Mission Statement

LEAD (Leadership, Engagement, Action, Development) is a center for student leadership and campus activities. We support SF State students, faculty and staff by providing leadership development programs, student organization resources, and event coordination and consultation. LEAD facilitates transformative learning and student engagement, developing strong leaders and conscientious citizens within SF State’s diverse community and beyond.

Rationale: Our mission statement is congruent with the University’s and Student Affairs mission statements by reinforcing the following:
1. An emphasis on student learning
2. Support of the university’s diverse population
3. Social justice and civility
4. Services and resources provision to the SF State community (faculty, staff and students)

Planning Goals

Goal #1: Students in LEAD Theme Community will define leadership using elements of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

Goal #2: Students in Greek organizations will learn about hazing. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

Goal #3: Student attending Student Organization Orientation will know policies and procedures regarding student organizations. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

Goal #4: Students attending the Leadership Symposium will gain knowledge that will be valuable to them as student leaders on campus. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

Goal #5: Increase participation in the Leadership in Action Workshop series. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

Goal #1: Student Learning Outcome

50% of students living in the leadership theme community will broaden their personal definition of leadership over the course of the year to include campus vision and elements of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

Rationale
The Social Change Model is a commonly used one in leadership development programs across the country. By using the tenets of this model, student leaders will gain leadership skills that are reflective of the University’s commitment to social justice.

Measures
Students will write their personal definition of leadership at the opening retreat in August and then again at the end of the academic year.
**Results**
The results for this Student Learning Outcome are still pending. End of the year data is still being collected and will then be analyzed by comparing to data collected in August 2010. This should be complete by July 31, 2011.

**Conclusion**
Conclusions can be provided once all data has been collected and analyzed.

**Goal #2: Student Learning Outcome**

Students attending the anti-hazing workshop will be able to accurately define hazing and provide examples of hazing after the workshop. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

**Rationale**
Hazing continues to be an issue confronting students in the fraternity and sorority community not only at SF State, but on an inter/national level as well. The number of hazing complaints received by LEAD in recent years has increased, prompting a need to educate students about hazing. Many students in organizations that have recently faced allegations of hazing are not able to articulate an accurate definition of hazing. Furthermore, many of the Greek chapters on campus are local chapters and do not receive any hazing education since they are not affiliated with inter/national organizations that mandate education on such issues. Assisting students with understanding examples of hazing and how to accurately define it will give them the knowledge necessary to assess their chapter’s new member education program to see if activities that could be considered hazing are occurring.

**Measures**
A pre-test and post-test will be administered to students attending the educational hazing workshop.

**Results**
A total of 12 hazing workshops were held during the 2010-2011 academic year. Unfortunately, pre-tests and post-tests were not conducted at any of the workshops. Anecdotal evidence based on the discussions with participants during the workshops suggests that significant learning about the definition of hazing occurred along with an increased ability of participants to provide accurate examples of hazing.

**Conclusion**
Fewer reports of student organization hazing were reported to LEAD during the 2010-2011 academic year than in previous years. Although causality cannot be claimed, the number of hazing workshops increased during the 2010-2011 academic year and the number of reported hazing cases decreased. This suggests that the educational hazing workshops could be a contributing factor to the decreased number of reported hazing incidents.

Hazing workshops will continue to occur during the 2011-2012 academic year. By the start of the academic year, a standard pre-test and post-test will be developed to use at all hazing workshops conducted in the future.

**Goal #3: Student Learning Outcome**

Students attending the Student Leader Orientation will increase their knowledge of policies and procedures regarding student organizations by an average of 30%. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

**Rationale**
Becoming an officer of a recognized student organization comes with many responsibilities. The Student Leader Orientation session is designed to provide student leaders with the knowledge and resources needed to be a successful officer of a recognized student organization on campus and to make them aware of University expectations and policies.
Measures
A pre-test and post-test will be administered to students attending the Student Leader Orientation session.

Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Number of sessions</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Average pre-test score</th>
<th>Average post-test score</th>
<th>Average knowledge increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion
The student learning outcome was achieved and surpassed.

Goal #4: Program Objective

75% of students attending the Leadership Symposium will network with other student leaders and learn about campus resources. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

Rationale
The Leadership Symposium is an opportunity for SF State leaders to connect with each other, build partnerships and develop leadership skills. This event is designed to assist students in their development as leaders on campus and is held strategically at the start of the fall semester to provide students with information and resources at the beginning of the academic year.

Measures
Attendees will complete an evaluation after the Leadership Symposium.

Results
464 students attended the Leadership Symposium on September 9, 2011. An evaluation was conducted after the Symposium in electronic format. All attendees were contacted via email after the Symposium and asked to complete the online evaluation. 67 responses were received, a response rate of 14%.

At the Leadership Symposium, I networked with other student leaders at SF State.

- Strongly Agree = 15
- Agree = 34
- Disagree = 13
- Strongly Disagree = 5
- 73.13% of respondents (49 total) indicated that they did network with other student leaders at SF State while at the Symposium by answering strongly agree or agree to this question.
The networking and experiential activities led by Drew from the Pacific Leadership Institute provided me with an opportunity to meet other student leaders on campus.

- Strongly Agree = 24
- Agree = 34
- Disagree = 3
- Strongly Disagree = 6
- 86.57% of respondents (58 total) indicated that they had an opportunity to meet other student leaders on campus during Drew’s session by answering strongly agree or agree to this question.

At the Leadership Symposium, I learned about other student organizations and campus organizations at SF State.

- Strongly Agree = 18
- Agree = 29
- Disagree = 15
- Strongly Disagree = 5
- 70.15% of respondents (47 total) indicated that they learned about other student organizations and campus organizations by answering strongly agree or agree to this question.

At the Leadership Symposium, I received information that will be valuable to me as a student leader at SF State.

- Strongly Agree = 28
- Agree = 31
- Disagree = 6
- Strongly Disagree = 2
- 88.06% of respondents (59 total) indicated that they received information that will be valuable to them as a student leader by answering strongly agree or agree to this question.
Conclusion

After reviewing the responses to the 4 questions related to networking and campus resources, it can be concluded that this programmatic objective was achieved. However, the response rate for the evaluation could be improved. A couple identified factors could have contributed to the low response rate. First, there was an error with the link to the evaluation in the first email that was sent to invite attendees to submit the evaluation. Attendees may have been frustrated by this and therefore less likely to submit the evaluation after receiving the second email with the correct link. In addition, there were 125 students that did not pre-register for the Symposium and had to register on site using a sign-in sheet. Many of the handwritten email addresses of attendees were illegible, so those students never had an opportunity to complete the evaluation.

Goal #5: Program Objective

Students attending the Student Leader Orientation will increase their knowledge of policies and procedures regarding student organizations by an average of 30%. (Campus Strategic Plan Goals I, V and VI)

Rationale

The Leadership in Action Workshop series serves as an opportunity for student leaders to further develop their own personal leadership skills and interact with other students, faculty and staff in a small setting.

Measures

Attendance information and satisfaction surveys will be collected at each workshop and then compared with data from previous years.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Number of workshops offered</th>
<th>Number of attendees</th>
<th>Average number of attendees per workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each attendee completed a paper evaluation at the conclusion of each workshop. With regard to satisfaction, one question on the evaluation asked attendees to rank the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: overall, I thought this was a good workshop. The collective results show that 100% of attendees either strongly agreed or agreed with that statement.

- Strongly agree = 63.7%
- Agree = 36.3%
- Not Sure =0%
- Disagree = 0%
- Strongly Disagree = 0%

Conclusion

With regard to increasing attendance by 10%, this programmatic objective was not achieved. From the 2009-2010 academic year to the 2010-2011 academic year, the average number of attendees per workshop decreased by 17.22%.

With regard to satisfaction, no satisfaction data for workshops held during the 2009-2010 academic year exists. Without this data, it is impossible to determine whether or not satisfaction increased 10%. However, considering that 100% of attendees indicated that they either strongly agreed or agreed with the statement that the workshop was good, that is the highest that it could have been and could not have increased any more.