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Servant Leader Chair for the UW-Madison College of Engineering

The Suzanne and Richard Pieper Family Foundation endowed a servant leader chair position at the UW-Madison College of Engineering in the fall of 2008. The mission of the chair is to “help prepare future leaders in their chosen fields to live lives of service to others by teaching and exemplifying character and moral values. Their examples and actions will lift up society, enrich organizations and communities, and have a positive effect on the least privileged.”

The current chair is Greg Harrington, who also serves as associate department chair for the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and is responsible for oversight of the department’s undergraduate program of over 400 students. Greg also teaches and conducts research in the area of drinking water engineering, which has given him opportunities to serve local communities with their drinking water needs and to help students perform drinking water development projects in developing countries. For these efforts, Greg was awarded the Ragnar E. Onstad Award for Service to Society in May 2015 and the Harvey Spangler Award for Innovative Teaching and Learning Practices in March 2020, both from the College of Engineering. He was also honored as the 2019 “Partner of the Year” by UW-Madison’s Center for Leadership and Involvement for his collaboration on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership.

Greg works closely with a Servant Leadership team to support the implementation of programs furthering the Foundation’s mission. Mark Kueppers has been collaborating with the team since 2014. Although he no longer has a formal appointment with the College of Engineering he has been instrumental in helping the chair with assessment efforts, particularly with the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL). Mark continues to serve as the Director of UW-Madison’s Center for Leadership and Involvement, overseeing the direction and vision of the center. Mark has been integral in helping to provide campus insight and connections to the Pieper Chair. Also assisting the team with MSL this year have been James Yonker, Larry Jolon, and Cory Hamilton. James is a leader of the Research and Data Management group in UW-Madison’s Division of Diversity, Equity, and Educational Achievement. Larry has moved from the Center for Leadership and Involvement to Miller Coors and Cory recently joined, in part, to replace Larry.

In her third year on our team was Paige LaPoint, who transitioned to the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences in June. Paige was instrumental in creating the new Emerging Leaders in Engineering program for the college. We are sorry to see Paige go but are pleased she has a new opportunity to continue her professional growth. As described in the report, Paige’s work set us up to transition leadership education from the co-curricular realm to the curricular realm. Leadership education is now housed within a new Center for Innovation in Engineering Education (CIEE), directed by Chris Dakes. Chris was a part of the Pieper Servant Leadership team from its inception until 2014 when he transitioned to the School of Business. We are excited to have him back in the College of Engineering. CIEE has recently hired Angela Kita as its associate director, a role that will son engage her with leadership education and the Pieper Servant Leadership team.

We are pleased to provide the Pieper Family Foundation with this annual report summarizing our activities through August 2022 and our goals for Academic Year 2022-23. The report is organized in accordance with the criteria set by the foundation to conduct its annual evaluation. We have also included specific information identifying how the funding provided for the Servant Leader Chair has made an impact. We look forward to receiving feedback from the foundation on our activities and to continuing our work into the coming year.
Criterion 1 – Outcomes Baseline Data

Typical Thinking that Goes into Evaluating the Criterion

“The servant leader chairs, with the exception of one, established this criteria before the chair was awarded, expressed in the form of a graph. In all cases this has been done through standard student surveys that the school was already conducting. From those surveys, questions were selected that represent the values, characteristics, actions, and involvement of someone representative of a servant leader. Institutions were asked to plot this going back five or six years as a baseline. The document established the database that will then be used in the future. The alumni portion of this is more elusive and each school has its own unique process. Whatever the benchmark that is established for the school, it’s compared historically going back as many years as possible both for the school and their peers in other schools, which is then continued each year in the future. This is a one-time award.”

Academic Year 2021-22 Progress

As noted in previous reports, we continue to track data in the senior exit survey that is administered by Skyfactor Inc. Our baseline data is from the 2007-08 academic year, the year prior to the one in which the college received the Pieper Family Foundation award. Our analysis of data since the baseline year is presented in our section on Criterion 3.

We acknowledge that the Skyfactor survey measures important traits of leaders but does not directly address the attributes used to describe servant leaders. Thus, we helped fund the campus-wide and College of Engineering implementation of a survey used by the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. This survey also focuses on leadership knowledge using the Social Change Model of Leadership development, which has been tentatively mapped to servant leadership. This survey was administered in 2015, 2018, and 2021 with Greg Harrington and Mark Kueppers as co-principal investigators for the entire UW-Madison study. Our MSL work is described in more detail in our section on Criterion 5.

Academic Year 2022-23 Goals

We will continue with our campus-wide leadership role in MSL for the coming year. Please see more in our discussion of Criteria 3 and 5.

Criterion 2 – Baseline Acceptance of Servant Leadership

Typical Thinking that Goes into Evaluating the Criterion

“Clear indication that the school is functioning with the qualities of a servant leader; building community, listening, awareness, stewardship, conceptualization and foresight, commitment to the growth of people and empathy. Displayed in multiple examples of what the school is actually
doing will validate this area. It is not unusual that the institutions that receive the Chair already have these types of programs underway. If they are of substantive magnitude, both locally, community, nationally, and internationally, one could expect to receive this one-time award.”

**Academic Year 2021-22 Progress**

Since our initial report for Year 2008, we have continued to refine our approach, increase our participation, and expand our involvement across campus in servant-leadership activities. Most notably, we have advanced from learning about servant-leadership toward a deeper adoption and commitment to the servant-leader model by aligning it with the broader college and campus commitments to leadership development. Based on the input of our Servant Leadership team, the UW-Madison Leadership Framework highlights specific leadership competencies and values that are directly connected to Servant Leadership characteristics. These include, but are not limited, to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Servant Leadership Characteristics</th>
<th>UW-Madison Leadership Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Fostering Bridge-Building &amp; Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the Growth of People</td>
<td>Supporting Learning &amp; Development of Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Community</td>
<td>Connection and Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most importantly, the UW-Madison Leadership Framework is based on the concept of leadership as the phenomenon of positive change in an individual, group or community’s beliefs, values or behaviors. This dovetails with the Servant Leadership philosophy of being in service to others and not for the purposes of power and authority. Since 2008, we have continued to explicitly integrate Servant Leadership into programming and courses and we have now helped to support campus by ensuring that these principles are being addressed on a campus level. Specific examples are further presented in our section on Criterion 6.

**Academic Year 2022-23 Goals**

Please see our discussion of Criterion 6.

**Criterion 3 – Outcomes Measures Above Demographic Norms**

**Typical Thinking that Goes into Evaluating the Criterion**

*Measuring each year what was established in Criterion 1. The baseline data graphs represented in Criterion 1 are updated, both the peer group and the school. If this is considered qualitative data in the minds of the foundation, they will receive an award. If the alumni data is missing, the award will not be made at maximum. If the norms in the institution are reasonably above average, one can expect a higher level award. If there are things missing, one can expect a lower level.*
**Academic Year 2021-22 Progress**

**Senior Exit Survey**

When receiving the Servant Leader Chair Endowment in 2008-09, we used results from our senior exit survey to establish baseline performance for Criterion 1. In all our annual reports since that time, we have continued to use results from that survey to provide longitudinal analysis for Criteria 3 and 4. Rather than provide all the data from that survey for this report, we summarize and discuss the results of those questions that have relevance to leadership education. We also provide a comparison of our student perceptions with the perceptions of students at peer universities.

The senior exit survey is administered by Skyfactor Inc and is taken by seniors at numerous engineering programs across the nation. This allows us to compare the perceptions of our students with the perceptions of students at other engineering programs. For each academic year, we receive the mean response for engineering students from UW-Madison, for engineering students within participating Carnegie peer group programs (research intensive universities), and for engineering students from all programs that participate in the exit survey.

We use statistical analysis to determine:

- whether our students’ perceptions are significantly better or worse than perceptions of students at our peer programs, and
- if our students’ perceptions are improving or declining with time.

Because a change in educational practice will generally take four to six years to be observed in a senior exit survey, we evaluate the above items over four to six year time intervals.

We selected the following nine questions to analyze for this report:

1. Satisfaction with value derived from team experiences.
2. Satisfaction with value of engineering program student organization activities.
3. Satisfaction with leadership opportunities in engineering program extracurricular activities (Question asked on 2010-2014 surveys) / Satisfaction with the engineering program having extracurricular leadership activities (Question asked on 2015-2022 surveys).
4. Satisfaction with your fellow students’ ability to function on multidisciplinary teams (Question asked on 2014-2022 surveys).
5. Satisfaction with your fellow students’ level of camaraderie.
6. Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to function on multidisciplinary teams (Question asked on 2010-2013 surveys) / I am confident that I can function on multidisciplinary teams (Question asked on 2014-2022 surveys).
7. Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to understand ethical responsibilities (Question asked on 2010-2013 surveys) / I am confident that I can understand ethical responsibilities (Question asked on 2014-2022 surveys).
8. Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to understand professional responsibilities (Question asked on 2010-2013 surveys) / I am confident that I can understand professional responsibilities (Question asked on 2014-2022 surveys).
9. Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to recognize the need to engage in lifelong learning (Question asked on 2010-2013 surveys) / I am confident that I can recognize the need to engage in lifelong learning (Question asked on 2014-2022 surveys).

An example of the data is provided in Figure 1 for the third question in the above list: “satisfaction with leadership opportunities in engineering program extracurricular activities.” This figure shows our students’ satisfaction with leadership opportunities and compares their mean satisfaction level with the mean satisfaction level of students at other engineering institutions. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). The remaining data are provided in Appendix A.

Statistical analyses showed that UW-Madison COE students had a significantly better perception of leadership opportunities at UW-Madison than did peer students of their own institutions (peer institution perceptions spiked in Year 2021 but this appears to be an anomaly). For the most recent six years, there was a statistically significant improvement in UW-Madison COE student perceptions of leadership opportunities. A change in survey question for the 2014-15 academic year likely contributed to the observed decline for all three cohorts in that year (see Item 3 above).

When considering the other questions in the same manner, we reached the following conclusions from the Skyfactor survey:

- Our students had significantly better perceptions of the following items than students at participating Carnegie peer institutions and at all participating institutions:
  - Satisfaction with value derived from team experiences.
  - Satisfaction with value of engineering program student organization activities.
  - Satisfaction with leadership opportunities in engineering program extracurricular activities.
  - Satisfaction with fellow students’ ability to work on teams.
  - Satisfaction with fellow students’ level of camaraderie.
  - Satisfaction with how engineering education enhanced ability to function on multidisciplinary teams.
  - Satisfaction with how engineering education enhanced ability to understand professional responsibilities.
  - Satisfaction with how engineering education enhanced ability to recognize need to engage in lifelong learning.

- Satisfaction with leadership opportunities had a statistically significant upward trend but none of the other measures had an observable upward or downward trend over the most recent 6 years.

Perceptions of Wisconsin students have been resilient through the COVID-19 pandemic years. Some noticeable changes were observed at peer institutions, but they have not yet resulted in any statistically significant trends.
Figure 1. Mean level of satisfaction with leadership opportunities in engineering program extracurricular activities. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. A change in survey question for the 2014-15 academic year likely contributed to the observed decline for all three cohorts.

Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership

As noted in Criterion 1, UW-Madison students participated in the MSL survey in 2015, 2018, and 2021. Because this continues to be a new initiative for our team, we describe this activity in more detail in our section on Criterion 5.

Academic Year 2022-23 Goals

As noted in our section on Criterion 5, we will continue to participate in the MSL with the UW Center for Leadership and Involvement and the UW Division of Diversity, Equity, and Educational Achievement to further dissect the data and better understand how our engineering students compare to the general student body. Once our MSL 2021 efforts are complete, this will transition from an initiative to a routine assessment measure.

Criterion 4 – Outcomes Measures Phenomenally Above Demographic Norms

Typical Thinking that Goes into Evaluating the Criterion

If Criterion 3 is profoundly above the norms and a result of the program indicates that they are continuing to track in that way, you can expect awards at this level. For example, on a scale of 1-10, a typical peer institution might be a 4 or 5. A typical institution that would have been
considered for a chair might be a 6. Phenomenal performance might be an 8 or a 9. We would expect eventually most of the institutions will be tracking at a 9, which would tend to maximize this award.

**Academic Year 2021-22 Progress**

The primary distinction between Criteria 3 and 4 is whether outcomes measures are above demographic norms or phenomenally above demographic norms. In our section on Criterion 3, we described how our students perceive our college relative to how other students perceive their colleges. While we have shown that our students perceive items such as leadership opportunities to be above demographic norms (Criterion 3), we defer to the foundation’s judgment on whether these perceptions are phenomenally above demographic norms (Criterion 4). As an example, the Skyfactor database used for Criterion 3 is based on a scale of 1 to 7. Converting this to a scale of 1 to 10, our Year 2021-22 scores were in the range of 7.5 to 9.1, an improvement above our Year 2007-08 scores of 7.1 to 8.0. For comparison, our peer institutions’ students had perceptions ranging from 6.8 to 8.1 in the baseline year and from 6.9 to 8.7 in Year 2021-22. While our scores are certainly at or near the level of 8 noted by the foundation for Criterion 4, the peer institution averages are also significantly higher than the 4 to 5 range noted for Criterion 4.

**Academic Year 2022-23 Goals**

As noted above, the primary distinction between Criteria 3 and 4 is whether outcomes measures are above demographic norms or phenomenally above demographic norms. Thus, our goals for Criterion 4 are similar to those already stated for Criterion 3.

**Criterion 5 – Breakthrough Venture Promising New Beginnings in Acts of Goodness**

**Typical Thinking that Goes into Evaluating the Criterion**

We are attempting to encourage the institution, its faculty and student body to think beyond their envelope, searching for new ways of networking and collaboration, whole new approaches to enrichment and effectiveness. This is not about ideas, it is about validated actions. If those actions include the institution, the community it lives in, the world it lives in nationally and internationally, and they are phenomenally above it or have exhibited a breakthrough and others are following, this would be a max award. If they have something that is really promising and covers all those areas, it might be on the lower end of the scale. An activity that has some promise will likely receive a rating of “1” while an activity that is transformational or systemic will likely receive a rating of “3.” An activity that is both transformational and systemic – the ideal synergistic nurturing – may receive a rating of “5.”
**Academic Year 2021-22 Progress**

In 2021-22, we continued to advance our work by supporting leadership efforts that focused on transformational and systemic change. The primary accomplishments we report below are: 1) the progress made by our Director of Student Organizations and Leadership Development by the College of Engineering, 2) creation of a new Center for Innovation in Engineering Education, 3) campus and College of Engineering participation in the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership, and 4) our continued participation in the Big Ten Leadership Educators Network.

**Director of Student Organizations and Leadership Development**

Paige LaPoint completed her third year as the College of Engineering’s Director of Student Organizations and Leadership Development during the 2021-22 academic year. Paige’s time was approximately 50% in student organization activities and 50% in leadership development activities, although there is considerable overlap in these roles. Focusing on her leadership development activities, Paige accomplished the following in her third year:

- Continued to develop COE’s first formal leadership development program, titled “Emerging Leaders in Engineering (ELE)”*. This program is partnered with the Leadership Certificate program offered by the university’s Center for Leadership and Involvement ([https://cfli.wisc.edu/leadership-certificate-info-packet/](https://cfli.wisc.edu/leadership-certificate-info-packet/)). Additional information on the ELE program can be found at:
  - Official website information: [https://www.engr.wisc.edu/academics/student-experience/emerging-leaders-in-engineering/](https://www.engr.wisc.edu/academics/student-experience/emerging-leaders-in-engineering/)
- Continued to teach her upperclassmen course titled “Applied Leadership Competencies in Engineering.” The course syllabus is provided in Appendix B. This course enrolled 39 students in Fall 2021 and 33 students in Spring 2022, totaling 72 students for the academic year. This more than tripled the enrollment from the previous academic year, in which 22 students enrolled during Fall 2020.
- Partnered with UW-Madison’s UniverCity Alliance and the Servant Leader Chair to include 12 community-based projects as part of the course, up from two the previous year. These projects give students the opportunity to practice the leadership competencies they discuss during class time. The 12 projects were:
  - Promoting and Improving Household Disaster Planning, Marathon County
  - Severe Weather Notification Strategies, Marathon County
  - Technical Rescue Team Development, Marathon County
  - Groundwater Protection Planning, Marathon County
  - Feasibility of Reducing Road Salt Use, Marathon County
  - Public Awareness and Education Opportunities to Enhance Agricultural Practices that Protect Land and Water, Marathon County
  - Fenwood Creek Watershed Survey Analysis, Marathon County
  - Strategic Planning for Emergency Medical Service, Marathon County
  - Employee Innovation Center for City of Stoughton
- Employer Innovation Center for City of Stoughton
- Understanding Traveler Metrics for Appleton International Airport
- Sustainability Action Plan for Appleton International Airport

- Worked with the Servant Leader Chair to provide funding for students and student organizations to lead service-learning or community outreach projects that “lift up society, enrich organizations and communities, and have a positive effect on the least privileged.” Funded projects are aligned with the Pieper Family Foundation belief that human goodness is not simply innate; it requires action and service to others; and that character is inspired and facilitated in cultures, organizations, and families by and through the example of enlightened leadership. Organizations receiving funds were student chapters of the Society for Women Engineers, Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers, National Society of Black Engineers, and Engineers Without Borders.

- Participated in the UW-Madison task force for the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. Paige implemented recommendations from the task force report into her leadership course and program. She also participated on the campus-wide Leadership @ UW team, which was tasked with implementing the recommendations of the task force.

- Developed a network of young alumni to serve as mentors for students in the emerging leaders program. After just one year of mentoring via online videoconferencing, we are receiving reports of students and mentors finding ways to meet face-to-face to continue their relationships.

- Assisted in planning for the 2022 Big Ten Leadership Educators Network Summit, held at UW-Madison in July.

As noted in our introduction to the report, Paige moved to the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences in June to pursue a career growth opportunity. Since then, she has been instrumental in ensuring program continuity, advising interim and newly hired individuals on best practices and expectations. As noted earlier, we miss Paige’s day-to-day involvement with the team but we surely appreciate the foundation she helped build and we are supportive of her career growth.

**College of Engineering Center for Education Innovation**

In September 2020, the College of Engineering announced plans to create a center focused on engineering education and innovation efforts. The center was launched in April 2022 with the hiring of Chris Dakes as its inaugural director. Chris was affiliated with the Pieper Chair from its inception at UW-Madison, working with Jeff Russell on several initiatives and easing the transition from Jeff Russell to Greg Harrington in 2012. Chris transitioned to the Wisconsin School of Business in 2014 and we are thrilled to have him back in the College of Engineering. CIEE has oversight of numerous educational initiatives and, consistent with our recommendations from the MSL (see next section), we are incorporating leadership education into this core academic function of the college.

At the close of August, CIEE was in the process of identifying an associate director. The associate director role is intended to provide oversight of two programs – the Emerging Leaders in Engineering program facilitated by the Pieper Chair and the Grand Challenges Scholars program
initiated by the National Academy of Engineering. The latter program requires engineering students to develop five competencies and we are using the leadership course as an integral part of one of those competencies. Although this report is intended to focus on the 2021-22 academic year, we announce that Angela Kita has since begun in this role.

In last year’s report, we announced that Pieper Servant Leadership Chair funds will be used to hire a second staff member to manage growth in the Emerging Leaders in Engineering program and its associated course. Hiring this second staff member will also help the college develop leadership programs that are comparable to or better than those programs offered by our peer institutions. We are also committed to having this person conduct statistical analysis of leadership outcomes attainment by engineering students. As noted last year, the Dean’s office chose to schedule this hire once the CIEE director was in place. We anticipate that a search for this position will take place later in the fall semester and completed for a new hire to begin in the spring semester.

**Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL)**

As we have previously reported, the MSL is an international research program focused on understanding the influences of higher education in shaping socially responsible leadership capacity & other leadership related outcomes (e.g., efficacy, cognitive skills, and resiliency). Beyond a research program, the MSL is an international movement toward more effective, evidence-based college student leadership development, and results can be evaluated with other leadership models in mind (including Servant Leadership, see Figure 2). More than 80 institutions of higher education have participated in this study.

![Figure 2 – Visual model of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership](image-url)
During the 2020-21 academic year, we successfully administered a survey of undergraduate students and graduate students in the School of Pharmacy. Over 30,000 undergraduate students were invited to participate and complete responses were received from 4,976 of them. This was a significant expansion of our effort from the 2018 survey, in which we invited 13,500 students to participate. This is almost 2.5 times as many students as we have invited to participate in previous editions. This will help us better analyze the least privileged, most marginalized student populations on our campus, so that we can ensure effective delivery of leadership education on a campus-wide basis. Greg Harrington serves as co-principal investigator for the study, along with Mark Kueppers. Mark is the director for UW-Madison’s Center for Leadership and Involvement.

Data analysis was completed in the 2021-22 academic year, leading to the following completed reports:

- Coalition report with key findings and recommendations for campus
  [https://uwmadison.app.box.com/s/7s6blgqjyawmyxogwmlfyb19yhleg47j](https://uwmadison.app.box.com/s/7s6blgqjyawmyxogwmlfyb19yhleg47j)
- Technical report with detailed statistics
  [https://uwmadison.app.box.com/s/voowbd1fjvm7214cb3h6d6ytwiu83vyh](https://uwmadison.app.box.com/s/voowbd1fjvm7214cb3h6d6ytwiu83vyh)
- Additional reports provided by MSLs research team
  [https://uwmadison.app.box.com/s/4jaro3y4shd1xa7oqpp81kt04rikp5qz](https://uwmadison.app.box.com/s/4jaro3y4shd1xa7oqpp81kt04rikp5qz)

Additional information is posted at [https://leadership.wisc.edu/research/](https://leadership.wisc.edu/research/), the Leadership @ UW website. Members of the Pieper Foundation and the Pieper Foundation Board are invited to browse the site.

When considering statistical significance tests, University of Wisconsin students score higher on leadership outcomes attainment than students at similar institutions (Big Ten, Carnegie and Barron’s classification peers). These differences are relatively small when evaluating differences on an effect size basis.

Our analysis also yielded the following key findings:

1. UW–Madison students scored as high on leadership outcomes as students at other institutions.
2. Leadership outcome scores for UW–Madison students have been mostly stable over time.
3. Consistent differences in leadership outcome scores were not observed by school/college.
4. Leadership outcome scores were not consistently associated with student demographics except for international status and GPA.
5. Some college environments - such as community service, organizations, student groups, mentoring, and leadership training - were strongly associated with higher leadership outcome scores.
6. Participation in those environments strongly associated with higher leadership outcome scores (Key Finding 5) was not consistently associated with selected student demographics.
7. High Impact Learning Experiences and Work for Pay were not strongly associated with leadership outcome scores.
As the key findings from this iteration of the MSL crystalized, the MSL Coalition considered goals and recommendations that aligned with the data and best practices in leadership development. The recommendations below were developed, reviewed, and revised with the intent to advance leadership education and research at UW-Madison.

1. Identify peer-based and time-based aspirational institutional benchmarks for student leadership outcomes.
2. Establish infrastructure that supports application of best practices for attainment of student leadership outcomes.
3. Expand engagement in on-going leadership research and assessment.
4. Develop and/or connect complementary curricular and co-curricular leadership programs.
5. Encourage curricular and co-curricular leadership programs to be grounded in theoretical and conceptual leadership models.
6. Incorporate experiences that are strongly associated with attainment of leadership outcomes into high impact learning experiences and work experiences.

One key purpose for our participation in the study is to serve as a vehicle for continuous improvement of leadership education programs at UW-Madison. As noted in the coalition report, one of the key findings was the lack of difference between undergraduate engineering students at UW-Madison and the rest of the undergraduate population. This allowed the task force to make recommendations for improvement that applied across the campus and these recommendations did not need to be tailored to specific colleges or schools on campus.

Some recommendations have already been adopted for the leadership course and the Emerging Leaders in Engineering program, particularly the opportunity for students to engage in community-based learning projects in collaboration with the UniverCity Alliance. Bringing leadership education into the Center for Innovation in Engineering Education is also consistent with the 4th and 5th recommendations noted above.

*Big Ten Leadership Educators Network*

Greg Harrington and Paige LaPoint worked with Big Ten partners to help sustain the participation of peer institutions in research and continuous improvement efforts via the MSL. The pandemic has challenged institutions to find ways to fund this effort and continued advocacy will be needed in the coming year or more of uncertainty.

Paige worked with staff from the Center for Leadership and Involvement to host the 2022 summit of the Big Ten Leadership Educators Network at UW-Madison in July 2022. This two day event included a presentation of UW-Madison’s MSL results by Greg Harrington, Mark Kueppers, and James Yonker.
**Academic Year 2022-23 Goals**

*College of Engineering Center for Education Innovation*

We have hired Dane Matilla to continue Paige LaPoint’s leadership course for Fall 2022 and expect Angela Kita to teach one section of the course in Spring 2023. We look forward to a successful transition of the ELE program into the CIEE during the year. We also expect to hire a second staff member to cover additional sections of our leadership competencies course, provide assistance to departments in meeting accreditation requirements for leadership education, ensure collaboration between curricular and co-curricular leadership education, and provide a more detailed statistical assessment of engineering students in the MSL dataset.

**Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership**

Greg Harrington and Mark Kueppers continue to serve as the campus-level Principal Investigators for the 2021 MSL. With data analysis complete, attention has focused on gaining campus-wide participation in implementing recommendations and on ensuring participation of Big Ten peers in the years to come. As noted in previous reports to the foundation, after completing participation in the 2024 edition of the MSL, we will likely have enough longitudinal data to replace the Skyfactor data used for Criteria 1, 3, and 4.

We have also begun exploring the possibility of leveraging our MSL activities to facilitate UW-Madison’s inclusion in an Elective Carnegie Classification titled “The 2024 Elective Classification for Leadership for Public Purpose.” The Carnegie Foundation defines this as “institutions that are committed to leadership for public purpose enhance the learning, teaching, and research mission of their institution by: developing leadership abilities in all institutional stakeholders; contributing to the public scholarly understanding of leadership as a public good, and understanding of the sociopolitical contexts, systems, and practices within which all leadership resides; and preparing students for lives of public leadership for public purpose in their careers, communities, and the broader society.” More information may be found at [https://carnegieelectiveclassifications.org/](https://carnegieelectiveclassifications.org/)

**Big Ten Leadership Educators Network**

The Big Ten Leadership Educators Network remains committed to meeting annually in an effort to advance the field of leadership education. The University of Michigan has been identified as the hosts for the next meeting in July/August 2023. We continue to work with our Big Ten peers to ensure a continued commitment to continuous improvement in leadership education across this globally recognized set of universities.
Criterion 6 – Carrying Out Mission of the Chair

Typical Thinking that Goes into Evaluating the Criterion

This is a follow-up of Criterion 2 and is an annual consideration. Is there a broad range of deliverable areas with some reasonable quantity of people involved carrying out the mission of the chair as agreed to and accepted by the institution?

Academic Year 2021-22 Progress

As we discussed at last year’s meeting, we have decided to be more judicious in distinguishing between initiatives and routine work of carrying out the chair’s mission. We continue to be involved in several campus-level and college-level activities as follows:

1. **College of Engineering Student Leadership Center.** We continue to work with student organizations to offer financial support (up to a total of $10,000) for UW-Madison College of Engineering students to lead service-learning or community outreach projects that “lift up society, enrich organizations and communities, and have a positive effect on the least privileged.”

2. **Community-Based Involvement in Engineering Classes.** We continue to work with connections at the Morgridge Center for Public Service and the UniverCity Alliance to bring community-based projects to the Senior Capstone Design course in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering. We have now performed projects for communities in Adams, Brown, Columbia, Dane, Door, Green, Marathon, Outagamie, Sheboygan, and Pepin Counties. We have also partnered with our Guatemala unit of Engineers Without Borders to work on school and water supply projects in our freshman engineering class.

3. **Collaboration with the UW-Madison Center for Leadership and Involvement.** We continue to engage the campus-level leadership development group with analysis of the campus-wide leadership framework and its continuous improvement. Over the past year, the framework was validated by nationally recognized experts in leadership education and incorporation of MSL data into a continuous improvement process was done to ensure that campus programs were appropriately delivering the content established by the framework. We are also engaged in strategic planning that will elevate the academic stature of the Center. Long term goals are to develop a leadership certificate that has an academic credential status similar to a minor and to include a research component inclusive of both scholarly research and internal operations research.

Academic Year 2022-23 Goals

We are looking to maintain our Servant Leadership programming opportunities while believing we can expand these opportunities with a new Center for Innovation in Engineering Education.
We will continue to engage in community building for student organizations and in the leadership education program. We also expect to expand on these efforts with a new hire in the college staff now that a director of the Education Innovation Center has been hired. Greg will also continue to engage with Mark Kueppers and the campus’ Center for Leadership and Involvement to develop strategic plans for the future.

**Criterion 7 – Servant Leader that Leads at an Element or Segment of our World**

*Typical Thinking that Goes into Evaluating the Criterion*

*Is there evidence that a professor in their nurturing locally, community, nation and world is consistently contributing or leading service model versus the power model? Are there multiple students participating in that level? Such a critical mass would be considered promising and obviously if such a leader or professor nurtures someone else who moves into that level, you could expect the maximum award.*

**Academic Year 2021-22 Progress**

We ask the board to consider Anthony Heddlesten, a 2007 alumnus of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, as an example of someone who consistently leads with servant leadership. In 12 short years, Anthony became the Chief of the Civil and Environmental Engineering Section for the Rock Island District of the US Army Corps of Engineers. This division plays a critical role in serving communities across much of Iowa and Illinois, providing protection from flood waters and waterborne disease as well as enhancing economic development with river transport of goods and generation of hydropower. He has routinely taken on temporary assignments to help a community or an Army Corps division in need.

In addition to his career, Anthony spent much of his free time working with the local community on education and improvement programs and this volunteerism led to his election as mayor of Riverdale, Iowa this past year. His emphasis as mayor has been to bring a culture of listening to community members in community decision making and he is extremely proud of his recent success in having Riverdale being selected for a Dolly Parton Imagination Library, which will bring education opportunities for kids 4 and under to Riverdale. He has also used this position to work with other mayors to better understand how infrastructure plays a vital role in community health and well being.

These high-ranking positions have come not because Anthony sought them, they have come because he gained a core following of coworkers and community members from his servant leadership approach. These individuals encouraged Anthony to take these roles. While doing all of the above, Anthony finds time to serve as a mentor in our Emerging Leaders in Engineering program.

Anthony’s remarkable efforts led us to nominate him for a Forward Award from the University of Wisconsin Alumni Association. The Forward Award “acknowledges rising stars in various fields
who exemplify the Wisconsin Idea through an emphasis on service, discovery, and progress. Young alumni within 15 years of graduation who have demonstrated exceptional early-career achievement and a positive impact on their professions or communities are eligible for this award.” Anthony was one of seven nominees selected to receive this prestigious award. At his acceptance speech, the director of our alumni foundation thanked him for being a “model servant leader.” We couldn’t agree more.

We invite the board to read more about Anthony’s approach at the Forward Award web site: https://www.uwalumni.com/news/anthony-heddlesten/

**Academic Year 2022-23 Goals**

We are also confident that the college’s new leadership program will instill and reinforce the service-oriented values that our students commonly carry forward into their careers. While we wish to approach this criterion with some humility, we believe there are a significant number of our former engineering students who are bringing positive change to the world while exhibiting the attributes of servant leaders. This belief is reinforced by the large number of students who are planting the seeds for such service while they are on campus.

We believe we now have the ability to track our students and alumni in ways that our fellow servant leader institutions do. Paige and Greg will continue to work together to nominate one or more students in next year’s annual report.

As we have indicated in previous years, we hope to use the Servant Leader Chair endowment to continue encouraging engineering students to participate in activities that serve underprivileged communities both locally and in developing countries. Our funding of student projects focused on providing clean water to impoverished communities and exposing the STEM fields to underrepresented communities is contributing to positive social change. We look forward to participating with and supporting our communities in making the world more just and humane.
Appendix A – Senior Exit Survey Data for Questions Relevant to Leadership Education

**Figure A1.** Mean level of satisfaction with value derived from team experiences. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). For the most recent six years, the difference between Wisconsin and peer engineering institutions was statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. For the same period, there was no statistically significant improvement or decline in student perception at Wisconsin.

**Figure A2.** Mean level of satisfaction with value of engineering student organization activities. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). For the most recent six years, the difference between Wisconsin and peer engineering institutions was statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. For the same period, there was no statistically significant improvement or decline in student perception at Wisconsin.
Figure A3. Mean level of satisfaction with leadership opportunities in engineering student organization activities. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). For the most recent six years, the difference between Wisconsin and peer engineering institutions was statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. For the same period, there was a statistically significant improvement in student perception at Wisconsin.

Figure A4. Mean level of satisfaction with fellow students’ ability to work in teams. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). For the most recent six years, the difference between Wisconsin and peer institutions was statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. For the same period, there was no statistically significant improvement or decline in student perception at Wisconsin.
Figure A5. Mean level of satisfaction with fellow students’ level of camaraderie. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). For the most recent six years, the difference between Wisconsin and peer institutions was statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. For the same period, there was no statistically significant improvement or decline in student perception at Wisconsin.

Figure A6. Mean level of satisfaction with how engineering education enhanced ability to function on multidisciplinary teams. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). For the most recent six years, the difference between Wisconsin and peer institutions was statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. For the same period, there was no statistically significant improvement or decline in student perception at Wisconsin. The large improvement for all institutions in 2013-14 was likely due to a rephrasing of the question asked in the survey.
Figure A7. Mean level of satisfaction with how engineering education enhanced ability to understand ethical responsibilities. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). For the most recent six years, the difference between Wisconsin and peer institutions was not statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. For the same period, there was no statistically significant improvement or decline in student perception at Wisconsin. The large improvement for all institutions in 2013-14 was likely due to a rephrasing of the question asked in the survey.

Figure A8. Mean level of satisfaction with how engineering education enhanced ability to understand professional responsibilities. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). For the most recent six years, the difference between Wisconsin and peer institutions was statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. For the same period, there was no statistically significant improvement or decline in student perception at Wisconsin. The large improvement for all institutions in 2013-14 was likely due to a rephrasing of the question asked in the survey.
Figure A9. Mean level of satisfaction with how engineering education enhanced ability to recognize need to engage in lifelong learning. The x-axis is organized on an academic year basis, so that 2015 refers to the 2014-15 academic year. The Pieper Servant-Leader Chair at the UW-Madison College of Engineering began in the 2008-09 academic year. The scale on the y-axis has a minimum value of 1 (very dissatisfied) and a maximum value of 7 (very satisfied). For the most recent six years, the difference between Wisconsin and peer engineering institutions is statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. For the same period, there was no statistically significant improvement or decline in student perception at Wisconsin. The large improvement for all institutions in 2013-14 was likely due to a rephrasing of the question asked in the survey.
Appendix B

Syllabus and Project Descriptions for
INTEREGR 303: Applied Competencies for Engineering Leadership
1. COURSE TITLE AND NUMBER
   INTEREGR 303 - Applied Leadership Competencies in Engineering

2. CREDITS AND CONTACT HOURS
   3 credits, 3 contact hours per week

3. CANVAS COURSE URL
   https://canvas.wisc.edu/courses/221049

4. COURSE DESIGNATIONS AND ATTRIBUTES
   None

5. MEETING TIME AND LOCATION
   Tuesdays and Thursdays from 4:00-5:15
   311 Wendt Commons

6. THE COURSE IS
   Elective

7. INSTRUCTIONAL MODE
   Face-to-face

8. HOW THE COURSE MEETS THE CREDIT HOUR POLICY
   This class meets for two, 75-minute class periods each week over the fall semester and carries the expectation that students will work on course learning activities (volunteering, reading, reflecting, writing, etc) for about 3 hours out of the classroom for every class period. There is a volunteer component to this course that will require you to work on a project in coordination with a local Wisconsin community with your peers both inside and outside of class.

9. INSTRUCTORS AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS

9.1 Instructor Title and Name
   Paige LaPoint, Instructor

9.2 Instructor Availability
   Wednesday from 1:00-2:00pm.

9.3 Instructor Email/Preferred Contact
   plapoint@wisc.edu
   608-262-2496
10. OFFICIAL COURSE DESCRIPTION
Introduction to basic leadership theories and perspectives; application of said theories to real-life experiences (both engineering and otherwise) through reflections, course discussion, readings, and experiential education in their local communities. Social Change Model of Leadership Development and Servant Leadership theory, viewed through an Applied Critical Leadership Theory lens.

11. REQUISITES
None

12. LEARNING OUTCOMES
12.1 Course Learning Outcomes
- Identify the leadership role that engineering professionals play in service to a breadth of social, political, environmental, economic, and global issues
- Apply and reflect on the “Seven C’s” of the Social Change Model through engaging as servant leaders in a stewardship service project
- Apply teamwork and leadership skills necessary to embrace individual differences and help groups collaborate on shared aims and values
- Identify and describe one’s own individual strengths, and be able to identify and honor the strengths in others
- Communicate comfortably and professionally with peers, practicing engineers, and adult professionals
- Reflect upon and understand one’s own responsibility to strive for self-awareness, empathy, authenticity, vulnerability, and curiosity when working on leadership skill attainment
- Utilize a critical race perspective to address leadership challenges found in personal and professional experiences to achieve change in response to power, domination, access, and achievement imbalances.*

*Note: outcome language from Santamaria & Santamaria (2012), p. 7

12.2 ABET Student Outcomes
3. an ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences
4. an ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts
5. an ability to function effectively on a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment, establish goals, plan tasks, and meet objectives
6. an ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies.
13. BRIEF LIST OF TOPICS TO BE COVERED
   ● Overview of prevalent theories regarding leadership
     ○ Social Change Model of Leadership
     ○ Servant Leadership Theory
   ● Identifying the strengths of the team and the individual (CliftonStrengths)
   ● Emotional intelligence, communication, teamwork and group dynamics
   ● Creating personal and professional goals that align with one’s values
   ● The role of the engineer in both leadership and servant leadership
   ● Diverse voices in leadership development

14. DISCUSSION SESSIONS
    N/A

15. LABORATORY SESSIONS
    N/A

16. REQUIRED TEXTBOOK, SOFTWARE & OTHER COURSE MATERIALS
    • None. All necessary materials will be provided by the instructor.
      ● “Strengths Based Leadership”--Tom Rath, Barry Conchie, 2008
      ● “Resolving Conflict Rationally and Effectively”
      ● “No Hard Feelings”--Liz Fosslein, Mary West Duffy, 2019

17. GRADING

This course is heavily project and reflection-based; it emphasizes the importance of reading the material, participating and listening during class discussions, and synthesizing your thoughts into reflection pieces. Successful students will put in the effort to learn more about themselves and their fellow students.

Discussion Participation: 15% An overall assessment will be made of each student’s continued participation in class discussion throughout the course. The instructor of this course will continuously evaluate the degree of critical thoughtfulness displayed by each student during the discussion to assess if the reading was completed and reflection from said reading occurred. Attendance will also be used as a metric to determine overall participation in the course.
Participation Grade Guidelines

A: This student comes to class prepared to think carefully, making connections between readings and topics discussed in the course. They are willing to take the lead in discussion periodically, posing interesting questions or taking risks by answering tough questions. This student avoids dominating discussion, instead participating mindfully in conversation with other students, considering their ideas and responding thoughtfully and respectfully. They help to create a sense of a shared conversation in the group as a whole.

AB: This student does most of what an A student does, but may be slightly lacking in one area – for instance, they may be a conscientious reader and thinker who tends not to listen to other students or otherwise dominates conversation instead of engaging in productive deliberation. Or, they may have been late to class a few times without informing the instructor 24-hours prior. Another example of this student would be missing a reading or two, and therefore lacking in overall contribution to the conversation.

B: This student participates often, but not consistently. They may attend every class and do all the readings but avoids actively participating in discussion, instead only responding to questions or adding periodically to others’ ideas. This student may participate well, but may have missed a class and did not inform their instructor 24-hours in advance, or failed to submit the makeup assignment after their absence.

BC: This student may be a frequent but superficial discussion participant. At times the student may seem to have not completed readings, though they usually come to class prepared.

C: This student is intermittently prepared for class (e.g., participates well but has missed two classes without informing the instructor prior and did not submit a makeup assignment). They may have moments of excellent contribution, but rarely participate beyond the occasional superficial comment.

D: This student very rarely participates in course discussions. When they do, their participation lacks substance and does not add much to the overall conversation.

F: This student has missed three classes without submitting a makeup assignment and/or attends most classes but never participates.

Class Presentations: 15% Students will be assessed on one individual presentation (5%) and one group presentation (10%).

Reflection Papers: 15% Students will submit several reflection papers throughout the semester regarding the various topics discussed. Reflection papers provide a way for the instructor to assess if students are understanding the material being covered.

Final Reflection Paper: 25% This final paper will discuss themes discovered throughout the semester, as well as answering questions provided in the prompt.
Volunteer Project Proposal and Final Paper: 30% A large portion of the class surrounds your volunteer project, the proposal you submit (10% of grade), and the final product for the community partner (20% of grade). This volunteer project asks for you to employ your “engineering brains”, while simultaneously understanding your due diligence as engineers to serve others. As such, you will collaborate with communities in Wisconsin to work on a project that utilizes your skills. You (and the team you will be paired with for this project) are expected to work with said partners to review the Scope of Service document that has been assigned to your group and complete the deliverables that have been outlined in the document, as well as those that have been discussed with your partners. Once you review your scope of service and work with both your mentors and project leads, you will write a project proposal with your team and submit it for approval to your instructor, as well as the local non-profit. Once it has been approved by both entities you and your team will utilize the class periods that are not being held to complete your approved project.

Overall Grading Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>90% or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>85-89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>80-84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>75-79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70-74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60-69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Below 59.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. EXAMS, QUIZZES, PAPERS & OTHER MAJOR GRADED WORK
- As listed above, two presentations will occur throughout the course. Both of these presentations will take place in class. One will be individual, and the other will be with the group students are assigned to. It is the expectation that the group members collaborate equally in the preparation and presentation of their assignment.
- All reflection papers (final or otherwise) are to be submitted electronically in Canvas by the end of the due date (11:59pm). The group volunteer project proposal will be due via Canvas to the instructor by the end of the due date (11:59pm).
- Your sign-in sheet will be due in class on 12/8/2020

19. HOMEWORK & OTHER ASSIGNMENTS
- Homework will be posted on the course Canvas site and announced during class.
- It is the expectation of your instructor that reflection papers are done on an individual basis, and group work is completed equally amongst the group.
○ Fellow group members will complete assessment sheets on their groups to help the instructor assess if all group members were contributing equally to the effort of the team.

- Late assignments will lose 10% per day late unless prior approval from the instructor.
- Attendance for class is required and will be taken at the beginning of each class. Attendance will play a role in your overall participation grade. If you must miss a class period it must be cleared with the instructor before the class period via email.

### 20. OTHER COURSE INFORMATION

N/A

### 21. SAMPLE COURSE OUTLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Homework</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/3</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Review syllabus, course expectations, etc. Intro to course and projects</td>
<td>Input preference for project into canvas.</td>
<td>9/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Larry from CfLI</td>
<td>Read “The Engineer of 2020” ch. 4</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Group work. Astin’s “Leadership for Social Change” review.</td>
<td>Reflection # 2 “Emotional Intelligence”–Create group work contracts and determine “team lead” (due on 9/24)</td>
<td>9/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/22</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Consciousness of Self theme...group work time</td>
<td>Take Strengths Assessment and schedule 1:1--Continue Group Project--Create group work contracts and determine “team lead”</td>
<td>9/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Discuss Strengths, continue with group work</td>
<td>Prep for Strengths Testimonials Presentation--Continue Group Project</td>
<td>9/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Strengths Testimonials (presentations)</td>
<td>Continue Group Project. <strong>Submit Project Proposal based on Scope of Services</strong></td>
<td>10/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Strengths Testimonials (presentations)</td>
<td>Continue working on project</td>
<td>10/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>Community Project</td>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td>Read &quot;No Hard Feelings&quot; Ch. 4 Handout--Reflection #3</td>
<td>10/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Congruence Exercise</td>
<td>Reflection #4--Identifying Your Why</td>
<td>10/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Commitment--personal development plans</td>
<td>Reflection #5--Personal Development Plans</td>
<td>10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group Work Time</td>
<td>Read Stregths Based Leadership Book Part Two</td>
<td>10/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Collaboration--Team Strengths Activity</td>
<td>Read &quot;No Hard Feelings&quot; Ch. 5</td>
<td>10/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td>Work Time--submit working draft of work</td>
<td>10/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27</td>
<td>Leadership Diversity</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Read “Resolving Conflict Rationally and Effectively”, as well as “No Hard Feelings” Ch. 6 and submit Reflection #6 (Canvas)</td>
<td>10/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Controversy with Civility discussion</td>
<td>Read &quot;The Case for Servant Leadership Ch. 3</td>
<td>10/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Citizenship--Discuss Servant Leadership-- Presentation</td>
<td>Read &quot;The Case for Servant Leadership Ch. 4&quot;</td>
<td>10/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Morgridge Center Speaker</td>
<td>Reflection #7--The Danger of a Single Story (via CfLI Certificate)</td>
<td>11/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Group Work--prep for check in</td>
<td>11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Work check-in</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence Convo</td>
<td>Competency Essay Due</td>
<td>11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19</td>
<td>Community Project</td>
<td>Group Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24</td>
<td>Community Project</td>
<td>Group Project</td>
<td>Reflection #8 Leadership Modules (via CfLI Certificate)</td>
<td>11/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1</td>
<td>Engineering Leadership</td>
<td>Guest Speaker (Diverse Perspective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3</td>
<td>Community Project</td>
<td>Group Project</td>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>Community Project</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10</td>
<td>Community Project</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Final Project Due 12/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RULES, RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES
· See the Guide’s to Rules, Rights and Responsibilities

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
By enrolling in this course, each student assumes the responsibilities of an active participant in UW-Madison’s community of scholars in which everyone’s academic work and behavior are held to the highest academic integrity standards. Academic misconduct compromises the integrity of the university. Cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration, and helping others commit these acts are examples of academic misconduct, which can result in disciplinary action. This includes but is not limited to failure on the assignment/course, disciplinary probation, or suspension. Substantial or repeated cases of misconduct will be forwarded to the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards for additional review. For more information, refer to https://conduct.students.wisc.edu/academic-integrity/.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
McBurney Disability Resource Center syllabus statement: “The University of Wisconsin-Madison supports the right of all enrolled students to a full and equal educational opportunity. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Wisconsin State Statute (36.12), and UW-Madison policy (Faculty Document 1071) require that students with disabilities be reasonably accommodated in instruction and campus life. Reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities is a shared faculty and student responsibility. Students are expected to inform faculty [me] of their need for instructional accommodations by the end of the third week of the semester, or as soon as possible after a disability has been incurred or recognized. Faculty [I], will work either directly with the student [you] or in coordination with the McBurney Center to identify and provide reasonable instructional accommodations. Disability information, including instructional accommodations as part of a student’s educational record, is confidential and protected under FERPA.” http://mcburney.wisc.edu/facstaffother/faculty/syllabus.php

DIVERSITY & INCLUSION
Institutional statement on diversity: “Diversity is a source of strength, creativity, and innovation for UW-Madison. We value the contributions of each person and respect the profound ways their identity, culture, background, experience, status, abilities, and opinion enrich the university community. We commit ourselves to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, outreach, and diversity as inextricably linked goals. Disrespectful behavior or comments directed toward any group or individual will be addressed by the instructor.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison fulfills its public mission by creating a welcoming and inclusive community for people from every background – people who as students, faculty, and staff serve Wisconsin and the world.” https://diversity.wisc.edu/