

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-15-2019

The effect of leadership programs on engagement

Megan Ann Henry
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you -
share your thoughts on our feedback form.

Recommended Citation

Henry, Megan Ann, "The effect of leadership programs on engagement" (2019). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2659.

<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/2659>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

THE EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS ON ENGAGEMENT

by

Megan Ann Henry

A Thesis

Submitted to the
Department of Educational Services and Leadership
College of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirement

For the degree of
Master of Arts in Higher Education

at

Rowan University

May 12, 2019

Thesis Chair: Dr. Andrew Tinnin

© 2019 Megan Ann Henry

Acknowledgements

Life would be impossible to bare without a strong support system behind you at every turn. For this and so much more I would like to thank my sister Erin, first and foremost, for being a huge part of that support system for me. I cannot begin to express how much it means to me that she is here through this experience with me. She has been unconditionally supportive, tough when necessary, and insightful throughout my graduate experience and both inspires and motivates me to continue moving forward every day. From reading my writings, to cooking me food, and reminding me to relax, I do not have enough words to thank Erin for all that she has done for me but hopefully this is a start.

To my parents, I am grateful for their unconditional support and love as I brave being the first in my immediate family to obtain a graduate education. To my friends and colleagues at the Chamberlain Student Center and Campus Activities, thank you for talking me through every high and low this year and all times before this. Thank you, Lauren Kuski, for being the best supervisor I could ever ask for, and for letting me use your own thesis work to inspire my own. Lastly, I would also like to thank Dr. Andrew Tinnin for his guidance to our class, especially the counsel he has provided to me. Dr. Tinnin may not have started our thesis process with us in the summer of 2018, but I could not imagine having gotten this done and truly becoming a higher education professional without his guidance and support.

Abstract

Megan Ann Henry

THE EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS ON ENGAGEMENT

2018-2019

Andrew Tinnin, Ed.D,

Master of Arts in Higher Education

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect that collegiate leadership programs offered through Leadership Rowan had on student levels of engagement at Rowan University. This study sought to find a connection between participation in leadership programs and higher levels of engagement as well as evidence of applied leadership skills as a result of their engagement. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was used to develop a measurement instrument to quantify student engagement. The survey was distributed to undergraduate students who engaged in the leadership Rowan Leadership Certificates at the Silver and Gold Levels.

The conclusions revealed that participants in the leadership programs were identified as highly engaged students. Data revealed a high measure of activities and abilities that are attributed to leadership values as outlined by the programmatic theoretical framework. It also revealed that students were able to articulate the ways in which they acted in diverse leadership positions in their everyday life. Findings are consistent with previous research and provide more knowledge on the effectiveness of leadership programs as co-curricular educational opportunities.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iv
List of Tables	viii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Significance of the Study	2
Assumptions and Limitations	3
Operational Definitions.....	3
Research Questions.....	4
Overview of the Study	4
Chapter II: Review of the Literature	6
Defining Leadership.....	6
Student Leadership Programs	7
CAS Standards for Student Leadership Programs	9
Student Leadership Theory: The Social Change Model	10
Student Engagement Theory.....	12
The National Survey of Student Engagement.....	14
Relevant Research on Engagement and Leadership	16
The Leadership Rowan Program	18
Recent Research on Leadership Rowan.....	19
Summary of the Literature Review	20
Chapter III: Methodology	22

Table of Contents (Continued)

Context of Study22

Population24

Data Collection Instruments24

Data Gathering Procedures25

Data Analysis25

Chapter IV: Findings.....27

 Profile of the Sample27

 Analysis of the Data.....29

 Research Question 129

 Research Question 236

 Research Question 343

Chapter V: Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations45

 Summary of Study45

 Discussion of the Findings.....46

 Research Question 146

 Research Question 248

 Research Question 351

 Conclusions.....52

 Recommendations for Future Practice.....53

 Recommendations for Future Research53

References.....55

Appendix A: Permissions to Use Survey Instrument57

Table of Contents (Continued)

Appendix B: Survey Instrument Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey62

List of Tables

Table	Page
4.1. Age of Sample (N=43).....	28
4.2. Grade Point Average/GPA (N=43).....	29
4.3. Connecting Academic Experiences to Everyday Life (N=35)	30
4.4. Emphasis of Coursework (N=35)	31
4.5. Hours Spent Preparing for Class per Week (N=35)	32
4.6. Length of Written Assignments (N=35)	33
4.7. Hours Spent Working per Week (N=35)	34
4.8. Institutional Influence on Knowledge, Skills, and Personal Development (N=35)....	35
4.9. Frequencies of Interactions with Peers in Academic Settings (N=35)	37
4.10. Frequencies of Interactions with Faculty (N=35)	38
4.11. Hours Spent in Non-Academic Activity Per Week (N=35).....	39
4.12. Academic Future Planning (N=35).....	40
4.13. Quality of Interactions with the Following People at Your Institution (N=35).....	41

Chapter I

Introduction

Student engagement theory is a student development theory that has been a topic of discussion in higher education research since the early 2000's (Kuh, 2009).

Engagement theory measures both the time and energy students devote to activities as well as the institutional effort devoted to utilizing best practices to provide activities and their correlations to positive learning outcomes (Kuh, 2009; Kuh et al., 2008). Research in student engagement theory today tends to seek out practices that encourage students to reflect on their own skills and contributions to their communities (Kahn, 2014). In the context of undergraduate programming, while a student can choose to engage in many co-curricular activities, not all activities are as directly focused on the development of personal and professional skills as those that are focused on leadership development.

Statement of the Problem

The term leadership development is common in current literature on higher education outcomes, but a shared meaning of what this development process looks like or what it should achieve has yet to be defined (Dugan, 2017). Moving beyond the commonly held perception of leadership as a position, recent studies have come to find that leadership development processes, when applied as an intentional piece of a student's co-curricular activity, can lead to important developmental outcomes (Christensen, 2015; Owen, 2012). Of all the leadership theory constructs present in modern research, the Leadership Rowan Leadership Certificate Program at Rowan University has adopted the Social Change Model. Little research has been done at Rowan University on the effect of student learning through the leadership programs on outcomes

like student engagement. Furthermore, research in the field is lacking on studies that observe the effect of leadership programs and measured levels of student engagement, or their ability to apply the skills learned in everyday life.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effect of participation in Leadership Rowan programs at Rowan University on measured levels of student engagement as well as the student's ability to apply learned values as defined by the theoretical framework of the leadership program. Leadership Rowan launched a new Leadership Certificate Program in 2018. To encourage and instruct an integrated and diverse process of leadership development, this program contains three levels; Bronze, Silver, and Gold; and is structured on the theoretical framework of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. Specifically, the study seeks to evaluate students involved in the Leadership Certificate program at the Silver and Gold level.

Significance of the Study

This study examined the impact of the Leadership Rowan Leadership Certificate at the Silver and Gold level on measured levels of student engagement. It then evaluated how involvement in these programs impacted a student's ability to apply leadership values learned according to the Social Change Model in everyday life. These findings may serve as a point of reference to evaluate the effectiveness of the Leadership Certificate Program in its inaugural year and contribute to the continuing development and improvement of the program. The study will also add to the overall literature on student engagement and leadership development programs.

Assumptions and Limitations

The scope of this study was limited to students at Rowan University in Glassboro, NJ in the 2018-2019 academic year. The students observed were those who engage in the Leadership Rowan Leadership Certificate Program at the Silver and Gold levels only. It is assumed that the information gathered from student self-reported surveys are truthful and an accurate statement of their present opinions and feelings. The study acknowledges the use of a convenience sample and assumes the sample is representative of the entire student population engaged in leadership programs. The study also acknowledges the possibility of researcher bias due to personal relationships to participants and the program being observed.

Operational Definitions

1. Leader: An individual who enacts themselves and others towards a certain purpose or goal, commonly tied to a position of formal authority with a title or informal authority through a group (Dugan, 2017).
2. Leadership: A term that typically refers to the overarching process of skills development, usually within a group of people with a common purpose (Christensen, 2015; Dugan, 2017).
3. Values: A reference point of knowing, being and doing (Dugan, 2017);
4. Student Leader: A student who often self-identifies as such and is co-curricularly enrolled in the Leadership Certificate Program at the Silver or Bronze Level.
5. Leadership Rowan: The collegiate leadership involvement program at Rowan University in Glassboro, NJ.

6. Leadership Certificate Program: The co-curricular leadership program administered by Leadership Rowan. Containing three levels, Bronze, Silver, and Gold, the program teaches students a series of values in leadership development at each level according to the Social Change Model through seminar engagement, interpersonal activity, and reflection.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. How has participation in the Leadership Rowan program impacted measurements of student engagement in silver and gold level students?
2. How does participation in Leadership Rowan affect a student's ability to apply leadership values in their everyday life as defined by the Social Change Model?
3. Do students who are more highly engaged also participate in more leadership practices?

Overview of the Study

Chapter II provides a review of various sections of the literature identified as relevant to this study. The review critically analyzes past and present studies on leadership programs and engagement, the theoretical structure of the Social Change Model, and past research on the Leadership Rowan program at Rowan University. This review provides a basis for student engagement theory, leadership theory, and current research in engagement and leadership.

Chapter III maps out the methodologies and procedures used in this study. This overview includes the context of this study within the department of Orientation & Student Leadership Programs (OSLP) at Rowan University. It provides an overview of

the target population of student leaders who engage with the OLSP programming initiatives through Leadership Rowan and the Leadership Certificates, with the convenience sample of undergraduate students who are enrolled in the Silver and Gold Certificates. The section also outlines the proposed measuring instruments utilized to measure and collect data, the *Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey* (Appendix B).

Chapter IV illustrates the findings of the study. It provides an overview of the sample profile of student leaders in Silver and Gold Leadership Certificates. It revisits the proposed research questions with an analysis of the data regarding the measured reports of engagement and the qualitative responses on the application of learned leadership values in day to day life.

Chapter V provides a discussion of the findings in relevance to the observed research questions. It discusses the observed engagement patterns of student leaders in Leadership Certificates and presents conclusions, limitations, and suggestions for future research on engagement, leadership programs, and the Social Change Model.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Defining Leadership

The concept of leadership takes on many forms in literature today and can be accompanied by numerous definitions. While many institutions provide statements of intent to develop future leaders, those same institutions have historically taken this intent to focus on the individual development of students holding leadership positions (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), 2015). Leadership is oftentimes thought of in terms of an individual role flowing from some form of influence or authority (Dugan, 2017; Komives, Wagner, & Associates, 2017). People who had great leadership ability were thought to have a certain list of traits, also referred to as skills, that set them apart from the rest of the population and made them more effective leaders (Dugan, 2017). These skills vary across the literature but can be understood to generally include adaptability, decision making, problem-solving, interpersonal skills, communication skills, self-efficacy, and organization skills, just to name a few (Dugan, 2017). However, major breakthroughs in leadership education emerged as it became apparent that many skills indicative of leaders could be acquired, thus popular thought was brought away from this singular mind frame to that of the process of learned leadership (Komives et al., 2017). Leadership in the context of leadership programs, as well as in the context of this study, is referred to as a process of development that occurs over time, and most often in group settings, that leads to the eventual development of leadership skills.

This move in focus to the process of leadership allows an individual to be taught how to be a leader, which can foster individual change as well as enable them to envision themselves in a bigger picture of the larger community around them (Dugan, 2011, 2017; Komives et al., 2017). The development of the future leader and investment in their leadership skill set has, in fact, become an expected and highly sought-after outcome of most college education today, placing leadership development on the forefront of co-curricular activity (Dugan, 2011, 2017). Increases in this skill set as a direct result of leadership education are a great appeal to both the institution and the student who invests in them as these skills can lead to other outcomes of success like academic advancement and student satisfaction, reflecting common elements of co-curricular activity that can also be linked to student engagement in higher education (Christensen, 2015; Dugan, 2017; Kuh, 2009; Pike & Kuh, 2005).

Student Leadership Programs

The study of leadership development has seen many advances in research during the past 15 years as it has become the subject of multiple studies in the field of higher education (Christensen, 2015; Owen, 2012). The term leadership development is used in research today to describe the skills development of a group of people and is a popular term tossed around higher education (Christensen, 2015; Owen, 2012). However, many have come to believe that leadership skills are simply a position or a mere result of growing up with a college degree (Christensen, 2015; Owen, 2012). What some leaders in higher education fail to realize is that when leadership development is brought into focus in leadership programs at an institutional setting, it goes beyond the label of simply being a by-product of college education and becomes an intentional piece of collegiate

co-curricular development efforts on the individual student development level (Christensen, 2015). Research suggests that human development and leadership development are connected to each other as leadership skills, like interpersonal communications, assist students moving through various stages of life, making sense of the world around them through new knowledge and perspectives (Owen, 2012).

Leadership development programs that entail intentional skill building can come from a variety of sources, such as sociocultural discussions, faculty-student mentoring, community service projects, involvement in various organizations, formal leadership programs, or institutional program services (Christensen, 2015). Whatever the source may be, students are placed into contexts through leadership programs that span the classroom and encourage them to learn more complex ways of thinking and being among diverse biopsychosocial changes (Owen, 2012). However, not all such leadership sources provide the same quality or effect as others. Leadership development is shown to be a process of learning and personal growth rather than an end result; and high impact practices such as those utilized in formal collegiate leadership development programs have shown to produce the most positive effects through the mentoring services, diverse socialization with peers, and civic projects provided within them (Christensen, 2015; Owen, 2012).

The lack of consensus regarding the definition of leadership development and the skills encompassed therein creates unique challenges in operationalizing practice and outcomes in this growing field of student affairs (Christensen, 2015; Owen, 2012). However, it can be argued that it is impossible to have one universal approach to leadership development as it is a vastly complex topic and should be considered in terms

of the context in which it takes place (Christensen, 2015). Whichever process or theoretical model the program is rooted in, effective leadership program practices have routinely been reported to both create meaningful environments and infuse identity development (Christensen, 2015).

CAS standards for student leadership programs. Despite the lack of consensus on formal leadership theoretical framework, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) has set a prescribed list of standards for all leadership programs to strive to meet in order to provide the best quality program in the interest of student development in the higher education field. These standards are meant to serve as guidelines so that a proper program can be formed that meets institution needs according to the student context (CAS, 2015). The twelve standards of the CAS guideline for student leadership programs are:

1. **Mission:** student leadership programs must engage and develop students in the process of leadership. The mission of the program must be under regular review and reflect the mission of the institution.
2. **Program:** the formal education of students must promote student learning and collaboration with colleagues across six domains: knowledge acquisition and application, cognitive complexity, intrapersonal development, interpersonal competence, humanitarianism and civic engagement, and practical competence.
3. **Organization and Leadership:** To achieve outcomes, student leadership programs must be purposeful and have clearly stated goals, accessible policies and expectations, and organizational flow.

4. Human Resources: programs must be staffed by individuals who are knowledgeable and qualified to accomplish the program mission.
5. Ethics: programs must adopt appropriate ethical practices.
6. Law, Policy, and Governance: Programs must uphold appropriate laws and regulations.
7. Diversity, Equity, and Access: Programs must maintain environments that are welcoming and inclusive to people of diverse abilities and backgrounds.
8. Institutional and External Relations: Programs must comply with all institutional policies.
9. Financial Resources: Appropriate funding is required to accomplish all program mission and goals.
10. Technology: Necessary technology to support program operations is required to achieve mission and goals.
11. Facilities and Equipment: As necessary for appropriate mission and workspace.
12. Assessment and Evaluation: All programs must have a clearly dictated assessment and evaluation plan to track all progress and needs for improvement to develop the program (CAS, 2015).

Student Leadership Theory: The Social Change Model

While the school of thought on leadership theory is vast, the most applicable theoretical basis on which the Rowan University Leadership Rowan Certificate Program is based on is the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (SCM). The SCM was created specifically to understand college students in a context that reflects current societal changes that affect student populations in institutional contexts (Komives et al.,

2017). A unique feature of the SCM is that it reflects a leadership development model as a process that starts with personal commitment, progresses in collaboration and shared leadership, and is intended for service of others in the greater community (Komives et al., 2017).

Under the social change model, leadership is shown to be a values-based process that is purposeful in nature to bring about positive social change and aims to encourage socially responsible leaders (Dugan, 2017; Komives et al., 2017). Operating on a set of basic assumptions, the model positions leadership as a learnable function of meaning-making and life experience (Dugan, 2017). The SCM provides a working framework that is able to be adapted for the various social contexts and individuals that it is used for (Dugan, 2017). The goal of a socially responsible leader under this model is to effectively teach that leader about social change efforts while developing the core values associated with the model in that leader (Dugan, 2017).

The seven values of the SCM, also referred to as the Seven C's, are grouped into three categories: group, individual, and society (Dugan, 2017; Komives et al., 2017). The group values include collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility (Dugan, 2017; Komives et al., 2017). Individual values encompass consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment, and finally, society covers the final value of citizenship (Dugan, 2017; Komives et al., 2017). When proper development in all categories is achieved through the model, then the student, or group of students, is better informed to bring about change (Dugan, 2017; Komives et al., 2017). Societal change is necessary for addressing societal issues across all backgrounds and can be considered a functional outcome of leadership (Dugan, 2017). Students who are engaged in the development of

their leadership skills through the SCM are given a roadmap that lays out a process for improving goal achievement, but this process is a flexible and ongoing one as each value is interchangeable and meant to act on each other as they develop (Dugan, 2017; Komives et al., 2017)

The Leadership Certificate program through Leadership Rowan focuses each level of its program on a different category of the SCM, allowing the students who participate in the program to engage in a deep developmental process of the skill set found within each category. When a student engages in all levels of the leadership program through Leadership Rowan, the goal is that they are developing as individuals in all 3 areas of the SCM and gain purposeful experience in all seven of the values or skills, eventually leading to socially responsible future leaders who can enact change. By participating in the leadership program, students may show development of these skills as a direct outcome of the program and contribute to a significant factor of student engagement that can relate to other positive outcomes in the institutional context.

Student Engagement Theory

A college degree has become the new standard for economic self-sufficiency as well as responsible citizenship, and earning a college degree is said to be linked to long-term cognitive, social, and economic benefits that are often passed on to future generations (Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, & Gonyea, 2008). However, in higher education many students who begin college leave before completion (Kuh et al., 2008). Certain institutional characteristics play a critical role in student persistence elements, such as student background and individual interactions with faculty and staff, and research suggests that there is much to learn about such characteristics and their unique link to

success from student engagement (Kahn, 2014; Kuh, 2009; Kuh et al., 2008; Thompson, 2013). One such study that links success and student engagement in co-curricular activity was performed by Lauren Thompson (2013) who observed student engagement among students of the Rowan After Hours late-night program. The theoretical framework surrounding engagement in her study as well as the inspiration for supporting research questions will be replicated in this study.

Student engagement represents both the time and energy students invest in activities and the effort the institution devotes to utilizing effective practices (Kuh, 2009; Kuh et al., 2008). Engagement as we know it was first developed to address concerns on gains in student learning and personal development in the 1970s (Koljatic & Kuh, 2001). Students gain much knowledge and skill from what they do while in college, and engagement theory attempted to provide direct evidence of individual student development through the college experience (Koljatic & Kuh, 2001; Schroeder 2003; Thompson, 2013). Engagement theory seeks to understand the nature of meaningful experiences that shape the college experience, and those activities that create meaningful experiences have come to be understood to include those that are accomplished in and out of the classroom (Kuh, 2009; Schroeder, 2003; Thompson, 2013). Such engagement is suggested by research to have the ability to build the foundational skills and dispositions that students need to live successful lives in and out of college (Kuh, 2009).

Education is constructed of multiple kinds of activities, including school-sponsored organizations, and those students who are engaged in learning in and out of the classroom are more likely to succeed in their education (Kuh, 2009; Thompson, 2013). Research performed by Pike and Kuh (2005) suggest that engagement in college is

associated with skills that lead to such success in higher education, such as gains in general ability and critical thinking. Studies also suggest that students who leave college prematurely were less engaged than those who persisted through graduation (Kuh et al., 2008). For those reasons, engagement theory is often used as an organizing assessment construct to evaluate institutional efforts in providing the most effective policies and practices needed within an institution's context to increase engagement (Kuh, 2009; Pike & Kuh, 2005). To be actively engaged in educationally purposeful practice, students must be making clear gains in ability, and an institution is clearly committed to engagement efforts if they promote those policies and practices put in place to foster it (Thompson, 2013).

Positive relationships exist between educational outcomes like persistence and engagement, but significant variation in engagement still occurs at the individual level (Kahn, 2014; Thompson, 2013). Research has begun to identify specific high impact practices that are effective in engaging students, such as collaborative learning, service learning projects, and learning environments that promote social relations and shared responsibility, and much of that research is done thanks in part to the development of such assessment tools like the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (Kahn, 2014).

The National Survey of Student Engagement. The NSSE was created in 1998 to explore ways of understanding how institutions promote effective practices and in what ways students engage in them (NSSE, n.d.). The NSSE developed as an alternative measurement of institutional performance and effectiveness to measure “the extent to which students are engaged in high impact practices” (Campbell & Cabrera, 2011, p. 78).

Panels of experts charged by the Pew Foundation developed a survey that would measure engagement under the accepted theory that more engagement could indicate more learning, and the survey holds the potential to advance knowledge on the role of the student experience in relation to outcomes like learning, academic success, and persistence (Campbell & Cabrera, 2011; NSSE, n.d.). Five benchmarks are outlined in the NSSE that elaborate the most important student-institutions engagement constructs and are presumed applicable across all institution types:

1. Level of academic challenge (LAC): Rigor of coursework
2. Active and collaborative learning (ACL): Whether students are reflective of and apply learning to work with others
3. Enriching educational experiences (EEE): Enriching experiences like study abroad, conversations with diverse others, and research with faculty
4. Student-faculty interaction (SFI): Contact with faculty in and out of the classroom
5. Supportive campus environment (SCE): Relations with faculty, administration, and other support services (Campbell & Cabrera, 2011, p. 79).

All NSSE benchmarks are measures on the survey on a 0-100 and are meant to reflect the two sides of engagement theory, what the student does and what the institution does to create engagement (Campbell & Cabrera, 2011). The NSSE has developed as a tool to evaluate educational quality, benchmark progress, and make changes in policy to highlight more effective practices (Campbell & Cabrera, 2011). The information provided by such a measure can help gather information on student background and institutional actions to provide them with details about the activities their students engage

in and areas that may need improvement to better engage students (Pike & Kuh, 2005; Thompson, 2013)

Relevant Research on Engagement and Leadership

While the knowledge pool on leadership development and programs has been in a steady growth over the past few years, the breadth of that research covers multiple areas of concentration on the field. Research performed in a dissertation by Christensen (2015) explored growth in leader efficacy, examining the high impact practices of an institutional retreat-based program and its effect on gains in student confidence and ability to perform in higher education environments. In this study, students participated in a retreat program where they worked with a group of peers and mentors from faculty and staff and perform a service project, actions that fit the current definition of high impact practices in higher education (Christensen, 2015). Participation in high impact leadership practices was observed to lead to higher leader efficacy, particularly seen in measures of female efficacy gains (Christensen, 2015).

Similarly, on the engagement side, studies suggest that students who leave college prematurely are less engaged than those who persist to graduation (Kuh et al., 2008). Observing the relationship between student behavior and institutional practices that foster student success, data obtained by the NSSE supports evidence that engagement can benefit all types of students and institutions that have good educational practices are more likely to have better-performing students (Kuh et al., 2008). A more recent study by Kahn (2014) sought to develop the theory of engagement in a way that highlights the student's own contributions and further supports these claims. The research found that offering students an opportunity to engage in high impact practices through taking responsibility

for a learning project encourages deeper reflection of action and identity from the student, which helps develop student identity and other outcomes (Kahn, 2014).

In student affairs practice, a significant study was performed at Rowan University observing the developmental model of the late-night program Rowan After Hours (RAH) and how that model impacted engagement (Thompson, 2013). Utilizing measures of engagement through a modified version of the NSSE, the study found that RAH employees who work between 11-30 hours per week reported higher personal, professional, and academic gains by 67% (Thompson, 2013). The findings suggested that RAH students were more highly engaged in campus life and community, perhaps due to the student development model of RAH (Thompson, 2013). Finally, the study found higher reported gains in work-related skills, understanding of people of diverse backgrounds, ability to communicate more clearly and efficiently, and higher levels of satisfying student and faculty interactions, measures that all suggested heightened engagement (Thompson, 2013).

Educational outcomes like persistence and academic success are similarly observed in both studies on leadership development and engagement. In particular, significant gains have been observed in student populations at Rowan University within the Rowan After Hours program that suggests developmental models employed within the division of student affairs also have positive effects on student outcomes (Thompson, 2013). However, although much research has been done on the impact of engagement in multiple areas of study in higher education, little has been done specifically on the impact of collegiate leadership development programs, specifically in the Leadership Rowan program at Rowan University.

The Leadership Rowan Program

Leadership Rowan is a part of the Office of Orientation and Student Leadership Programs (OSLP) at Rowan University in Glassboro, New Jersey. The programs offered through Leadership Rowan aim to help prepare students for future leadership roles through “education, enrichment, and empowerment” so that students can “transform themselves, their communities, and the world” (Leadership Rowan, n.d.). Leadership Rowan offers several different kinds of educational and co-curricular leadership programs, including leadership conferences, ProfTalk Speaker Series, first-year experience programs, co-curricular leadership education certificates, and leadership awards (Leadership Rowan, n.d.). The Leadership Rowan program acknowledges that there is no one leadership construct to adhere to for optimal learning and that they aim to enable students to explore multiple constructs in order to develop and be best prepared for leadership roles within the University, the community, and the global world (Leadership Rowan, n.d.). The program adheres all activities to four goals:

1. Prepare students for leadership positions by expanding their knowledge of leadership paradigms and enhancing their skills in self-management and ethical decision-making.
2. Provide students with the opportunity to develop the individual talents and organizational tools necessary to foster and sustain healthy organizations.
3. Assist students in the exploration and use of leadership styles, self and group management, and leadership skills as they practice the art of leadership within campus-based and community-based organizations.

4. Provide opportunities for undergraduate students to obtain official recognition of their leadership development in three program phases: a) Leadership Training; b) Leadership Applications and Organizational Effectiveness; and c) Leadership Sustainability (Leadership Rowan, n.d.).

The Leadership Rowan program utilizes several different development sources including mentoring, sociocultural discussions, formal educational programs, and first-year experiences (Christensen, 2015; Leadership Rowan, n.d.). These integrative delivery methods reflect program content that is indicative of a variety of student development theories. The program also places great importance on self-management, ethical decision making, exploration of leadership styles, and collaboration. These qualities suggest curriculum roots in relational development, as apparent when reflecting on Komives's emphasis on the importance of seeking social change, feedback, and collaborative activity (Komives et al., 2017; Leadership Rowan, n.d.).

Recent research on Leadership Rowan. In the past 10 years, a small selection of research has been performed on different aspects of Leadership Rowan. A study done by Gavin Farber (2010) observed outcomes of the Freshmen Leadership Interest Program (FLIP) from participation in the program all the way through four years of undergraduate study. Participants in the study were surveyed about their leadership involvement over their collegiate experience since participating in the programs, and the research showed that students who were surveyed were more likely to be involved in various co-curricular activities, including leadership positions (Farber, 2010). More recently, research has taken a more in-depth look at the impact of Leadership Rowan programs as a whole on student development of self-authorship (Spinks, 2017). Students with a minimum of one

year of participation with Leadership Rowan programs were surveyed and results showed that they had higher levels of measured self-authorship development since their involvement with the program, an outcome that indicates deeper individual values and sense of civic responsibility (Spinks, 2017). Numerous other studies have been conducted on the effect of leadership experience in various areas of university life on different collegiate outcomes, but no studies currently exist that specifically focus on the impact of Leadership Rowan programs on critical university assessment means, like engagement.

Summary of the Literature Review

The research highlighted throughout this chapter emphasizes leadership development programs, the theoretical framework related to leadership development at Rowan University, and student engagement theory. Leadership development coincides with the development of the individual student through many stages of their college lives and enables them to make sense of the world around them through new skills, or values, and perspectives (Owen, 2012). There are many different methods that can be utilized to initiate leadership skill development, and the most effective programs are those that model integrative student development that leads to meaningful social change such as the Social Change Model for Leadership Development demonstrates (Christensen, 2015; Komives et al., 2017; Owen, 2012).

Developing a student's leadership skills has been associated with positive educational outcomes like well-being as well as growth in life skills like interpersonal communications (Owen, 2012). Through involvement in programs, similar outcomes are also associated with student engagement, understood as the time and energy students invest in activities and the effort their institutions devote to utilizing effective practices

(Kuh, 2009; Kuh et al., 2008). These studies in this chapter demonstrate that student leadership development programs are one of the many ways students become involved and develop skills that enable them to be successful in higher education, and engagement can be a useful tool for assessing the effectiveness of institutional support in providing effective programs (Kuh et al., 2008; Pike & Kuh, 2005).

Despite this research, little is known about the impact that leadership programs may have on measured levels of engagement. Furthermore, no studies on engagement have attempted to observe the impact of leadership programs on engagement at Rowan University through the Leadership Rowan Program. The study aims to add to this knowledge base, and the information contained in this review will serve as a guide later in the study to guide interpretation of the data collected from the student survey and identify common thematic concepts.

Chapter III

Methodology

Context of Study

This study was performed at Rowan University, a four-year public institution located in Glassboro, New Jersey. Rowan University was founded as a state normal school in 1923 to serve the rising need to develop teachers who would serve the southern parts of the state (Rowan History, 2018). In 1950, to keep up with the rising demands on post-secondary education as well as the demands of the growing suburban community surrounding the university, the school changed its name to Glassboro State College and functioned as a small-town college until the 1990s (Rowan History, 2018). In 1992, the school would find itself launched into a rapid period of rapid growth as industry giant Henry Rowan gifted the institution \$100 million, changing its name to Rowan College of New Jersey before achieving university status in 1997 (Rowan History, 2018). Today, Rowan University has a student population of nearly 18,500 students and is ranked 19th in the northern region according to *U.S. News & World Report* (Our Past, Present & Future, 2018). Home to 74 bachelorette, 51 masters, and 4 doctoral programs including two medical degrees, Rowan stands as a comprehensive research institution providing quality education and resources to the southern New Jersey community (Rowan History, 2018).

The Office of Orientation and Student Leadership Programs (OSLP) is a department within the institutional division of Student Affairs. OSLP states in their mission statement that they “serve to enhance the experience of undergraduate students” through programs that assist in leadership development as well as “provide a capstone to

students' co-curricular learning and development" (Orientation & Student Leadership Programs, 2018). Leadership Rowan is Rowan University's leadership program, providing education and enrichment initiatives that enable students to transform their co-curricular learning (Leadership Rowan, n.d.). Leadership Rowan employs 3 student program assistants, a professional staff member, and a graduate coordinator. Together this staff oversees the planning and execution of a first-year experience program entitled First-Year Connection: Leadership (FCL), a series of signature events such as the ProfTalk speaking series, and the Leadership Certificate co-curricular program.

The Leadership Certificate program launched a new curriculum in the 2018-2019 academic year. The new certificate program seeks to provide a more active leadership development experience and follows the Social Change Model of Leadership (Leadership Certificates, 2018). The certificate is broken down into 3 levels that focus on different competencies and typically takes a minimum of 3 years to complete. The Bronze Leadership Certificate focuses on individual values of consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment (Leadership Certificates, 2018). The Silver Leadership Certificate focuses on the group values of collaboration, common purpose and controversy with civility (Leadership Certificates, 2018). Finally, the Gold Leadership Certificate focuses on the societal and community value of citizenship (Leadership Certificates, 2018). A total of 628 undergraduate students enrolled for the program at the start of the school year, and 213 of those students have shown to be active participants. At each level, 121 students are enrolled in the Bronze Certificate, 50 in the Silver Certificate, and 42 in the Gold Certificate.

Population

The target population for this study was the estimated 213 undergraduate student leaders who are enrolled in one of the three levels of leadership certificates offered through Leadership Rowan at Rowan University. The available population was the 136 members enrolled in either the Silver or Gold certificate. Participants were asked for their voluntary participation through an email invitation sent to them in the spring 2019 semester. Of the 136 individuals asked to participate, a total of 47 (34.6%) participants completed or partially completed the survey.

Data Collection Instruments

I replicated and modified the *Rowan After Hours Student Employee Survey* presented in the thesis *Rowan After Hours: the impact of student employment on student engagement* by Lauren Thompson (2013). This survey was adapted from the *National Survey of Student Engagement 2018* (NSSE) by the Trustees of Indiana University. Copyright and permissions to use the survey instruments can be found in *Data Collection Instrument permissions and Usage Agreement* (Appendix A).

The 20-item survey is made up of 18 multiple choice, Likert-style questions and 2 open ended response questions. The multiple-choice questions were modified from the NSSE to include background information of students including demographic information and provide a basic understanding of the sample's engagement patterns to determine the relationship between being an active student in the leadership certificate and being actively engaged. The open-ended questions are qualitative in nature and aim to identify the achievement of core competencies achieved by individuals in each certificate level. Specifically, they aim to evaluate a student's understanding and development of group

and societal values as defined in the Leadership Certificate Program at the Silver and Gold levels to demonstrate student learning over the course of their participation in the program. A copy of the Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey can be found in Appendix B.

Data Gathering Procedures

The students chosen to receive the survey are all enrolled in the Silver or Gold Certificate Program through Leadership Rowan in the 2018-2019 academic year. Being in the second or third levels, they all ideally have a minimum of one year's experience participating in leadership programs prior to this certificate. All students are also considered to be active participants in their certificate program, meaning that they have shown active participation in leadership curriculum through completing enrollment and reflection surveys and attending seminar sessions.

The survey was administered January 2019 through February 2019 at Rowan University, and included an introduction, explaining its voluntary nature and informed consent information. The data collected from this survey may help inform Leadership Rowan of the current effectiveness of the new program and help to further develop the certificate curriculum. No identifiers were collected with the completion of the survey.

Data Analysis

Data was collected and analyzed in a convergent design over the course of the study (McMillan, 2016). Variations in student response between certificate levels and across variable like gender and age were explored using Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) software. Data from the multiple-choice questions were analyzed on SPSS using frequency and descriptive tables to examine findings in reference to the

research questions. The open-ended questions were evaluated and coded based on recurring ideas and thematic concepts that align with defined group and societal values as defined by those discussed in the Silver and Gold Certificate Programs (McMillan, 2016). Both sets of data were examined together for common themes and relations (McMillan, 2016).

Chapter IV

Findings

Profile of the Sample

The participants for this study were undergraduate students selected from Rowan University's Leadership Rowan program in Glassboro, New Jersey during the spring 2019 semester. To participate, students must have been enrolled in the Leadership Certificate Program at the Silver or Gold levels. Of the 136 surveys distributed, 35 completed surveys and 12 partial surveys were returned, yielding a completion rate of 26%. Of 43 total respondents, 25 (58.1%) reported enrollment in the Silver certificate and 18 (41.9%) reported enrollment in the Gold certificate. The sample contained 11 males (25.6%) and 32 females (74.4%). Of the 43 valid respondents, there were 14 sophomores (32.6%), 13 juniors (30.2%), 14 seniors (32.6%), and 2 seniors with 5+ years (4.7%). Since the Silver and Gold seminar certificates occur at the second and third level, no freshmen were surveyed in this sample as they typically are only enrolled in the Bronze level.

Table 4.1 describes the respondents reported age, ranging from 18 years old to 24+, with the majority being 20 years of age (27.9%).

Table 4.1

Age of Sample (N=43)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
18 years old	1	2.3
19 years old	9	20.9
20 years old	12	27.9
21 years old	11	25.6
22 years old	7	16.3
23 years old	1	2.3
24+ years old	2	4.7

When asked how many majors participants planned to complete while at Rowan, 31 reported that they intended to complete one major (72.1%), and 12 reported the intent to complete more than one (27.9%). As far as degree aspirations, 7 participants (16.3%) reported that the highest level of education they intend to complete is a bachelor's, 25 (58.1%) reported they intended to complete a master's, and 11 (25.6%) reported that they intended to complete a doctoral or professional degree.

Table 4.2 describes the break down of grades reported by Leadership Certificate students according to their cumulative GPA. Most students reported a cumulative GPA range of 3.8 to 4.0 (30.2%) or 3.2 to 3.4 (30.2%). All respondents reported a cumulative GPA above 2.7 to 2.9, placing 100% of respondents at a passing threshold.

Table 4.2

Grade Point Average/GPA (N=43)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
3.8 to 4.0	13	30.2
3.5 to 3.7	8	18.6
3.2 to 3.4	13	30.2
3.0 to 3.1	8	18.6
2.7 to 2.9	1	2.3

During the spring 2019 semester in which the survey was issued, most of the participants (N=35) reported that they were enrolled in 4 to 6 classes for academic credit (91.4%). The remaining participants were taking 7 or more classes (2.9%), 1 to 3 classes (2.9%), or none at all (2.9%). Overall, Leadership Rowan Certificate participants reported (N=35) that their educational experience was excellent (54.3%), good (42.9%), or fair (2.9%).

Analysis of the Data

Research question 1. How has participation in the Leadership Rowan program impacted measurements of student engagement in silver and gold level students?

Table 4.3 demonstrates how often Leadership Rowan students reported connecting their academic experiences with their everyday life, N=35 due to participant drop out contributed to survey fatigue. The majority of student reported that they Sometimes, Often, or Very Often demonstrate abilities that connect what they learn in the classroom to other classes or other experiences outside of the classroom. Only 2 participants (5.7%) reported that they never include diverse perspectives in course discussions or assignments.

Table 4.3

Connecting Academic Experiences to Everyday Life (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Very Often</i>		<i>Often</i>		<i>Sometimes</i>		<i>Never</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments <i>M=3.37, SD=.598</i>	15	42.9	18	51.4	2	5.7	0	0
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues <i>M=3.09, SD=.742</i>	11	31.4	16	45.7	8	22.9	0	0
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments <i>M=2.97, SD=.923</i>	12	34.3	12	34.3	9	25.7	2	5.7
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue <i>N=34, M=3.03, SD=.717</i>	9	26.5	17	50.0	8	23.5	0	0
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from their perspective <i>M=3.17, SD=.707</i>	12	34.3	17	48.6	6	17.1	0	0
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept <i>N=34, M=3.26, SD=.618</i>	12	35.3	19	55.9	3	8.8	0	0
Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge <i>N=33, M=3.55, SD=.506</i>	18	54.5	15	45.5	0	0	0	0

Table 4.4 illustrates how much emphasis a student’s course work places on different methods within the classroom. The majority of students report that they have Quite a Bit or Very Much used the methods described in Table 4.4, especially forming new ideas based on various pieces of information. Only 2 participants (5.7%) reported that they are asked to memorize course material Very Little.

Table 4.4

Emphasis of Coursework (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Very Much</i>		<i>Quite a Bit</i>		<i>Some</i>		<i>Very Little</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Memorizing course material <i>M=2.83, SD=.891</i>	9	25.7	13	37.1	11	31.4	2	5.7
Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations <i>M=3.29, SD=.622</i>	13	37.1	19	54.3	3	8.6	0	0
Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts <i>M=3.15, SD=.702</i>	11	32.4	17	50.0	6	17.6	0	0
Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source <i>M=3.21, SD=.592</i>	10	29.4	21	61.8	3	8.8	0	0
Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information <i>M=3.29, SD=.579</i>	12	35.3	20	58.8	2	5.9	0	0

Table 4.5 shows how much time students spend per week preparing for class. A total of 19 (54.3%) participants reported spending between 6 to 15 hours per week preparing for class, and only 7 (20%) reported spending less at 1-5 hours per week.

Table 4.5

Hours Spent Preparing for Class per Week (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
1-5 Hours	7	20.0
6-10 Hours	9	25.7
11-15 Hours	10	28.6
16-20 Hours	5	14.3
21-25 Hours	1	2.9
26-30 Hours	2	5.7
30+ Hours	1	2.9

Table 4.6 demonstrates the length of written assignments completed by participants, including those not assigned. All participants (N=35) report being assigned at least 1 written assignment up to 5 pages. Most participants also report being assigned at least one assignment between 6 and 10 pages in length (77.1%). Lastly, just more than half of participants (58.8%) reported being assigned a written assignment 11 pages or more in length.

Table 4.6

Length of Written Assignments (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Up to 5 pages</i>		<i>Between 6 and 10 pages</i>		<i>11 pages or more</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
None	0	0	8	22.9	14	41.2
1-2 Papers	9	25.7	11	31.4	11	32.4
3-5 Papers	8	22.9	12	34.3	8	23.5
6-10 Papers	7	20.0	2	5.7	1	2.9
11-15 Papers	5	14.3	1	2.9	0	0
16-20 Papers	4	11.4	1	2.9	0	0
More than 20	2	5.7	0	0	0	0

Table 4.7 shows how much time students spent per week working on or off campus jobs. The majority of participants (80%) engage in an on-campus job, and most of them spending 16-20 hours per week working (25.7%). The majority of students reported that they do not spend time working on an off-campus job (71.4%). Those who do work off-campus work between 1 to 15 hours, with one working 21-25 hours (2.9%).

Table 4.7

Hours Spent Working per Week (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Working for pay on campus</i>		<i>Working for pay off campus</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
0 Hours	7	20.0	25	71.4
1-5 Hours	4	11.4	3	8.6
6-10 Hours	3	8.6	3	8.6
11-15 Hours	7	20.0	3	8.6
16-20 Hours	9	25.7	0	0
21-25 Hours	2	5.7	1	2.9
26-30 Hours	0	0	0	0
30+ Hours	3	8.6	0	0

Table 4.8 depicts the influence of the institution on student’s reported levels of knowledge, skills, and personal development. The majority of students reported that their time at the university has influenced their surveyed skills Some, Quite a Bit, or Very Much. Only 2.9% of students reported that the institution had Very Little Influence in the areas of analyzing numerical and statistical data, developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics, understanding people of other backgrounds, and being an informed and active citizen.

Table 4.8

Institutional Influence on Knowledge, Skills, and Personal Development (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Very Much</i>		<i>Quite a Bit</i>		<i>Some</i>		<i>Very Little</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Writing clearly and effectively <i>M=3.37, SD=.646</i>	16	45.7	16	45.7	3	8.6	0	0
Speaking clearly and effectively <i>M=3.37, SD=.690</i>	17	48.6	14	40.0	4	11.4	0	0
Thinking critically and analytically <i>M=3.46, SD=.611</i>	18	51.4	15	42.9	2	5.7	0	0
Analyzing numerical and statistical information <i>M=3.11, SD=.796</i>	12	34.3	16	45.7	6	17.1	1	2.9
Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills <i>M=3.46, SD=.701</i>	20	57.1	11	31.4	4	11.4	0	0
Working effectively with others <i>M=3.54, SD=.701</i>	23	65.7	8	22.9	4	11.4	0	0
Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics <i>M=3.23, SD=.877</i>	17	48.6	10	28.6	7	20.0	1	2.9
Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.) <i>M=3.26, SD=.852</i>	17	48.6	11	31.4	6	17.1	1	2.9
Solving complex real-world problems <i>M=3.23, SD=.731</i>	14	40.0	15	42.9	6	17.1	0	0
Being an informed and active citizen <i>M=3.11, SD=.832</i>	13	37.1	14	40.0	7	20.0	1	2.9

When asked to evaluate their entire educational experiences, all respondents (N=35) responded that their experience was Excellent ($f=19$, $\%=40.4$), Good ($f=15$, $\%=31.9$), or Fair ($f=1$, $\%=2.1$).

Research question 2. How does participation in Leadership Rowan affect a student's ability to apply leadership values in their everyday life as defined by the Social Change Model?

The Social Change Model's (SCM) individual and group values cover the attributes of collaboration, commitment, and common purpose. Table 4.9 depicts the frequencies of student interactions with peers in academic environments. The majority of students report collaborative efforts and both a common purpose and commitment to learning in reporting that they Very Often (47.5%) or Often (34.3%) asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways. Similarly, most participants reported that they Very Often (28.6%) or Often (51.4%) explained course material to one or more students. The least number of participants reported that they attend an art exhibit, play, or other art performance only Sometimes (42.9%) or Never (22.9%), indicating that the participants may all have better sense of purpose in studies outside of that area.

Table 4.9

Frequencies of Interactions with Peers in Academic Settings (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Very Often</i>		<i>Often</i>		<i>Sometimes</i>		<i>Never</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways <i>M=3.26, SD=.780</i>	16	47.5	12	34.3	7	20.0	0	0
Attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance (dance, music, etc.) <i>M=2.20, SD=.901</i>	3	8.6	9	25.7	15	42.9	8	22.9
Asked another student to help you understand course material <i>M=2.80, SD=.964</i>	9	25.7	14	40.0	8	22.9	4	11.4
Explained course material to one or more students <i>M=3.09, SD=.702</i>	10	28.6	18	51.4	7	20.0	0	0
Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students <i>M=2.60, SD=1.090</i>	10	28.6	7	20.0	12	34.3	6	17.1

Table 4.10 demonstrates the rates of interaction between participants and faculty, which can indicate levels of engagement with the SCM values of collaboration, common purpose, and congruence in academic pursuits. The majority of students reported that they Very Often or Often interacted with faculty on all four measures surveyed.

Table 4.10

Frequencies of Interactions with Faculty (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Very Often</i>		<i>Often</i>		<i>Sometimes</i>		<i>Never</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Talked about career plans with a faculty member <i>M=2.91, SD=.887</i>	11	31.4	11	31.4	12	34.3	1	2.9
Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.) <i>M=3.09, SD=1.121</i>	19	54.3	4	11.4	8	22.9	4	11.4
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class <i>M=2.74, SD=1.094</i>	11	31.4	10	28.6	8	22.9	6	17.1
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member <i>N=34, M=2.62, SD=.985</i>	8	23.5	9	26.5	13	38.2	4	11.8

Table 4.11 shows the reported hours spent by participants on non-academic activities every week. Demonstrating the SCM values of collaboration, congruence, and commitment, the majority of students who spend time participating in co-curricular activities reported spending 1-5 hours (20.0%), 5-10 hours (28.6%), or 11-15 hours (17.1%) engaged per week. Hours spent doing community service or volunteer work had a slightly different distribution as the majority of students reported a 1-5-hour (54.3%) commitment, highlighting values of common purpose and citizenship. Time reported spent relaxing and socializing also held high distributions with most students committing 1-5 hours (25.7%), 6-10 hours (20.0%), or 11-15 hours (14.3%) per week.

Table 4.11

Hours Spent in Non-Academic Activity Per Week (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)</i>		<i>Doing community service or volunteer work</i>		<i>Relaxing and socializing (time with friends, video games, TV or videos, keeping up with friends online, etc.)</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
0 Hours	0	0	9	25.7	0	0
1-5 Hours	7	20.0	19	54.3	9	25.7
6-10 Hours	10	28.6	5	14.3	7	20.0
11-15 Hours	6	17.1	0	0	5	14.3
16-20 Hours	7	20.0	1	2.9	8	22.9
21-25 Hours	2	5.7	1	2.9	3	8.6
26-30 Hours	0	0	0	0	0	0
30+ Hours	3	8.6	0	0	3	8.6

Table 4.12 shows the reported academic future planning measures for participants. The majority of measures showed engagement of 40% or more in the areas of completing a culminating senior experience (40.0%), participating in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together (42.9%), participating in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement (57.1%), or holding a formal leadership role in a student organization or group (74.3%). All high measuring data points also align themselves with

the SCM values of common purpose, consciousness of self, commitment, collaboration, and citizenship.

Table 4.12

Academic Future Planning (N=35)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Done or in Progress</i>		<i>Plan to Do</i>		<i>Do Not Plan to Do</i>		<i>Have Not Decided</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement <i>M=5.11, SD=2.259</i>	20	57.1	11	31.4	2	5.7	2	5.7
Hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group <i>M=5.89, SD=1.937</i>	26	74.3	6	17.1	3	8.6	0	0
Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together <i>M=4.03, SD=2.651</i>	15	42.9	2	5.7	12	34.3	6	17.1
Participate in a study abroad program <i>M=2.17, SD=1.317</i>	2	5.7	3	8.6	23	65.7	7	20.0
Work with a faculty member on a research project <i>M=3.41, SD=2.401</i>	10	29.4	3	8.8	16	47.1	5	14.7
Complete a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.) <i>M=4.11, SD=2.483</i>	14	40.0	10	28.6	5	14.3	6	17.1

Table 4.13 displays the rates of quality interactions between participants and groups of people at the institution. On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being poor and 7 being excellent, the majority of students rated their quality of interactions at a 5 or better when it came to interactions with other students (88.5%), academic advisors (68.6%), student services (85.7%), and other administrative staff and offices (62.9%). Interactions demonstrate the use of interpersonal and written communication skills and could be indicative of the SCM values collaboration, consciousness of self, and event citizenship.

Table 4.13

*Quality of Interactions with the Following People at Your Institution (N=35)
(1 being poor, 7 being excellent)*

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Students</i>		<i>Academic Advisors</i>		<i>Faculty</i>		<i>Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)</i>		<i>Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	2.9	2	5.7	0	0	0	0	3	8.6
3	1	2.9	1	2.9	1	2.9	2	5.7	3	8.6
4	2	5.7	8	22.9	3	8.6	3	8.6	7	20.0
5	11	31.4	10	28.6	10	28.6	6	17.1	10	28.6
6	13	37.1	6	17.1	13	37.1	12	34.3	9	25.7
7	7	20.0	8	22.9	8	22.9	12	34.3	3	8.6

In the data collection survey, participants were asked to explain in what ways has participation in Leadership Rowan taught them about what it means to be a good leader. There were 26 responses to the qualitative questions on the data collection survey due to participant survey fatigue. Of the 26 responses, 13 of them reference the themes of individual development and interpersonal skills development through mentions of being more comfortable talking to others and understanding more about their leadership styles. One respondent demonstrated learning relevant with the individual and group dimensions of the SCM values with the following response:

Leadership Rowan has taught me to be a servant leader. I have come to realize that those who I admire most are servant leaders. I continue to learn through their actions to mimic in my own life. Aside from providing me with amazing mentors, Leadership Rowan has provide[d] me with knowledge to bring to others. I have recently received two of my own mentees, and noticed that I have skills and ideas that they do not. After reflecting, I realized that these were from attending events on campus...

Five respondents directly referenced their roles as mentors to younger bronze certificate students, citing the experience as a developmental one for them as they recognize their own skills development and the influence they have on others to “try new things”. Other themes referenced in the 26 responses include having a more global world view, identifying leadership as a process rather than a position, a sense of community, openness to new ideas, improved career development, improved communication skills, and servant leadership.

Research question 3. Do students who are more highly engaged also participate in more leadership practices?

The analysis of research question 1 and Table 4.3 through Table 4.13 demonstrates that the majority of participants in the study rate high on scales of engagement. The final question asked participants to reflect on how they are a leader and to describe any significant examples in which they demonstrated leadership abilities in those situations. The total respondent rate on this question was 24 participants due to survey fatigue.

Of the 24 responses, 12 of them directly referenced holding a formal leadership role as their major engagement with leadership practices, 5 individuals even cited more than one formal position. Informal leadership roles such as group projects, family care, and influence with out official titles were also referenced. All of these leadership roles demonstrate various values congruent with the SCM values in the individual and group categories, including collaboration, commitment and consciousness of self.

Nineteen of the responses cited references related to the SCM values of citizenship and congruence. The themes of helping, modeling the way, motivating, and teaching others were reoccurring in all of those selected responses. Participants cited enjoyment in pushing others to be the best that they can be, especially through the mentoring program between the Gold Certificate and Bronze Certificate students. Participants expressed feeling that they were approachable and able to use their leadership to advocate for their peers and model a way for students younger or unfamiliar with any of their lived experiences.

Other themes that were observed from respondents include a capacity for problem solving, mediating group conflict, critical thinking, being a voice for others, the ability to work in a team setting, and actively developing individual skills.

Chapter V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary of the Study

This study investigated the engagement levels of students who participated in Leadership Rowan programs at Rowan University in Glassboro, New Jersey. It also observed student's abilities to apply learned leader values as defined by the Social Change Model (SCM) framework in everyday life. Participants were undergraduate students actively enrolled in the Leadership Rowan Leadership Certificate Program at the Silver Certificate and the Gold Certificate levels.

The survey instrument used to measure data from participants on engagement levels and leadership practices was distributed electronically to students at Rowan University in New Jersey during the Spring 2019 semester. The survey instrument, the *Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey* (Appendix B), was adapted from the thesis research of Lauren Thompson's research, "Rowan after hours: The impact of student employment on student engagement" (Thompson, 2013). Both Thompson's survey and the survey utilized in this study were adopted from the online version of the *National Survey of Student Engagement* (NSSE) developed by The College Student Report and the Trustees of Indiana University.

A copy of the *Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey* was distributed in an online format with Qualtrics to 136 students who are identified as active participants in the Silver or Gold Certificate. A total of 47 individuals responded or partially responded, yielding a 34.6% response rate. The quantitative data was gathered and organized by Qualtrics and then analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)

computer software. The qualitative data was analyzed with text identifiers through Qualtrics. The data were analyzed by measures of descriptive statistics, frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations.

Discussion of the Findings

The *Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey* utilized as the measurement instrument in this study was a survey replicated from a study by Lauren Thompson entitled *Rowan after hours: The impact of student employment on student engagement* (2013) and based after the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE survey is issued at participating universities on a 3-year cycle and each institution is issued a profile document depicting their individualized results (NSSE, n.d.). In the interpretation of the findings, data from this study was compares to the Rowan University NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile from the most recent survey cycle in order to evaluate engagement levels of the present population.

Research question 1. How has participation in the Leadership Rowan program impacted measurements of student engagement in silver and gold level students?

The findings of the data analysis of the *Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey* demonstrate that the students surveyed do have higher levels of engagement. In Lauren Thompson's research study on Rowan After Hours, it was reported that 36.9% of student earn an A- or better, equivalent to a grade point average range of 3.5 to 4.0 (Thompson, 2013). Additionally, when reviewing Rowan University's NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile, about 49% of Rowan University students report earning grades within that 3.5 to 4.0 range, while 44% report earning grades in the range of 2.7 to 3.4. According to the leadership certificate participants in this student, 48.6% of participants report earning

grades in that same 3.5 to 4.0 grade point average range, a percentage that is comparable to the ones reported in previous reports (Table 4.2). The remainder of participants, about 51.4%, earned either between 2.7 to 3.4 on the grade point average scale.

Next, the findings evaluated participants' ability to make connections between academic experiences and everyday life as well as their emphasis on course work. The majority of leadership certificate students indicated that they Often or Very Often engage in activities that connect what is learned in the classroom to everyday life (84.37%). According to the Rowan University NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile, only 62.21% of respondents reported the same. In terms of emphasis on course work, the data of this research study found that leadership students are above the measured average of the Rowan University NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile in applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations (Leadership Certificates=91.4% / NSSE=73.5), analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts (Leadership Certificates=82.4% / NSSE=70), evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source (Leadership Certificates=91.2% / NSSE=67.5), and forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information (Leadership Certificates=93.1% / NSSE=69.5). The findings found that students scored below average on memorizing course material (Leadership Certificates=62.8% / NSSE=67.5), and all were based on respondents answering Very Much or Quite a Bit on the survey instrument.

As far as hours spent per week on activities, leadership certificate students showed to average similar rates compared to the Rowan University NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile's findings, showing that the majority of students spend between 6-10 hours (Leadership Certificate=25.7% / NSSE=24.5%) and 11-15 hours (Leadership

Certificate=28.6% / NSSE=21%). In terms of hours spent working per week, findings differ from the NSSE Profile as the majority of leadership students report working some amount of time working for pay on campus per week (Leadership Certificate=80% / NSSE=20%), compared to working off campus (Leadership Certificate=28.6% / NSSE=47.5%).

Finally, when analyzing data on institutional influence, the participants of this study scored above average scores reported by the Rowan University NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile, just like results from Thompson's study found in their study sample (Thompson, 2013). The majority participants in the *Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey* responded that they felt their institution influenced their knowledge, skills, and personal development Very Much or Quite a Bit (Leadership Certificate=84.86% / NSSE=63.35%).

Based on the data collected in comparison to the Rowan University NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile and the study performed by Lauren Thompson (Thompson, 2013), student who participate in Leadership Rowan Certificate Programs at the Silver and Gold levels appear to demonstrate higher measure of engagement in the Rowan University community and academics. This is likely due to the program's emphasis on skills development as defined by the theoretical construct of the Social Change Model.

Research question 2. How does participation in Leadership Rowan affect a student's ability to apply leadership values in their everyday life as defined by the Social Change Model?

The research question was evaluated through the use of engagement measures on the *Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey* that looked at interpersonal interactions and

nonacademic activity. The survey also utilized qualitative measures of leadership learning and practice.

The measurement instrument in this study measured the involvement of participants in interactions with peers in academic settings. Across all categories, 62% of respondents reported that they Very Often or Often interacted with peers in academic settings across all measures, compared to 50.9% reported by the Rowan University NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile. The leadership certificate students rated above average on all measure in comparison to the NSSE Profile, only the variable prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students was equal to average reported levels (Leadership Certificate=48.6% / NSSE=48%). In similar measures of interactions with faculty members, similar patterns were observed with leadership certificate respondents reporting that they Very Often or Often have interactions with faculty at an average of 59.63%, compares to the NSSE Profile average of 36.75%. Participants in this study also rated the quality of interactions with individuals at the institution on a scale of 1 to 7, with the majority reporting high ratings of 5 to 7 on their interaction with other students (88.5%) and faculty (88.6%). Findings may present frequencies that are above average for the leadership certificate respondents as they are actively learning to apply individual and group values as defined by the SCM like common purpose, collaboration, and congruence.

When asked about the amount of time spent engaged in non-academic activities per week, the majority of respondents reported that they spend 1-15 hours participating in co-curricular activities (65.7%), or relaxing and socializing (60%). Respondents also spend a large portion of time doing community service or volunteer work 1-10 hours

(68.6%) per week. Additionally, in measures of future planning, the respondents of this study showed higher levels of responses in Done or In Progress or Plan to do in the variables participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement (Leadership Certificate=88.5% / NSSE=85.5%), hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group (Leadership Certificate=91.4% / NSSE=49.5%), participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together (Leadership Certificate=48.6% / NSSE=43%), work with a faculty member on a research project (Leadership Certificate=38.2% / NSSE=42.5%), and complete a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.) (Leadership Certificate=68.6% / NSSE=59%). All of these measures demonstrate a recognition of the SCM values of citizenship through community service and group membership as well as common purpose and collaborations. All of these measures contribute to the data that supports the idea that leadership certificate students are highly motivated, and they engage in leadership actions that seem to demonstrate their learned values and skills from the certificate program.

To support the themes observed in the quantitative measures of the *Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey*, the qualitative question was asked; What has participation in Leadership Rowan taught you about what it means to be a good leader? From the 25 respondents, themes that can be associated with the SCM values were identified from the data. Themes of individual development and growth were present, consistent with individual values of the SCM. The desire for learning and continued development was expressed, and group values like collaboration and the experience of being able to teach

others were reoccurring themes. Other themes articulated in responses included improved communication skills, servant leadership, career development, and an openness to new ideas. Thanks to an intentional co-curricular program developed to teach these values, students were able to self-disclose these qualities that they have learned as a result of the program.

Research question 3. Do students who are more highly engaged also participate in more leadership practices?

Research question 1 and research question 2 established that the students who engage in the Leadership Certificate at the Silver and Gold levels who responded to this study are students who can be qualified as highly engaged on most levels. The final research question wanted to evaluate qualitatively how students can articulate their identities of leadership in their everyday actions. The *Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey* asked the reflective question; How are you a leader? Please describe any significant examples and how you demonstrate leadership abilities in those situations.

Of 24 qualitative responses, 12 of them referenced a former leadership role as an example of how they are leaders, and 5 of them referenced more than one leadership role. Some reference informal leadership such as mentoring, group projects, or elder family positions in providing care and running a household. Nineteen respondents reference actions that can directly relate to the SCM values of citizenship and congruence, including community service, servant leadership, being a role model, and teaching others. The diversity in recognition of the different kinds of roles in which one can be a leader, even the acknowledgement of different leadership styles as references by 2 respondents, demonstrated an ability to engage in leadership skills in a multitude of ways.

Conclusions

Students who participated in leadership co-curriculars through Leadership Rowan's Leadership Certificate program at the Silver Certificate and Gold Certificate levels were surveyed using engagement measures. Following guidance from a study by Lauren Thompson entitled *Rowan after hours: The impact of student employment on student engagement* (2013), data was compared against the Rowan University NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile to determine engagement levels of the current population.

As demonstrated in the findings, it was found that a majority of respondents from this study were found to be above the NSSE 2016 Respondent Profile information or right on target, indicating the population of Leadership Certificate students is highly engaged. Research suggests that highly engaged students, and intentional development of a student's leadership skills, are both associated with positive educational outcomes like well-being, and growth in life skills like interpersonal communications (Kuh, 2009; Kuh et al., 2008; Owen, 2012). The study found that students who are engaged in these programs also demonstrate higher levels of actions which utilize leadership values and abilities, such as higher levels of peer to peer interactions (62%) as well as qualitative reports of engaging in activities such as service and mentorship. Finally, respondent's qualitative responses show a clear ability to identify diverse types of formal and informal leadership roles performed in a student's life along with acknowledgements of the interpersonal and professional skills that investing in those roles has developed.

It can be concluded that more research needs to be performed on this area in order to further understand the development of leadership skills and how they connect back to the leadership programming provided. Responses appear to indicate student learning and

development up to this point, but the no other studies have been performed on the effect of the Leadership Rowan programs on measures like engagement.

Recommendations for Future Practice

Based on the finding in this study the following are recommended for future practice:

1. Share the findings with current students and leadership program administrators
2. Continue to utilize measures such as these to evaluate how students are retaining the information that is being delivered in the ways that that the administrators have planed
3. Continue to offer leadership programming initiatives to encourage the continued growth of students

Recommendations for Future Research

This study faced a few notable limitations in practice. The survey experienced a low response rate (34.6%) and survey fatigue, presumably due to the length of the measure. The study also occurred concurrently with 2 other national surveys being issued to stratified portions of the student population, of which the population under observation here could have been a part of. This survey also only looked at the engagement rates of Silver Certificate and Gold Certificate level, undergraduate students at Rowan University in Glassboro, NJ.

Based upon the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are presented:

1. Create a shorter, more deliberate measurement instrument targeted to evaluate specific leadership attributes as determined by the theoretical model, the Social

Change Model, to obtain more meaningful data and reduce the risk of survey fatigue.

2. A study conducted where the survey is issued to Bronze and Gold students to compare skills development from the first level of the certificate to the last.
3. A future replication study, utilizing the more relevant 2019 NSSE respondent data from the most recent cycle of the survey.

References

- Campbell, C. M., & Cabrera, A. F. (2011). How sound is NSSE?: Investigating the psychometric properties of NSSE at a public, research-extensive institution. *The Review of Higher Education*, 35(1), 77-103. doi:10.1353/rhe.2011.0035
- Christensen, M. A. (2015). Growth in leader efficacy based on participation in a college student leadership development program. *ProQuest LLC*; 2016.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2015). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (9th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Dugan, J. P. (2011). Students' involvement in group experiences and connections to leadership development. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2011(S1), 17-32. doi:10.1002/ir.414
- Dugan, J. P. (2017). *Leadership theory: cultivating critical perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Farber, G. (2010). Leadership and the first-year experience: a study of outcomes from student involvement and the FLIP Program. *Rowan Digital Works*; 2010.
- Kahn, P. E. (2014). Theorising student engagement in higher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(6), 1005-1018. doi:10.1002/berj.3121
- Koljatic, M., & Kuh, G. D. (2001). A longitudinal assessment of college student engagement in good practices in undergraduate education. *Higher Education*, 42(3), 351-371.
- Komives, S. R., Wagner, W., & Associates (Eds.). (2017). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations. In R. M. Gonyea & G. D. Kuh (Eds.), *Using NSSE in institutional research* (pp. 5-20). *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no. 141. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(5), 540-563. doi:10.1353/jhe.0.0019
- Leadership Rowan. (n.d.). Retrieved from:
<https://sites.rowan.edu/oslp/leadership/about.html>
- Leadership Certificates. (2018). Retrieved from:
<https://sites.rowan.edu/oslp/leadership/certificates/index.html>

- McMillan, J. H. (2016). *Fundamentals of Educational Research* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). (n.d.). *Our Origins and Potential*. Retrieved from <http://nsse.indiana.edu/html/origins.cfm>
- Nationally Recognized. (2018). Retrieved from Rowan University: <https://www.rowan.edu/home/about/our-past-present-future>
- Owen, J. E. (2012). Using student development theories as conceptual frameworks in leadership education. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2012(140), 17-35. doi:10.1002/ss.20029
- Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2005). A typology of student engagement for American colleges and universities. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 185-209
- Rowan History. (2018). Retrieved from Rowan University: <https://www.rowan.edu/home/about/our-past-present-future/rowan-history>
- Schroeder, C. (2003). How are we doing at engaging students? *About Campus*, 8(1), 9-16.
- Spinks, R. K. (2017). Leadership Rowan: Impact on student development of self-authorship. *Rowan Digital Works*; 2013.
- Thompson, L. (2013). Rowan after hours: The impact of student employment on student engagement. *Rowan Digital Works*; 2013.

Appendix A

Permissions to Use Survey Instrument

Monday, December 10, 2018 at 4:59:49 PM Eastern Standard Time

Subject: Re: Rowan University Higher Education Administration Program: Thesis Permission Inquiry
Date: Tuesday, November 6, 2018 at 1:42:58 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: Kuski, Lauren Anne
To: Henry, Megan Ann
Attachments: image001.png

Megan,

Thank you for reaching out. I give you permission to reference and utilize my thesis in your own work, including my survey instrument with your modifications.

Please let me know if you need more information.

Thanks,
Lauren

--

Lauren Kuski

Assistant Director, Rowan After Hours (RAH)

Chamberlain Student Center & Campus Activities

201 Mullica Hill Road | Student Center, Rm 220A | Glassboro, NJ 08028

phone. 856.256.4879 | email. kuski@rowan.edu | rowan.edu/scca

pronouns. she/her/hers



From: "Henry, Megan Ann" <henrym2@rowan.edu>
Date: Sunday, November 4, 2018 at 6:19 PM
To: "Kuski, Lauren Anne" <kuski@rowan.edu>
Subject: Rowan University Higher Education Administration Program: Thesis Permission Inquiry

Hello Lauren,

In fulfillment of my major requirements at Rowan University's Masters in Higher Education Administration Program, I am writing a thesis on the topic of participation in leadership programs and its effect on measured levels of student engagement.

I am writing today to ask your permission to reference and utilize pieces of your thesis written at Rowan University entitled "Rowan After Hours: the impact of student employment on student engagement" in my own thesis work. In particular, with your permission and that of NSSE, I hope to utilize your survey with appropriate updates and modifications, in my own study this school year.

Page 1 of 2

Please let me know if this is acceptable to you for me to use your thesis survey in this way, and I appreciate any assistance you can offer to me in this manner to help make this study a success.

Best,

Megan Henry

--

Megan Henry

Graduate Coordinator, Chamberlain Student Center and Campus Activities, Rowan After Hours
Rowan University | 201 Mullica Hill Rd. | Chamberlain Student Center, Suite 220 | Glassboro, NJ
08028

T: [856-256-4388](tel:856-256-4388) | F: [856-256-5635](tel:856-256-5635) | E: henrym2@students.rowan.edu | www.rowan.edu/scca

Thursday, April 25, 2019 at 1:05:21 AM Eastern Daylight Time

Subject: RE: NSSE Usage Permissions for Higher Education Graduate Thesis
Date: Wednesday, November 28, 2018 at 8:39:00 AM Eastern Standard Time
From: Ragone, June A
To: Henry, Megan Ann

Greetings Megan,

We have no issue with you moving forward with your research. We are aware that Rowan's NSSE participation effort will also be in the field this winter.

I know you will have the opportunity to produce some impactful research!

Best to you,
June

From: Henry, Megan Ann
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 11:59 PM
To: Ragone, June A <ragonej@rowan.edu>
Subject: NSSE Usage Permissions for Higher Education Graduate Thesis

Hello June!

I hope that you had a wonderful Thanksgiving!

As you know from previous communications, I am performing a study on leadership programs and engagement for my thesis topic that is inspired from a previous study of this nature on Rowan After Hours. For my survey, I was hoping to utilize about 14 items of the NSSE survey, and the administration personnel from NSSE have asked that I reach out to you for special permissions as Rowan will be participating in NSSE in 2019. I have completed NSSE's Usage Proposal form, and have attached both this form that details the intent of my study and a draft of my survey with the NSSE items highlighted.

Please let me know if there is anything else that you need to view in order to determine if I am able to obtain permissions to distribute this survey to my targeted population.

Thank you very much!

Megan Henry

--

Megan Henry

Graduate Coordinator, Chamberlain Student Center and Campus Activities, Rowan After Hours Rowan University | 201 Mullica Hill Rd. | Chamberlain Student Center, Suite 220 | Glassboro, NJ 08028 **T:** [856-256-4388](tel:856-256-4388) | **F:** [856-256-5635](tel:856-256-5635) | **E:** henrym2@students.rowan.edu | www.rowan.edu/scca

Page 1 of 1



The College Student Report Item Usage Agreement

The National Survey of Student Engagement's (NSSE) survey instrument, *The College Student Report*, is copyrighted and the copyright is owned by The Trustees of Indiana University. Any use of survey items contained within *The College Student Report* is prohibited without prior written permission from Indiana University. When fully executed, this Agreement constitutes written permission from the University, on behalf of NSSE, for the party named below to use an item or items from *The College Student Report* in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.

In consideration of the mutual promises below, the parties hereby agree as follows:

- 1) The University hereby grants **Megan Henry** ("Licensee") a nonexclusive, worldwide, irrevocable license to use, reproduce, distribute, publicly display and perform, and create derivatives from, in all media now known or hereafter developed, the item(s) listed in the proposal attached as Exhibit A, solely for the purpose of including such item(s) in the survey activity described in Exhibit A, which is incorporated by reference into this Agreement. This license does not include any right to sublicense others. This license only covers the survey instrument, time frame, population, and other terms described in Exhibit A. Any different or repeated use of the item(s) shall require an additional license.
- 2) "National Survey of Student Engagement", "NSSE", and the NSSE logo are registered with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Except as provided in part 3c below, these elements may not be incorporated without permission in materials developed under this agreement, including but not limited to surveys, Web sites, reports, and promotional materials.
- 3) In exchange for the license granted in section 1, Licensee agrees:
 - a) there will be no licensing fee to use NSSE items for the purposes described in Exhibit A;
 - b) to provide to NSSE frequency distributions and means on the licensed item(s);
 - c) on the survey form itself, and in all publications or presentations of data obtained through the licensed item(s), to include the following citation: "Items *xx* and *xx* used with permission from *The College Student Report*, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-18 The Trustees of Indiana University";
 - d) to provide to NSSE a copy of any derivatives of, or alterations to, the item(s) that Licensee makes for the purpose of Licensee's survey ("modified items"), for NSSE's own nonprofit, educational purposes, which shall include the use of the modified items in *The College Student Report* or any other survey instruments, reports, or other educational or professional materials that NSSE may develop or use in the future. Licensee hereby grants the University a nonexclusive, worldwide, irrevocable, royalty-free license to use,

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research
1900 East Tenth Street • Eigenmann Hall, Suite 419 • Bloomington, IN 47406
Phone: (812) 856-5824 • Fax: (812) 856-5150 • E-mail: nsse@indiana.edu • Web Address: www.nsse.iub.edu



reproduce, distribute, create derivatives from, and publicly display and perform the modified items, in any media now known or hereafter developed; and

- e) to provide to NSSE, for its own nonprofit, educational purposes, a copy of all reports, presentations, analyses, or other materials in which the item(s) licensed under this Agreement, or modified items, and any responses to licensed or modified items, are presented, discussed, or analyzed. NSSE shall not make public any data it obtains under this subsection in a manner that identifies specific institutions or individuals, except with the consent of the Licensee.

4) This Agreement expires on April 30, 2019.

The undersigned hereby consent to the terms of this Agreement and confirm that they have all necessary authority to enter into this Agreement.

For The Trustees of Indiana University:

 Alexander C. McCormick
 Director
 National Survey of Student Engagement

Date

For Licensee:




 Megan Henry
 Graduate Coordinator, Rowan After Hours
 Rowan University

12/03/18

Date

For Advisor:



 Andrew Tinnin Ed.D
 Assistant Vice President for Student Life
 Rowan University

12/3/18

Date

Appendix B

Survey Instrument

Leadership Rowan Engagement Survey

We are inviting you to participate in a research survey entitled “The Effect of Leadership Programs on Engagement”. We are inviting you because you are representing your Leadership Rowan Leadership Certificate Cohort at the Silver or Gold Level. In order to participate in this survey, you must be 18 years or older.

The survey may take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate in this survey, do not respond to this electronic survey. The number of subjects to be enrolled in the study will be 108.

The purpose of this research study is to assess the connection between Rowan University undergraduate student leader’s engagement and their participation in student leadership programs. This study will help us to gain a better understanding student involvement in leadership programs can relate to measured levels of engagement. The total number of subjects involved are 108 student leaders who represent their Student Government Association club or organization.

Completing this survey indicates that you are voluntarily giving consent to participate in the survey.

There are no risks or discomforts associated with this survey. There may be no direct benefit to you, however, by participating in this study you may help us understand a connection between student involvement in leadership programs and levels of engagement, uncovering the possible positive or negative learning outcomes of being involved in such programs on the student. These findings will add to the knowledgebase, to further improve the understanding of the effectiveness of leadership programs.

Your response will be kept confidential. We will store the data in a secure computer file and the file will destroyed once the data has been published. Any part of the research that is published as part of this study will not include your individual information. If you have any questions about the survey, you can contact Megan A. Henry at the address provided below, but you do not have to give your personal identification.

Researcher:

Megan Henry
Higher Education Administration Masters
Candidate
Rowan University
henrym2@rowan.edu
(856) 256 – 4388

Advisor:

Andrew Tinnin, Ed. D.
Professor
Educational Services, Administration
and Higher Education
tinnin@rowan.edu
(856) 256 – 4041

Section 1: Background Information

Please answer the following to the best of your ability.

1. What is your age?
 - a. 18
 - b. 19
 - c. 20
 - d. 21
 - e. 22
 - f. 23
 - g. 24+
2. What is your cumulative GPA?
 - a. 3.8 to 4.0
 - b. 3.5 to 3.7
 - c. 3.2 to 3.4
 - d. 3.0 to 3.1
 - e. 2.7 to 2.9
 - f. 2.4 to 2.6
 - g. 2.0 to 2.3
 - h. 1.7 to 1.9
 - i. 1.4 to 1.6
 - j. 1.3 & below
3. What is your gender?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Other: [short answer space]
4. What is your class level?
 - a. Freshman
 - b. Sophomore
 - c. Junior
 - d. Senior
5. As of January 2019, what Leadership Rowan certificate level are you in?
 - a. Bronze
 - b. Silver
 - c. Gold
6. How many majors do you plan to complete?
 - a. One
 - b. More than one
7. What is the highest level of education you ever expect to complete?
 - a. Some college but less than a bachelor's degree
 - b. Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
 - c. Master's degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)
 - d. Doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.)

Section 2: Engagement.

Answer the follow multiple choice questions as instructed.

8. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
Asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways	1	2	3	4
Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	1	2	3	4
Come to class without completing readings or assignments	1	2	3	4
Attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance (dance, music, etc.)	1	2	3	4
Asked another student to help you understand course material	1	2	3	4
Explained course material to one or more students	1	2	3	4
Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	1	2	3	4
Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	1	2	3	4
Given a course presentation	1	2	3	4

9. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	1	2	3	4
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	1	2	3	4
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	1	2	3	4
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	1	2	3	4

Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from their perspective	1	2	3	4
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	1	2	3	4
Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	1	2	3	4

10. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
Talked about career plans with a faculty member	1	2	3	4
Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	1	2	3	4
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	1	2	3	4
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	1	2	3	4

11. During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following?

	Very little	Some	Quite a bit	Very much
Memorizing course material	1	2	3	4
Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	1	2	3	4
Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	1	2	3	4
Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	1	2	3	4
Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	1	2	3	4

12. About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing the following?

	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	30+
Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)								
Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Working for pay on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Working for pay off campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Doing community service or volunteer work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Relaxing and socializing (time with friends, video games, TV or videos, keeping up with friends online, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Providing care for dependents (children, parents, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Commuting to campus (driving, walking, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

13. During the current school year, about how many papers, reports, or other writing tasks of the following lengths have you been assigned? (Include those not yet completed.)

	None	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	More than 20
Up to 5 pages	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Between 6 and 10 pages	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11 pages or more	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate?

	Have not decided	Do not plan to do	Plan to do	Done or in progress
Participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement	1	2	3	4
Hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group	1	2	3	4
Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where	1	2	3	4

groups of students take two or more classes together				
Participate in a study abroad program	1	2	3	4
Work with a faculty member on a research project	1	2	3	4
Complete a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)	1	2	3	4

15. How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

	Very little	Some	Quite a bit	Very much
Writing clearly and effectively	1	2	3	4
Speaking clearly and effectively	1	2	3	4
Thinking critically and analytically	1	2	3	4
Analyzing numerical and statistical information	1	2	3	4
Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	1	2	3	4
Working effectively with others	1	2	3	4
Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	1	2	3	4
Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	1	2	3	4
Solving complex real-world problems	1	2	3	4
Being an informed and active citizen	1	2	3	4

16. Rate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution on a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being poor and 7 being excellent.

	Poor						Excellent
Students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Academic advisors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?
 a. Excellent
 b. Good

- c. Fair
 - d. Poor
18. How many courses are you taking for credit this current academic term?
- a. None
 - b. 1 to 3
 - c. 4 to 6
 - d. 7 or more

Section 3: Leadership

Please respond to the following to the best of your ability in 300 words or less.

19. What has participation in Leadership Rowan taught you about what it means to be a good leader?
20. How are you a leader? Please describe any significant examples and how you demonstrate leadership abilities in those situations.