td>P-19</td>
<td>P-23</td>
<td>P-22</td>
<td>P-28</td>
<td>P-29</td>
<td>P-28</td>
<td>P-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program as new, different</td>
<td>P-17</td>
<td>P-16</td>
<td>P-16</td>
<td>P-23</td>
<td>P-01</td>
<td>P-09</td>
<td>P-24</td>
<td>P-30</td>
<td>P-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D.P., portfolio dissertation</td>
<td>P-07</td>
<td>P-38</td>
<td>P-37</td>
<td>P-01</td>
<td>P-04</td>
<td>P-06</td>
<td>P-24</td>
<td>P-28</td>
<td>P-08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 5

*Did you realize how much self-direction and self-motivation you were expected to have?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–38</td>
<td>P–28</td>
<td>P–39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td>P–23</td>
<td>P–39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautionary comments</td>
<td>P–06</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>P–23</td>
<td>P–12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>P–17</td>
<td>P–19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors needed</td>
<td>P–33</td>
<td>P–20</td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program more prescriptive than anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–29</td>
<td>P–24</td>
<td>P–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 1, Question 6

*Would you recommend the Leadership Program to someone else?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would not recommend program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific reasons to recommend program</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made cautionary statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 1**

*Was drafting the I.D.P. a difficult task? How did you approach this activity?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafting I.D.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used earlier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D.P.s as templates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting I.D.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to fulfill competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear about vision, goals, program expectations</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td>P–12</td>
<td>P–35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 2**

*Did you make revisions to your original I.D.P.?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made or intended to make changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 3

*How well have you been able to take advantage of the job-embedded aspect of the Leadership Program?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Took advantage of job-embedded aspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But took more time than expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive but less absolute</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–06</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to specific requirements</td>
<td>P–09</td>
<td>P–20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional benefits to requirements</td>
<td>P–31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not take advantage of job-embedded aspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General statements</td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>P–15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific statements</td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td>P–19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 4a**

*Of the six major competencies, which one has been the most useful, or most valuable, for you to develop?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency-area*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-09</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-06</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19</td>
<td>Neglected to select a competency-area. All “interwoven.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-40</td>
<td>Neglected to select a competency-area. All “intertwined.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-11</td>
<td>Neglected to select a competency-area. “Too early to comment.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-22</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-27</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-28</td>
<td>Neglected to select a competency-area. Cover “every aspect of leadership.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 4a, continued

Of the six major competencies, which one has been the most useful, or most valuable, for you to develop?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency-area*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neglected to select a competency-area. “Too early to tell.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Competency-area descriptors are as follows:
- Competency-area 1. Effective teacher/instructor/mentor
- Competency-area 2. Dynamic change-agent
- Competency-area 3. Effective organizer
- Competency-area 4. Collaborative consultant
- Competency-area 5. Reflective researcher
- Competency-area 6. Competent scholar

Some respondents singled out an individual component of a competency-area. In those cases, the corresponding lower-case letter in parentheses indicates the component.
Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 5a

*Of the six major competencies, which one has been the least useful, or least valuable, for you to develop?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency-area*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1994 cohort
- P-09 X(e)
- P-21 X(e)
- P-31 X
- P-33 X
- P-37 X(a)

1995 cohort
- P-04 X
- P-06 Neglected to select a competency-area. “They work together fine.”
- P-07 X
- P-20 Neglected to select a competency-area. “I need all [of them.”
- P-38 X

1996 cohort
- P-15 Neglected to select a competency-area. “None.”
- P-16 X
- P-32 X

1997 cohort
- P-01 X X(a)
- P-17 X
- P-19 Neglected to select a competency-area. All “interwoven.”
- P-40 Neglected to select a competency-area. All “intertwined.”

1998 cohort
- P-02 X(e)
- P-05 X
- P-14 Neglected to select a competency-area. “I can’t decide.”
- P-23 X

1999 cohort
- P-25 Neglected to select a competency-area.
- P-26 Neglected to select a competency-area.

2000 cohort
- P-11 Neglected to select a competency-area. “Too early to comment.”
- P-22 X
- P-24 Neglected to select a competency-area. Had not thought “in those terms.”
- P-27 X
- P-28 Neglected to select a competency-area. Cover “every aspect of leadership.”
- P-29 X
- P-36 X
- P-39 Neglected to select a competency-area. “All were useful.”
Participant Interviews: Part 2, Question 5b, continued

Of the six major competencies, which one has been the least useful, or least valuable, for you to develop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency-area*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-08</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Competency-area descriptors are as follows:
- Competency-area 1. Effective teacher/instructor/mentor
- Competency-area 2. Dynamic change-agent
- Competency-area 3. Effective organizer
- Competency-area 4. Collaborative consultant
- Competency-area 5. Reflective researcher
- Competency-area 6. Competent scholar

Some respondents singled out an individual component of a competency-area. In those cases, the corresponding lower-case letter in parentheses indicates the component.
**Participant Interviews: Part 3, Question 1**

*Did your regional group function well?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td>P–11</td>
<td>P–22</td>
<td>P–13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group not</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohesive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacking</td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 3, Question 2

*Have the Roundtables been valuable?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td>P–13</td>
<td>P–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General aspects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally negative</td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>P–02</td>
<td>P–22</td>
<td>P–29</td>
<td>P–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–36</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program-related aspects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social aspects</th>
<th>P–31</th>
<th>P–38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant involvement</td>
<td>P–09</td>
<td>P–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty involvement</td>
<td>P–23</td>
<td>P–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Addressed professional and program aspects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Both aspects valuable</th>
<th>P–37</th>
<th>P–06</th>
<th>P–16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program-aspects always; professional aspects sometimes</td>
<td>P–33</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>P–15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participant Interviews: Part 3, Question 3

*Have you relied on e-mail or the Internet in the Leadership Program?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–13</td>
<td>P–18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relied on electronic communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific comments about electronic communication</td>
<td>P–33</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–17</td>
<td>P–14</td>
<td>P–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–19</td>
<td>P–40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific comments about e-mail</td>
<td>P–06</td>
<td>P–15</td>
<td>P–25</td>
<td>P–22</td>
<td>P–12</td>
<td>P–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–38</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–28</td>
<td>P–35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participant Interviews: Part 4, Question 1

*What does [the concept of] “leadership” mean to you?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defined in relational terms</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–11</td>
<td>P–10</td>
<td>P–08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined in terms of the individual at the forefront</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named selves as leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–26</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined in terms of leadership theorists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>P–25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined in terms of opportunity to serve</td>
<td>P–09</td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participant Interviews: Part 4, Question 2**

*Have you heard the term “tolerance for ambiguity” in reference to the Leadership Program? If so, what does it mean to you?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Had not heard of the term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided no definition</td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td>P–15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Had heard of the term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commented negatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means program is leadership oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally representative</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 4, Question 3

The Leadership Program demands that its participants have a strong theoretical foundation to support its practical application. How has that requirement affected you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory statements of value</td>
<td>P–33</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>P–22</td>
<td>P–24</td>
<td>P–03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement had negative affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td>P–10</td>
<td>P–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement had positive affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides insight</td>
<td>P–31</td>
<td>P–20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects reading habits</td>
<td>P–40</td>
<td>P–14</td>
<td>P–28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participant Interviews: Part 4, Question 4

*How have you changed with regard to attitude, habits, or both as a result of the Leadership Program?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no change</td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In habits</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In attitude and habits</td>
<td>P–06</td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>P–02</td>
<td>P–24</td>
<td>P–10</td>
<td>P–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 1

*Do you believe that the faculty functions as a team?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty functions as a team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–38</td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of teamwork exist</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–22</td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td>P–10</td>
<td>P–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty does not function as a team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues exist (undefined)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 2

*Do you believe that all faculty members operate in ways that are true to the philosophy and the Leadership Program as it is described in printed and website promotional material?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response or challenged Leadership’s philosophy</td>
<td>P–09</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td>P–36</td>
<td>P–03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty operate in ways true to philosophy of Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided rationales for faculty</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–22</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty does not operate in ways true to philosophy of Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexplained/ambiguous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–02</td>
<td>P–24</td>
<td>P–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-perception incorrect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–25</td>
<td>P–39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 3**

*The Leadership Program claims that it is participant-driven. In your experience, does this seem to be the case? Why or why not?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response/indefinite response</td>
<td>P–15</td>
<td>P–02</td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant-driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexplained/ambiguous</td>
<td>P–09</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–28</td>
<td>P–13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant influences</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty responsibility</td>
<td>P–31</td>
<td>P–27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stresses of program</td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>P–11</td>
<td>P–30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not participant-driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-driven vision and criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td>P–26</td>
<td>P–22</td>
<td>P–14</td>
<td>P–39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants have no voice, no authority</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>P–25</td>
<td>P–24</td>
<td>P–10</td>
<td>P–03</td>
<td>P–03</td>
<td>P–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 4

Do you believe that a partnership exists to the extent that the faculty and students are all equal participants in the Leadership Program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of equal partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexplained responses</td>
<td>P–33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to specific times, faculty, program aspects</td>
<td>P–09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality a positive necessity</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P–36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 5

*Have you gotten the faculty support that you’ve needed?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received faculty support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–33</td>
<td>P–20</td>
<td>P–38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of participant responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>P–06</td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>P–19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive faculty support</td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 5, Question 6

*If you could ask the faculty one question—without fear or reprisal—what would it be?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no response</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–04</td>
<td>P–15</td>
<td>P–11</td>
<td>P–12</td>
<td>P–08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feeling of hesitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–14</td>
<td>P–28</td>
<td>P–13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses of respondents’ questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances and time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–27</td>
<td>P–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–09</td>
<td>P–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–38</td>
<td>P–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–01</td>
<td>P–31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program aspects</td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigor and competency</td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td>P–06</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 1

*The Leadership Program is sometimes alleged to be less rigorous than a traditional doctoral program. Please comment on that allegation.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct response to stated issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-embedded aspect adds to value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency-based aspect and rigor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No criteria for comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-05</td>
<td>P-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less rigorous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally rigorous or more rigorous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No experience with other programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-11</td>
<td>P-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to philosophy</td>
<td>P-31</td>
<td>P-07</td>
<td>P-16</td>
<td>P-01</td>
<td>P-14</td>
<td>P-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of participant</td>
<td>P-38</td>
<td>P-31</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-24</td>
<td>P-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-04</td>
<td>P-07</td>
<td>P-16</td>
<td>P-01</td>
<td>P-14</td>
<td>P-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-24</td>
<td>P-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-06</td>
<td>P-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-01</td>
<td>P-14</td>
<td>P-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-24</td>
<td>P-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-07</td>
<td>P-16</td>
<td>P-01</td>
<td>P-14</td>
<td>P-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-24</td>
<td>P-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to traditional programs</td>
<td>P-09</td>
<td>P-20</td>
<td>P-15</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td>P-02</td>
<td>P-26</td>
<td>P-27</td>
<td>P-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-21</td>
<td>P-20</td>
<td>P-15</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td>P-02</td>
<td>P-26</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-33</td>
<td>P-20</td>
<td>P-15</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td>P-02</td>
<td>P-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-37</td>
<td>P-20</td>
<td>P-15</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td>P-02</td>
<td>P-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 2

Which was more difficult to complete — the dissertation or the portfolio?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td>P-04</td>
<td>P-15</td>
<td>P-01</td>
<td>P-02</td>
<td>P-25</td>
<td>P-11</td>
<td>P-10</td>
<td>P-03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-32</td>
<td>P-19</td>
<td>P-05</td>
<td>P-27</td>
<td>P-12</td>
<td>P-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-14</td>
<td>P-28</td>
<td>P-30</td>
<td>P-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-23</td>
<td>P-29</td>
<td>P-35</td>
<td>P-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation more difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>P-20</td>
<td>P-16</td>
<td>P-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-26</td>
<td>P-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-38</td>
<td>P-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio more difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduates (none)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>P-09</td>
<td>P-06</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation and portfolio equally difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 3

Discuss the final paper. For example, was the nature of the paper a surprise? Did you find doing it a valuable experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a surprise</td>
<td>P–09*</td>
<td>P–06*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not a surprise</td>
<td>P–17</td>
<td>P–26</td>
<td>P–39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may or may not have been a surprise</td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>P–15*</td>
<td>P–40*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–20</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Asterisks indicate participants who did not find writing the final paper a valuable experience.*
Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 4

*Did you set a deadline for completing the Leadership Program? If so, did you meet it? Why or why not?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set and met deadline</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P–36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participant Interviews: Part 6, Question 5**

Discuss some pros and cons about your experience in the Leadership Program. For example, did you experience any surprises—positive or negative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already answered</td>
<td>P–37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant, faculty, and staff support</td>
<td>P–33</td>
<td>P–16</td>
<td>P–24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both positive and negative</td>
<td>P–21</td>
<td>P–07</td>
<td>P–22</td>
<td>P–10</td>
<td>P–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time, religious concerns, regional group</td>
<td>P–32</td>
<td>P–05</td>
<td>P–11</td>
<td>P–30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

COVER LETTER AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: FACULTY
Hi!

I have a big favor to ask you. My dissertation is a qualitative one that describes the Leadership Program from its inception to the present. In order to get a complete picture, I am using my own experience, documentation such as minutes from faculty meetings, and faculty and participant interviews. This is where you come in.

The following questions came about in three ways: (1) From my own regional group, Berrien District (BerrienDis); (2) from participant interviews; and (3) from conversations with my dissertation committee. The questions are intended to form part of the triangulation so important to research studies.

Some of the questions require only short responses. Others require more thought. I know how precious time is for all of us so whatever you can do will become a valuable part of the history of the program.

Please be assured that everything you say will be held in complete confidence. No one will be able to identify you. No one else but me will see the responses. And when the questions and responses appear in the appendix of my dissertation, there will be no way to identify them by individual—if anyone even bothers to look at them!

To make this as easy as possible, I will send you the questions via e-mail. Just fill in your response after each question and send it all back to me as a reply to my message. If you cannot answer the following questions by Monday, June 14, 2004, please let me know right away. Otherwise, I’ll look forward to your responses.

Thank you in advance from the bottom of my heart.

Cilla Tucker
Part 1: Faculty Issues

Question 1. How were you approached about joining the Leadership faculty?

Question 2. What attracted you to the Leadership Program?

Question 3. As a Leadership faculty member, have your expectations been met?

Question 4. What faculty changes have occurred since you joined the Leadership Faculty? Why were these changes made? How have these changes affected the program?

Question 5. Do you believe that the faculty functions as a team? Why or why not?

Question 6. Do you believe that all faculty members operate in ways that are true to the philosophy of the Leadership Program as it is described in printed and website promotional material? Why or why not?

Question 7. What criteria do you use to know when a participant had done enough to prove competency?

Question 8. What happens when a participant demonstrates that the program is not a good fit for him or her, either because of personality or academic issues? How does the faculty deal with this situation?

Question 9. Do you believe that a partnership exists to the extent that faculty and students are all equal participants in the Leadership Program? Why or why not?

Question 10. If you could ask the participants one question, what would it be?

Question 11. How is the process for selecting participants different from what it was when the program was first created?

Question 12. How do you keep continuity in the program and within the faculty when the faculty changes?

Question 13. What program changes have occurred since you joined the Leadership faculty? Why were these changes made? How have these changes affected the program?

Question 14. Briefly describe the portfolio process, from I.D.P. to portfolio presentation.

Question 15. Are the Roundtables valuable experiences for you? Would you like to see changes made in their content? If so, what changes would you propose?

Question 16. Do you believe that the orientations adequately provide participants with a thorough understanding of the Leadership philosophy? Do the orientations equip participants with what they need for completing the program? Why or why not?
Part 3: Communication

Question 17. How are changes in policy and other pertinent news communicated effectively to the participants? Is the current method effective? Are there ways to improve this communication?

Question 18. What effect does the use of technology have on communication? For example, has the use of technology led to deeper discussion? Why or why not?

Question 19. Do you read the minutes of regional-group meetings? Why or why not?

Question 20. Do you respond to faculty discussion questions? Why or why not?
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