

EVALUATING THE WELDON COOPER CENTER'S LEAD PROGRAM

CARRIE O'FORAN

Master of Public Policy Candidate
Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy
University of Virginia
May 2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I'd like to thank my client, the Weldon Cooper Center, for being willing to work with me on this project. More specifically, thank you to Charles Hartgrove for providing feedback and taking time to talk with me when I needed help. Thank you to everyone on the LEAD team for inviting me to attend the program and for answering any and all clarifying questions I had. I really appreciate all of the help and support. Finally, thank you to everyone at the Weldon Cooper Center for your enthusiasm and encouragement. I am so grateful.

Next, I'd like to thank my APP professors - Professor Bassett and Professor Wyckoff for all of their help and support. Any time I felt confused or discouraged about how my project fit within the broader APP curriculum, both Professor Bassett and Professor Wyckoff spent time to help clarify my assignments and encourage me. In addition, their feedback and suggestions helped push me to produce a better final product. Thank you both.

Similarly, thank you to all my Batten classmates for their constant support and encouragement. In particular, thank you to Alex Hendel and Bryan Christ for taking the time to read, edit, and comment on my drafts, and to Alex for being my APP partner for two semesters.

Finally, thank you to my family for encouraging me through my entire time at Batten. I couldn't have done this without their support.

DISCLAIMER

The author conducted this study as part of the program of professional education at the Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy, University of Virginia. This paper is submitted in partial fulfillment of the course requirements for the Master of Public Policy degree. The judgments and conclusions are solely those of the author, and are not necessarily endorsed by the Batten School, by the University of Virginia, or by any other agency.

HONOR STATEMENT

On my honor as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment.

Carrie Oforan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	
	1
Disclaimer	
	1
Honor Statement	
	1
Executive Summary	
	4
Problem Statement	
	4
Background	
	5
Local Government	5
Leadership	5
The Weldon Cooper Center	6
The LEAD Program	6
Program Goals and Curriculum	7
Current Evaluations	7
Literature Review	
	8
Critical Reflection and Self-Awareness	8
Critical Reflection in LEAD	9
High-Performance Organizations Framework	9
Evaluations of HPO	10
Findings Summary	11
Leadership Development Best Practices	11
Methods	
	12
Goals of the Evaluation	12
Current Evaluations	12
Types of Program Evaluations	13
Formative Evaluation	13
Process Evaluation	13
Learning Evaluation	13

Outcomes Evaluation	14
Data Collection	14
Surveys	14
Interviews	15
Focus Groups	15
Mixed Methods	15
The Best Fit for LEAD	15
Evaluation Design Options	
	17
Study Design 1: Pre-Program vs. Post-Program Leadership Question	17
Study Design 2: Post-Program Follow-Up	17
Study Design 3: 360-Degree Leadership Assessment	18
Modified Post-Program Survey	19
Criteria	
	20
Effectiveness	20
Cost	21
Recommendation	
	22
Implementation	
	24
Limitations	
	25
Works Cited	26
Appendix A	32
Appendix B	34
Appendix C	36
Appendix D	39

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service is an organization located in Charlottesville, Virginia that seeks to “strengthen and preserve effective government in Virginia” (“About | Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service,” n.d.). Leading, Educating, and Developing (LEAD) is one of their programs designed to improve the leadership capabilities of local government employees. While the Weldon Cooper Center evaluates LEAD after every session with post-program surveys, they seek to conduct a more rigorous evaluation of the program.

After a careful review of the literature on leadership programs, critical reflection, and the High-Performance Organization framework, a program evaluation is necessary to estimate LEAD’s impact on participants’ leadership skills. I consider the following study designs:

1. Pre-Program vs. Post-Program Leadership Question
2. Post-Program Follow-Up
3. 360-Degree Leadership Assessment

Ultimately, I recommend study design three: a pre- and post-program 360-degree leadership assessment. This study design is optimal because it measures program outcomes where the Weldon Cooper Center previously only had information on participant satisfaction and program implementation. The first and second study designs do not measure outcomes. Moreover, I recommend moving the current post-program survey online and modifying the questions to make analysis easier. Lastly, I recommend that if the Weldon Cooper Center seeks to expand the LEAD program, they do so by expanding the number of meetings between participants.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Although local government employees provide critical services for Americans every day, too few local public officials have the leadership skills to efficiently and effectively govern (“The Most Important Problem,” 2019). The LEAD program aims to improve local public leadership by helping participants reflect on their experiences, struggles, and current leadership style, and presenting a leadership framework that focuses on leaders as those who empower individuals around them (Terry & Hartgrove, 2019). Given the critical role program participants play in providing public services, it is vital that the LEAD program is evaluated.

BACKGROUND

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Although the federal government gets significantly more attention from both the media and citizens, local governments play an extremely important role in Americans' everyday life (Hopkins, 2018). State and local governments spend approximately \$3.25 trillion every year, or just under 10% of the U.S. annual GDP ("2019 U.S. State & Local Gov. by the Numbers," n.d.). Across the United States, there are over 90,000 local governments, including nearly 20,000 cities, 38,000 special districts, over 16,000 townships, and almost 13,000 independent school districts ("Units of U.S. Local Government," n.d.). Most significantly, in 2019 local governments employed around 15 million individuals, three times the number of individuals employed by state governments and over six times the number of federal employees ("2019 U.S. Government Employment," n.d.).

Additionally, local governments handle numerous policy issues relevant to Americans' everyday lives. The White House's State and Local Government page notes that "Most Americans have more daily contact with their state and local governments than with the federal government" ("State & Local Government," n.d.). Local governments typically handle public education, local courthouses and jails, and transportation concerns. They also provide public welfare services, oversee most criminal justice cases, and are the primary responders in emergency situations (Randall, Gordon, Greene, & Huffer, n.d.). In particular, 40 percent of direct local government expenditures went to elementary and secondary education in 2015 ("State and Local Expenditures," 2015). Education is a vital issue to most Americans; in a poll from the Pew Research Center, nearly 70 percent of respondents said that education should be a top priority for the federal government in 2019. Education was the third most popular policy issue on a list of topics that should be a top concern, behind only the economy and healthcare (Bialik, 2019). In addition to education, 10 percent of direct local expenditures are spent on health and hospitals ("State and Local Expenditures," 2015). Finally, eight percent of direct local expenditures are spent on police and corrections ("State and Local Expenditures," 2015). Despite their smaller scale, local governments have an undisputed role in affecting American public policy.

LEADERSHIP

Within the local government, public leaders are integral in ensuring effective governance – and many Americans are highly concerned about public leadership. In polls conducted throughout 2019, about a quarter of Americans named "poor leadership/the government" as *the most important problem* facing the country today ("The Most Important Problem," 2019). Even though local governments tend to receive more trust and confidence than the federal government in public

surveys, Americans are clearly worried about the quality of public leadership (Parker, Morin, & Menasce Horowitz, 2019). Additionally, many believe that rebuilding our trust in the government and bridging the gap across increasingly divided political parties can start primarily with positive, civil interactions between local governments and their residents (Rainie, Keeter, & Perrin, 2019). Thus, it is critical that our local managers and leaders have the skills and experience necessary to effectively govern our cities, towns, school districts, and counties.

The COVID-19 pandemic has further highlighted the importance of effective local leadership. Local public leaders were often the first to make critical decisions on public safety in their communities, such as whether to keep schools open and what guidelines to provide their residents. These decisions also affected how seriously residents took the COVID-19 pandemic impacting whether they followed social distancing guidelines or not. Effective local leaders play big roles in keeping their residents healthy and ensuring their residents well-being more broadly.

THE WELDON COOPER CENTER

The Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service is a University of Virginia (UVA) affiliated organization in Charlottesville, Virginia whose goal is to “strengthen and preserve effective government in Virginia.” Specifically, its main activities include research, developing and administering political leadership programs, and providing training for various public service officials (“About | Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service,” n.d.). One of these programs is LEAD, a week-long political leadership program designed for local government administrators seeking to expand their leadership skills (“LEAD | Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service,” n.d.). Around 40 individuals attend each of the seven sessions, for a total of 280 LEAD participants each year (“Upcoming LEAD Classes | Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service,” n.d.).

THE LEAD PROGRAM

The LEAD program is a one-week course focused on providing local government managers the necessary tools and skills to ensure their organizations become more efficient and effective. Since its establishment in 1997, over 4,000 individuals have attended the LEAD program. While the Weldon Cooper Center focuses on governance in Virginia, leaders from any state or locality are welcome to attend the program. In order to enroll in LEAD, individuals must fill out an application, which requires personal information, employment status, educational history, and a short answer about their motivations for enrolling in the program (“LEAD Application | Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service,” n.d.). Once accepted, individuals must pay \$4,550 to enroll. The fee covers lodging, instructional materials, and most meals provided for the week. Most, if not all, participants have their program fees paid for by their employer. Approximately 40 individuals are accepted for each session, and there are about seven sessions each year.

PROGRAM GOALS AND CURRICULUM

The major goals of the LEAD program are to promote personal and professional reflection and introduce participants into a management framework called High-Performance Organization (HPO). HPO is focused on five factors of high performance: quality of management, openness and action orientation, long-term orientation, continuous improvement and renewal, and quality of employees (“The High-Performance Organization Framework,” n.d.). Oftentimes, senior members of an organization attend the longer, two-week leadership program directed by the Weldon Cooper Center called the Senior Executive Institute. Throughout this program they learn about HPO and later decide to send other members of their organization to LEAD in order to better learn the framework. This can help an organization align its management model, creating more efficient and effective leadership. Additionally, LEAD seeks to give participants time in groups to reflect on their own personal and professional success and struggles. This reflection can help public leaders clarify their strengths, weaknesses, and goals (Terry & Hartgrove, 2019).

LEAD curriculum includes HPO, the role of public service leaders, reflection on personal leadership style, organizational structure, emotional intelligence skills, team cohesion, and employee engagement. Typically, the week starts with an orientation session on a Saturday afternoon. Following this, participants have programming from 8am to 6pm, Sunday to Thursday. Programming includes activities such as lectures relevant to the topics discussed above, team building activities in groups, case study analyses, self-reflection assignments such as the Myers-Briggs test, and other learning activities. The program focuses on team activities, with team meetings or team activities nearly every day. Additionally, participants often have short homework assignments to complete for the following day (“LEAD Sample Schedule,” 2017). A full sample schedule is included in Appendix A.

CURRENT EVALUATIONS

Although the Weldon Cooper Center has conducted post-program surveys of the LEAD program for many years, these surveys were designed within the organization and simply asked participants to rate their experiences. This is critical because satisfaction surveys such as these do not indicate whether participants had changes in beliefs and understanding or changes in behavior following the program. No pre-surveys were conducted in coordination with these surveys, and little follow-up has been conducted with the program participants to ask about application or implementation. Pre-surveys are important because they allow the evaluator to establish a baseline with which to compare the post-program results. Follow-up is important because it gives insight into participants’ abilities to apply program knowledge. A more comprehensive program evaluation would be helpful to the Weldon Cooper Center in determining how it can adapt the LEAD program to better equip our local leaders and whether the program should be expanded.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to get an understanding of LEAD's effectiveness as a leadership development program, I have reviewed the literature evaluating leadership programs similar to LEAD. LEAD has two major components to its programming - critical reflection and self-awareness exercises and instruction and discussion of the High-Performance Organization framework. Below I walk through literature discussing the effectiveness of both types of activities in an effort to gauge the effectiveness of LEAD.

CRITICAL REFLECTION AND SELF-AWARENESS

The first major component of LEAD's programming is critical reflection and self-awareness activities. Critical self-reflection is defined by the literature as the systematic examination and analysis of one's beliefs and their implications (Nesbit, 2012; Densten & Gray, 2001; Wu & Crocco, 2019). Thus, critical reflection involves more than simple introspection, but must include challenging and analyzing the individual's fundamental beliefs (Densten & Gray, 2001; Horton-Deutsch & Sherwood, 2008). In addition to critical self-reflection, critical reflection can also include the analysis of new material to aid learning. Some common ways individuals engage in critical reflection include journaling, small group discussions, case study analysis, and self-awareness activities (Nesbit, 2012).

There are several theories as to how critical self-reflection can improve an individual's leadership abilities. First, critical self-reflection can help individuals better understand their previous leadership failures and experiences (Wu & Crocco, 2019). This understanding can help the individual avoid making the same mistakes in the future (Densten & Gray, 2001; Horton-Deutsch & Sherwood, 2008). Additionally, critical self-reflection can allow an individual to better see their own biases, tendencies, and behavior patterns. Once they recognize these, they will be more cognizant of where they might fall short as a leader in the future (Densten & Gray, 2001; Wu & Crocco, 2019). This can help the individual better understand where to focus in their leadership development. Practicing critical reflection can also help individuals integrate reflection as a habit, helping the individual to constantly improve and understand their leadership capabilities (Horton-Deutsch & Sherwood, 2008). Finally, an individual who gains a better understanding of their own beliefs may more easily understand the viewpoints of individuals around them, making them a more understanding leader and allow them to influence other people more effectively (Densten & Gray, 2001; Wu & Crocco, 2019).

In addition, for critical reflection of new materials, the theory of change is fairly simple. When an individual reflects and analyzes material they recently learned they may be more likely to buy into the theories or at the very least be more likely to remember and understand it. For example, some

individuals learn best when they put theory into practice, “but practice makes sense only through reflection as enhanced by theory” (Densten & Gray, 2001).

CRITICAL REFLECTION IN LEAD

The LEAD program engages participants in critical reflection in numerous ways. First, each participant is given a journal with their programming materials upon arrival, and instructors repeatedly encourage participants to use the journal to take notes and reflect on the material throughout. Sometimes, specific time is set aside during programming for participants to write in their journals. Participants are also encouraged to reflect in their journals after programming ends. At the end of each day, there is a self-reflection and journal prompt for participants to write about on their own. In addition to time spent in a classroom setting with lecture and discussion, participants are each assigned to a small team which they meet with nearly every day. Each of these teams are led by one of the instructors. Team meetings are used for participants to reflect on how the classroom materials relate to their professional experiences as leaders. Additionally, participants work through leadership case studies within their teams which help them gain additional perspectives on their previous leadership struggles. Finally, participants take the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator assessment prior to arriving for LEAD and spend part of one day discussing their strengths and weaknesses. As groups, they talk through their leadership tendencies and gain a better understanding for the perspectives of other types of leaders.

Unfortunately, there is very limited literature evaluating the impact of critical reflection on leadership development specifically. The literature that does exist on critical reflection does not go further than theorizing how critical reflection and self-awareness engagement might improve an individual’s leadership capabilities. Additionally, while critical self-reflection has been a common component of leadership development for a long time (Wu & Crocco, 2019), there are few studies that isolate the impact of it on leadership capabilities. However, research by Brooks, Harris, and Clayton indicates that critical reflection improves students’ ability to “make connections between theory and practice” (Brooks, Harris & Clayton, 2010). For example, they found that even nursing students who understood underlying theories had difficulty applying theories into practice without reflection (Brooks, Harris & Clayton, 2010). Thus, while evaluations supporting the effectiveness of critical self-reflection in improving leadership are sparse, critical reflection does seem to help students apply theories and better understand new material (Wu & Crocco, 2019).

HIGH-PERFORMANCE ORGANIZATIONS FRAMEWORK

As noted above, the other major component of LEAD’s programming is instruction and discussion of the High-Performance Organization (HPO) framework. The HPO framework was created out of extensive research into what made some organizations exceptional and some fail. Afterwards, numerous characteristics were identified from this research as contributing factors to success and a survey was distributed to companies across the world. These surveys had respondents score

themselves on the different characteristics and share performance metrics. Finally, this data was used to isolate five groups of characteristics that correlate with successful organizations (“The High-Performance Organization Framework,” n.d.). The five factors are —

1. Quality of Management: Managers at HPOs trust and respect their employees, communicate clearly, and create strong relationships with their employees.
2. Openness and Action Orientation: At HPOs, there is a culture of valuing frequent and open communication. Decision-making is transparent and employees are included in important processes.
3. Long-Term Orientation: HPOs focus on long-term successes rather than short term gains.
4. Continuous Improvement and Renewal: HPOs have a distinct strategy and goal that it continuously and ardently works towards.
5. Quality of Employees: Employees at HPOs are diverse, resilient, and flexible.

As a leadership program, LEAD does not focus on all of these characteristics. In particular, most of the instruction and discussion is spent on quality of management. In practice, this includes extended discussions about where authority and power for decision making rests within an organization, and how LEAD participants can empower rather than micromanage individuals below them on the organizational hierarchy. This instruction includes theoretical explanations, case study examinations, and group discussions on what the theory would look like at each of their organizations. For public sector organizations, quality of management, as defined by the HPO model, is the most critical component of creating an effective organization (de Waal, 2010). Thus, while LEAD only focuses on one of the characteristics that make organizations effective, it is the most important characteristic and therefore can make a big difference in the organization’s success.

EVALUATIONS OF HPO

There have been several attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of using the HPO framework to improve organization financial and non-financial outcomes. In one study, a private manufacturing company called Swagelok, with locations across the United States and Canada, was evaluated. First, in 2013, researchers used a survey to evaluate seven Swagelok facilities on the HPO framework. Each facility subsequently received feedback on where they could improve according to the HPO framework. In 2015, additional surveys were used to evaluate any improvements. Results varied across the different locations. However, “all locations agreed that the HPO Framework had been instrumental, in a positive way, to the development of their organization and its people” (de Waal, 2017). Additionally, every location reported improvements in operational performance, employee engagement, customer service, and employee relationships (de Waal, 2017). The locations that demonstrated the biggest increases in their HPO scores from 2013 to 2015 also showed an increase in sales. By contrast, locations that had no increase in their HPO score or a decline in their HPO score saw their sales decline (de Waal, 2017).

Unfortunately, although there is more literature evaluating the HPO framework than there is literature evaluating critical reflection, this research comes with several caveats. First, all of these evaluations were conducted and analyzed by Andre de Waal, a researcher who was part of the team that created the HPO framework. Therefore, there is very limited research that provides an *independent analysis* of the HPO framework's effectiveness. Likewise, even de Waal's research indicates that the HPO framework is most effective when everyone at the organization is involved and engaged. It is difficult to compare the results of an entire organization engaging in the HPO framework to a single individual receiving leadership training in the HPO model. Still, many of the individuals who are sent to LEAD are attending because other more senior members of their organization have already received the training (Terry & Hartgrove, 2019). Finally, much of the concrete findings included above are from a case study of a private company. We may find different results for the local governments that LEAD would be focusing on.

FINDINGS SUMMARY

This literature review has demonstrated several important results. First, there is some evidence that critical reflection helps individuals retain and apply new theories more effectively. Thus, participants should be better equipped to apply the HPO framework to their leadership style due to the various reflection practices used in LEAD. Additionally, there is some evidence that the HPO framework improves organizations' non-financial and financial outcomes. However, this research is questionably biased and limited in its applicability to LEAD's programming. Moreover, there is very little research that provides evidence on the effectiveness of critical self-reflection on improving an individual's leadership capabilities. Given these limitations, it is unwise to make extrapolations as to the probable effectiveness of the LEAD program. Thus, a program evaluation should be conducted to evaluate LEAD's impact on participant's leadership skills.

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT BEST PRACTICES

For leadership development programs more generally, there are several evidence-based best practices. First, a meta-analysis of leadership development evaluations found that on average programs had positive reactions from participants, increased participant learning, significantly increased participant transfer of learned material, and resulted in positive leadership outcomes (Lacerenza, Reyes, Marlow, Joseph, & Salas, 2017). Additionally, this study also found that some leadership development factors were associated with better outcomes. Providing participants with feedback on their theory application and leadership capabilities improves their ability to apply program instruction. Programs that include training on soft-skills significantly improved participant leadership outcomes while programs with hard-skills training were more effective at improving learning. Longer training is more effective at improving outcomes than shorter training; however, it is important for the training to be spaced out over time. Finally, to aid participant learning, it is most effective to use instruction, demonstration, and practice in combination rather than instruction alone (Lacerenza et al., 2017).

METHODS

There are many types of program evaluations and multiple methods used to collect data. Below, I walk through the Weldon Cooper Center's goals for the evaluation, the types of program evaluations, and various data collection methods.

GOALS OF THE EVALUATION

The Weldon Cooper Center seeks to conduct an evaluation of the LEAD program for several reasons. First, the LEAD program continues to be one of the Weldon Cooper Center's more popular leadership programs. Currently, the LEAD program has sufficient participant interest and has not struggled to attract attendees. At the same time, the market continues to evolve and bring more leadership programs to public service officials. Thus, the Weldon Cooper Center has considered expanding LEAD. Prior to taking this on, it is critical that the Weldon Cooper Center understands whether the LEAD program is effective at improving leadership skills and where it can be improved and adapted. In particular, it is important to understand which components of the program are most effective and helpful prior to expanding. This would help the Weldon Cooper Center identify not only whether to expand, but also how to expand LEAD. When considering the best way to evaluate LEAD, it is important that the design aligns with the Weldon Cooper Center's needs.

Additionally, public service leaders pay over \$4,000 in order to attend, along with travel costs. These costs are typically, if not always, covered by the participant's employer. Still, given that local governments incur significant costs to send their employees the LEAD program, it must be valuable to their development as a public leader. For this reason, it would be beneficial for the evaluation to illuminate *if* LEAD is effective, not just *why* it is or isn't effective.

CURRENT EVALUATIONS

Currently, the Weldon Cooper Center evaluates the LEAD program through end-of-program satisfaction surveys wherein participants rate their satisfaction with each of the program components' content and presentation. Participants are also given the opportunity to provide written comments on their experience. These surveys are completed on paper, meaning an employee at the Weldon Cooper Center has to spend time entering all the data from these surveys into a database and typing all of the free response answers. (Terry & Hartgrove, 2019). An example of the current evaluation is included in Appendix B.

TYPES OF PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

“Program evaluation” is a broad umbrella term that encompasses many different types of evaluations. Below, I walk through four of the major types of program evaluations and their benefits and drawbacks.

FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Formative evaluations are used for programs that are in the development stages. These can help inform organizations on how feasible and appropriate the program is before it is implemented. They are useful for making modifications and ensuring that a program is sustainable prior to implementation (“Types of Evaluations,” n.d.). However, they are not appropriate for programs that are already being implemented. For this reason, *a formative evaluation is not appropriate for LEAD*.

PROCESS EVALUATION

Process evaluations are used to determine “whether program activities have been implemented as intended” (“Types of Evaluations,” n.d.). They typically tell analysts how the program participants experienced the program and the “trainee reactions” to the program (Reyes, Dinh, Lacerenza, Marlow, Joseph, & Salas, 2019; Clark, 2015). This type of evaluation is useful in identifying whether the program is being received by the participants as expected. Additionally, it can also inform which parts of the program participants find most and least useful. Thus, it can be useful when the organization’s goal is program improvement because process evaluations provide information on *why* the program is or is not succeeding (“Types of Evaluations,” n.d.; Mark, Henry, & Julnes, 2000; James Bell Associates, 2007). However, if the goal of the program evaluation is to acquire evidence that the program has an impact, for grant applications or otherwise, this is not a useful model. It will not inform *if* a program is succeeding. However, it is often used in combination with an outcomes evaluation to help clarify if the null results of an outcomes evaluation are due to an incorrect theory of change or poor instruction. The Weldon Cooper Center’s current post-program survey is most similar to a process evaluation.

LEARNING EVALUATION

Learning evaluations assess whether participants understood and remembered information and knowledge shared in the program (“Evaluating Leadership Development Programs,” n.d.). For example, it would answer whether an STD awareness training improved knowledge of STD prevention methods among a population (“Types of Evaluations,” n.d.). Learning evaluations typically tell organizations if participants are understanding the material, but not if they are able to apply their knowledge. Many learning evaluations are conducted using pre- and post-surveys or interviews to measure change over time (Levine, González-Fernández, Bodurtha, Skarupski, & Fivush, 2015; Reyes et al., 2019).

OUTCOMES EVALUATION

Lastly, outcomes evaluations provide information on whether the intervention ultimately resulted in the desired results. For example, it would answer whether an STD awareness training decreased the rate of STDs among participants. These are especially useful for an organization seeking a program evaluation for funding purposes (“Types of Evaluations,” n.d.). However, they are also critical in understanding whether or not the program is effective, a question that the previous evaluation designs fail to address. They are most feasible when the program’s desired impact is easily measurable, such as a decrease in drug use or an increase in math scores. Still, they do not explain *why* a program is or is not effective.

DATA COLLECTION

Three of the main techniques for collecting data to evaluate a program are surveys, interviews, and focus groups. These techniques are used for all four types of program evaluations. However, they do have implications for the type of information acquired. Additionally, they vary in their time commitment.

SURVEYS

As one of the most common data collection tools, surveys are “the cornerstone of research on economic, political, and social phenomena across academic, commercial, nonprofit, and government sectors” (Hillygus, 2016). Surveys’ biggest benefit is the ability to easily collect a lot of data. In contrast to interviews, surveys can be completed fairly quickly so it is much easier to reach a large audience. They don’t require researchers to commit to a lot of active collection time. However, surveys tend to provide less in-depth information than interviews because respondents are not typically answering many open-ended questions. Surveys are best used to collect data on simple, closed-ended questions. Additionally, surveys can easily misrepresent respondents’ views through poorly worded questions (Newcomer, Harry, & Joseph, 2015; Hillygus, 2016; Converse & Presser, 1986).

Surveys can be conducted in several ways – in person, over the phone, or over the internet (Newcomer et al., 2015). Each of these methods has benefits and drawbacks. For example, surveys conducted in-person have higher response rates, can include more questions, and can allow respondents to clarify questions with the administrators. Still, in-person surveys can make it difficult to ask about sensitive topics and to gather a very large sample size. This is because participants may feel more comfortable answering questions about sensitive topics alone rather than in a group or while being watched. Surveys conducted over the phone also benefit from participants being able to clarify questions with the analysts, but tend to have lower response rates. Surveys conducted over the internet both suffer from very low response rates and lack of interaction with the respondents, but they are much cheaper to administer and can reach many individuals (Newcomer et al., 2015; “Polling Fundamentals,” n.d.).

INTERVIEWS

Interviews are another way researchers can gather data on a program. Interviews are often used because they allow participants to provide more in-depth answers, increasing the depth of knowledge for the analysis (Pradarelli, Jaffe, Lemak, Mulholland, & Dimick, 2016; Halsall & Forneris, 2016). Additionally, interviews are more flexible than surveys in that participants can easily share concerns that the researcher may not have thought to ask about. However, interviews have several important drawbacks. Interviews take significantly more time to conduct than surveys, meaning it is more difficult to reach a large sample of people and they are more expensive (Newcomer et al., 2015). Interviewers also have to be trained to minimize their impact on participant's answers, since people are likely more likely to censor themselves in an interview than on a self-completed survey (Newcomer et al., 2015).

FOCUS GROUPS

Finally, focus groups also allow researchers to gather more in-depth answers from participants. Unlike interviews, focus groups allow participants to interact and converse. Through group discussion of the questions, focus groups sometimes help participants provide more complete answers to the interviewer. They can use each other's thoughts to understand their own experiences better. However, focus groups may also result in some participants being less likely to share their thoughts. For example, if a participant has opinions that diverge from the group, they may hold back. Thus, the researcher may not receive an accurate picture of participant views. Like interviews, focus groups also require a trained moderator to minimize impact on participant's answers. Moreover, they take a significant amount of time.

MIXED METHODS

In addition, some program evaluations use a mix of these methods. Qualitative methods, like interviews and focus groups, tend to provide a fuller answer to the researcher's question than a quantitative method, such as closed-ended survey questions, can provide. However, quantitative methods can provide a quicker summary of overall trends. Using a combination of the two methods is a common way to make up for the gaps in both. Still, this is typically costlier and more complicated as the researcher must be able to design a strong survey and receive training in conducting either interviews or focus groups.

THE BEST FIT FOR LEAD

A survey fits the Weldon Cooper Center's interests better than interviews, focus groups, or a mixed method approach because given the limited employee bandwidth, high-quality interviews or focus groups will take far too long and use significant resources. Qualitative methods such as interviews and focus groups also result in lengthy passages to analyze. This can be done by hand or using software. Both options are less than ideal as they add either time and effort to an employee or cost a significant amount of money. Additionally, the LEAD team already talks fairly extensively with program participants throughout and after the program. While these are not formal interviews and

are likely missing multiple points of view, the program leaders do have a significant amount of informal knowledge and feedback that is more open-ended than their end-of-program survey. For these reasons, all of the proposed alternatives will utilize surveys rather than interviews, focus groups, or mixed-methods.

In terms of the best type of program evaluation for LEAD, several of the options would work well. For example, given that the Weldon Cooper Center does not currently follow up with participants after they return to work, it would be beneficial to distribute a survey several months after the program ends that acts similar to a process evaluation, asking questions about what participants still found valuable. However, since the Weldon Cooper Center already has a process evaluation, it would also be beneficial to conduct an outcomes evaluation to see if the program is producing results. The alternatives included below will include a mix of process, learning, and outcomes evaluations, as all three can provide valuable information to the Weldon Cooper Center in different ways.

However, in addition to the recommended evaluation design, the current survey structure as described above should be adapted to provide more useful results for the Weldon Cooper Center. Rather than reporting satisfaction for each of the program components, it would be more beneficial to ask direct closed-ended questions such as “What was the least/most useful session for your professional development as a change maker?” with a multiple-choice list of each of the program sessions. This would provide a more concise version of the satisfaction questioning, with more easily interpretable and actionable output. Additionally, rather than including a large space for additional comments, there should be specific short answer questions to provide structure to participant’s answers. This would allow the Weldon Cooper Center to easily find the information they are looking for within the open-ended response. Finally, this survey should be moved to an online format using Qualtrics Survey Software. This will allow participants to type rather than handwrite their responses, making it easier to fill out. Qualtrics also automatically provides summary statistics on the quantitative questions which would reduce work for the LEAD team and give them feedback sooner.

EVALUATION DESIGN OPTIONS

STUDY DESIGN 1: PRE-PROGRAM VS. POST-PROGRAM LEADERSHIP QUESTION

The first study design option for the Weldon Cooper Center is to add a question asking each participant what good leadership looks like in the application and then again after the program. One of the main goals of the LEAD program is to introduce a model of leadership that focuses on empowering other people rather than making all decisions from the top down. This pre-program vs. post-program study design would help the Weldon Cooper Center measure whether or not participants show a change in thinking regarding what good leadership looks like.

Currently, in order to attend LEAD, all participants must fill out an online application. The application process is fairly short. It asks for personal information, employment history, academic history, and one or two short answer questions (“LEAD Application | Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service,” n.d.). This option would add an additional short answer to the application that asks “What do you think good leadership looks like?” This question would also be added to the post-program survey. The Weldon Cooper Center would be able to compare the answers of participants after attending the program and prior to attending the program. Although the post-program surveys are anonymous, and it would not be possible for individual answers to be matched and compared, general trends in answers would show whether there were big changes in the types of responses. This study design would add a learning evaluation to the Weldon Cooper Center’s current process evaluation, providing additional valuable data on the program’s effectiveness.

STUDY DESIGN 2: POST-PROGRAM FOLLOW-UP

The second study design option adds a post-program follow-up a few months after participants attend the program that gauges whether participants still find the program’s lessons useful in their day-to-day work lives. While it is valuable to know participants’ thoughts and opinions on the program immediately after they experience it, it is also important to know if they continue to see value in their experiences after returning to work. It may be difficult for participants to determine the value of the program experience until they return to work and test out the lessons in the work setting. Therefore, following up with participants a few months after they return to work would add helpful information to the Weldon Cooper Center’s understanding of the program. The Weldon Cooper Center does not currently follow-up with participants after the program ends.

This survey would be distributed by email to each of the programs’ participants three months after the program ends. Three months would likely be long enough for participants to adequately know whether the program was useful to them in the long run. The survey would ask questions regarding how much value participants see in what they learned at LEAD in their everyday work life.

Example questions include – “How often do you use lessons learned at LEAD at work?”, “How valuable was the LEAD experience to your development as a leader?”, and “Have you changed your leadership style or practice since attending LEAD?” These questions would be multiple choice or Likert scale designs rather than free response. Given that this survey would be distributed by email after the program ends, response rates would likely be dramatically lower than the response rates for post-program surveys currently delivered.

STUDY DESIGN 3: 360-DEGREE LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT

The third study design option is to use a pre- and post-program 360-degree leadership assessment. 360-degree leadership assessments are commonly used to measure leadership. Typically, the individual sends the assessment to their coworkers, bosses, and others that work closely with them. Each person they send it to fills out an assessment of the individual’s leadership abilities. These answers are then compiled to provide feedback to the individual on multiple dimensions of leadership. The Weldon Cooper Center would compare participant assessment scores after the program to scores prior to the program to evaluate LEAD’s impact.

Many LEAD participants may have already had a 360-degree leadership assessment completed prior to participation in the LEAD program. For example, the International City/Council Management Association (ICMA) is a membership association which many local government leaders are a part of. In order to gain membership to this association, you have to complete a “multi-rater assessment” within the first five years of entering the credentialing program. They have a list of pre-approved multi-rater assessments that meet their credentialing requirement on their website.

In order to gain pre- and post-program data, LEAD would ask participants in their application if they have taken an ICMA-approved multi-rater assessment within the last six months. If they have, they would be asked to send their results to LEAD. For participants that have not, they would be asked to take the Concord Leadership Assessment Survey. This is an ICMA-approved multi-rater assessment, and it is the most widely used 360-degree survey (“Multi-rater Assessments Approved for Use by ICMA-CMs”, n.d.). They would be allowed to opt-out of this request. Three months after they attend LEAD, all participants would be asked to take the same ICMA-approved multi-rater assessment they took prior to LEAD. Again, they would be asked to send their results to LEAD. The Weldon Cooper Center would encourage participation in these evaluations and encourage individuals to send their results by paying for the cost of the post-program evaluation.

Once this data is collected, the Weldon Cooper Center would compare the leadership scores after the program to those prior to the program. In particular, the Concord Leadership Assessment Survey has an empowerment measurement. The Weldon Cooper Center would focus on comparing participant empowerment scores before and after the program. The average of all the differences would help provide an idea of whether or not participants are improving.

MODIFIED POST-PROGRAM SURVEY

In addition to one of these study designs, the current post-program survey should be modified for ease of analysis. The current survey asks participants to rate their satisfaction with each of the sessions and session instructors on a 7-point Likert scale. In consideration of limited time, these questions would be modified to provide the same information in a more digestible way. For example, rather than asking participants to rate their satisfaction with each session, the survey would ask participants which session they found most valuable and which session they found least valuable. When looking through the original satisfaction data, evaluators would be looking for which session had the lowest satisfaction scores and the highest satisfaction ratings. However, rewording the questions in this way would provide the same information in a clearer manner. Additionally, the current survey has a space for participants to write any additional feedback. This section would be reworded to include multiple open-ended questions that framed the feedback. This would again allow the LEAD team to more quickly work through the responses. Lastly, it is critical that this survey is moved to an electronic format, specifically Qualtrics Survey Software. Using paper surveys forces someone to manually type each individual response, time that could be saved and better spent reviewing the resulting data. Qualtrics automatically provides some summary statistics after responses are collected as well. This would further reduce any time the Weldon Cooper Center needed to analyze the results.

CRITERIA

In this section, I will walk through the criteria the Weldon Cooper Center would use to evaluate the LEAD program after collecting data using the proposed evaluation.

EFFECTIVENESS

The first criteria the Weldon Cooper Center would use to evaluate LEAD is effectiveness. In a broad sense, effectiveness for LEAD is defined as how well the LEAD program can develop participants' leadership skills and capabilities. More specifically, LEAD defines good leadership as leaders that develop and empower individuals around them. Thus, LEAD is effective when it is increasing its participants' ability to empower other individuals.

How the Weldon Cooper Center measures the effectiveness of LEAD in practice changes based on which study design is used. For example, for the first study design, a pre- and post-program leadership question, effectiveness would be defined as a significant shift in participant responses from viewing leadership as a non-empowering role or through a micromanaging lens to viewing good leadership as someone who supports and develops. The LEAD team would read through each response prior to the program and each response after and categorize the responses into whether they fit the HPO model. If there was at least a 30 percent increase in the number of responses that fit the HPO model of leadership in the post-program responses, this would indicate program effectiveness.¹ However, the higher the percent increase in the number of responses that fit the HPO model of leadership in the post-program responses, the higher the effectiveness of the program.

By contrast, in practice, effectiveness would be measured slightly differently for the second study design - the post-program follow-up. Since this survey would include a myriad of questions about the participant's application of material, it is difficult to pin down effectiveness to one measure. However, the responses to a question such as "How often do you use lessons learned at LEAD in your work?" would be a good indicator of success. If a majority of respondents answered somewhat or very often for this question, this would indicate program effectiveness.

Finally, for the last study design, the 360-degree leadership assessment, effectiveness would be measured based on change in empowerment scores. Empowerment is one of the dimensions that the Concord Leadership Assessment Survey provides a score on. Thus, for this study design, a positive average difference between the pre- and post-program assessments on the empowerment score would indicate program effectiveness.

¹ These measures should be used more as guidelines than strict cutoffs of effectiveness. For example, if there was a 29 percent increase in the number of responses that fit the HPO model of leadership, this shouldn't automatically indicate that LEAD is not effective.

COST

The second criteria that the Weldon Cooper Center would use to evaluate LEAD is costs. While none of the study designs evaluate the cost of the program, it is still important in evaluating a program. For example, a program that improves management skills by five percent might not sound as appealing if it cost \$10,000 per participant. The Weldon Cooper Center should evaluate the cost of LEAD by comparing total yearly revenues of the program to total yearly costs. Total yearly costs should include employee salaries, venue fees, catering costs, and costs of materials. Total yearly revenues should mainly include program tuition.

RECOMMENDATION

After consideration of each of these survey designs and consultation with the Weldon Cooper Center, I recommend survey design three - a 360-degree leadership assessment. While both of the other survey designs would provide the Weldon Cooper Center with valuable new information, the 360-degree leadership assessment is the only design which would measure leadership outcomes. Thus, this design is the only option that can indicate *if* the LEAD program is effective at developing better leaders. Given that the Weldon Cooper Center already collects information on learner response and participant preferences, it would be most valuable to them to add a design that collects data on more than simply participant reaction. Additionally, a 360-degree leadership assessment design would provide feedback to participants on their leadership strengths and weaknesses. This would not only help LEAD, but also help participants understand what they have improved and what they still need to work on. Thus, this evaluation itself could improve participant outcomes by providing critical feedback. Furthermore, this survey design fits well into LEAD's curriculum. As discussed, much of the curriculum focuses on how to be a leader that empowers. In order to best understand whether or not individuals are succeeding in this dimension, it is important to get feedback from people working with and under the program participant. This survey design naturally does this.

Additionally, as discussed in the alternatives section, I recommend adapting their current program evaluation for simplification and ease of analysis. This includes moving the survey to an online format and changing the formatting of questions to make analysis easier for the Weldon Cooper Center. The current post-program evaluation is included in Appendix B, and the recommended amended post-program survey is included in Appendix C.

Under the circumstances where the Weldon Cooper Center enacts the evaluation design and finds that the LEAD program does not impact participant empowerment scores, I recommend implementing study design two - the post-program follow-up. In conjunction with the data they are gaining from their immediate post-program survey about what participants find valuable, introducing a follow-up survey would allow the Weldon Cooper Center to learn more about participant application of material. The results of the 360-degree leadership assessment would not indicate *why* the LEAD program is or is not working. Thus, adding this follow-up survey could help supplement the Weldon Cooper Center's knowledge on whether or not participants are applying what they are learning after they leave LEAD. I have added a draft of this survey in Appendix D.

Finally, I recommend that if the Weldon Cooper Center seeks to expand the LEAD program they consider expanding the program so participants are meeting or checking in with a mentor multiple times. Most successful leadership programs tend to have more than one meeting. One way to introduce this concept more gradually is to coordinate LEAD partners to check in with each other

on their respective leadership goals. Alternatively, participants could have regular online meetings with their LEAD small groups to continue to share their experiences, successes, and failures. However, ideally in the long run this would include multiple in-person sessions.

IMPLEMENTATION

There are a few barriers that should be considered in implementation. First, there is a concern that individuals may not send their pre-LEAD results or refuse to take the assessment. However, this barrier should be minimized because taking the assessment is in the self-interest of each participant. If they have already taken the assessment, sending their results does not require too much effort. If they have not taken the assessment, their results will be valuable to them as well as LEAD. In addition, it sets them up well to acquire ICMA-certification. LEAD should emphasize these benefits when communicating with participants.

Second, it will be costly for LEAD to pay for every participant to take the post-program follow-up. For example, the Concord Leadership Assessment Survey costs \$175 for ICMA members. For non-ICMA members, the cost per-participant is even higher. However, given that LEAD's program fees are already high and the value of a second 360-degree leadership assessment is much lower for program participants, it is critical for LEAD to cover the cost. In order to help minimize the cost burden for the Weldon Cooper Center, they might consider reducing LEAD programming costs by moving LEAD programming from the Darden School of Business to another less costly location. Additionally, if the Weldon Cooper Center is highly concerned with the cost burden, they could randomly select half of LEAD's participants to use for this assessment. This would reduce the number of assessments they have to pay for while maintaining the integrity of the assessment.

Finally, there are a lot of moving parts in this assessment, and it will take a lot of coordination to keep all the participant data organized and collected. Furthermore, once the data is collected, it will require a significant amount of time and effort to compare participants' pre- and post-program results. In order to ease the administrative burden on the Weldon Cooper Center's current employees, I recommend hiring an intern whose job is focused on collecting and analyzing this data.

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, several LEAD sessions have been postponed to ensure the safety of participants. This evaluation design shouldn't be impacted by this setback. Once programming resumes, the evaluation can be completed as described.

LIMITATIONS

Most program evaluation designs will include limitations, especially if random assignment is not possible. There are several important limitations that should be considered for this program evaluation. First, as noted above, the Weldon Cooper Center has limited funds to spend on this evaluation. As a result, the pre-program evaluation will not be covered by the Weldon Cooper Center. This may result in limited response rates that could impact the results. For example, if a significant number of participants choose not to send their results or choose not to take a pre-program 360-degree assessment, there will be limited pre-program data to compare post-program data to. This could make it difficult to assess whether LEAD has a positive impact on participants' leadership abilities. Additionally, given that this pre-program assessment is optional and not randomly assigned, there may be bias in who decides to take the assessment. For example, participants who have higher buy-in to the leadership program prior to attending might also be more interested in taking a 360-degree leadership assessment. These individuals may see a greater change after the program because they were more invested in the program prior to attending. Finally, this evaluation design allows for participants to use a previous 360-degree assessment if they had already taken one within six months of the beginning of the LEAD program. This is to accommodate for individuals who have recently completed a similar assessment who may not be interested in taking the assessment again so quickly. However, while this accommodation will help increase collection of pre-program data, it could introduce bias if these individuals changed significantly since the assessment. Still, if a participant has experienced significant change in their leadership style or skill since their previous assessment, they will likely be more interested in taking the assessment again naturally.

In addition, due to employee time and budget limitations, some evaluation structures were not feasible. For example, extensive, formal focus groups or interviews may have provided helpful information for the Weldon Cooper Center and the LEAD team. However, these evaluation designs require extensive employee training on conducting effective focus groups or interviews and additional employee time in conducting them.

WORKS CITED

- Bialik, K. (n.d.). *State of the Union 2019: How Americans see major national issues*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/02/04/state-of-the-union-2019-how-americans-see-major-national-issues/>
- Brooks, E., Harris, C. R., & Clayton, P. H. (2010). *Deepening Applied Learning: An Enhanced Case Study Approach Using Critical Reflection*. *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education* Vol. 2, 55-76.
- CDC. (n.d.). *Types of Evaluation*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2.
- Clark, J. (2015). *Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Evaluation Model in Instructional Design*. <http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/isd/kirkpatrick.html>
- Converse, J., & Presser, S. (1986). *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- de Waal, A. (2010) *Achieving High Performance in the Public Sector*. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 34:1, 81-103, DOI: 10.2753/PMR1530-9576340105
- de Waal, A. (2017). *Evaluating High Performance the Evidence-Based Way: The Case of the Swagelok Transformers*. *SAGE Open*, 7(4), 2158244017736801. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017736801>
- de Waal, A., & Hanna, D. (2016). *HPO Model + HPO Framework = Organizational Improvement for a European Multinational*. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 35, 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.21696>

Densten, I. and Gray, J. (2001). *Leadership development and reflection: what is the connection?*

International Journal of Educational Management, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 119-124. <https://doi-org.proxy01.its.virginia.edu/10.1108/09513540110384466>

Gallup Inc. (2019). *The Most Important Problem*. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/1675/Most-Important-Problem.aspx>

Govtech. (2019). *2019 U.S. Government Employment*.

https://www.govtech.com/navigator/numbers/us-government-employment_55.html

Govtech. (2019). *2019 U.S. State & Local Gov. by the Numbers*.

https://www.govtech.com/navigator/numbers/us-state---2019local-gov-by-the-numbers_121.html

Govtech. (n.d.). *Units of U.S. Local Government*.

https://www.govtech.com/navigator/numbers/units-of-us-local-government_57.html

Halsall, T., & Forneris, T. (2016). *Evaluation of a leadership program for First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Youth: Stories of positive youth development and community engagement*. Applied Developmental Science.

Hillygus, D. (2016). *The Practice of Survey Research: Changes and Challenges*. In New Directions in Public Opinion (2nd ed.).

https://sites.duke.edu/hillygus/files/2014/06/Hillygus_Chapter_final.pdf

Hopkins, D. (2018, June 6). *All Politics Is National Because All Media Is National*.

FiveThirtyEight. <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/all-politics-is-national-because-all-media-is-national/>

- Horton-Deutsch, S. and Sherwood, G. (2008). *Reflection: an educational strategy to develop emotionally-competent nurse leaders*. Journal of Nursing Management, 16: 946-954.
<https://doi-org.proxy01.its.virginia.edu/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00957.x>
- ICMA. (n.d.) *Multi-rater Assessments Approved for Use by ICMA-CMs*. <https://icma.org/multi-rater-assessments-approved-use-icma-cms>
- James Bell Associates. (2007). *What's the Difference? Understanding Process and Outcome Evaluation*. <https://www.jbassoc.com/resource/whats-difference-understanding-process-outcome-evaluation/>
- Lacerenza, C. N., Reyes, D. L., Marlow, S. L., Joseph, D. L., & Salas, E. (2017) *Leadership Training Design, Delivery, and Implementation: A Meta-Analysis*. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 102(12), Dec 2017, 1686-1718
- Levine, R., González-Fernández, M., Bodurtha, J., Skarupski, K., & Fivush, B. (2015). *Implementation and Evaluation of the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine Leadership Program for Women Faculty*. Journal of Women's Health, 24(5).
<https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2014.5092>
- Mark, M., Henry, G., & Julnes, G. (2000). *Evaluation: An Integrated Framework for Understanding, Guiding, and Improving Policies and Programs* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Nesbit, P. L. (2012). *The Role of Self-Reflection, Emotional Management of Feedback, and Self-Regulation Processes in Self-Directed Leadership Development*. Human Resource Development Review, 11(2), 203–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484312439196>

Newcomer, K., Harry, H., & Joseph, W. (2015). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Parker, K., Morin, R., & Menasce Horowitz, J.. (2019, March 21). *Worries and priorities about America's future*. Pew Research Center.
<https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2019/03/21/worries-priorities-and-potential-problem-solvers/>

Pradarelli, J. C., Jaffe, G. A., Lemak, C. H., Mulholland, M. W., & Dimick, J. B. (2016). *A leadership development program for surgeons: First-year participant evaluation*. *Surgery*, 160(2), 255–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2016.03.011>

Rainie, L., Keeter, S., & Perrin, A. (2019, July 22). *Trust and Distrust in America*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.people-press.org/2019/07/22/trust-and-distrust-in-america/>

Randall, M., Gordon, T., Greene, S., & Huffer, E. (n.d.). *Follow the Money: How to Track Federal Funding to Local Governments*. The Urban Institute.
https://www.urban.org/research/publication/follow-money-how-track-federal-funding-local-governments/view/full_report

Reyes, D., Dinh, J., Lacerenza, C., Marlow, S., Joseph, D., & Salas, E. (2019, September). *The state of higher education leadership development program evaluation: A meta-analysis, critical review, and recommendations*. The Leadership Quarterly.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2019.101311>

Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. (n.d.). *Polling Fundamentals*.
<https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/polling-and-public-opinion/polling-fundamentals>

Terry, L., & Hartgrove, C. (2019, October 3). *Meeting with the Weldon Cooper Center*.

The HPO Center. (n.d.). *Continuous Improvement and Renewal*.

<https://www.hpocenter.com/hpo-factor/continuous-improvement-renewal/>

The HPO Center. (n.d.). *Long-Term Orientation*. <https://www.hpocenter.com/hpo-factor/long-term-orientation/>

The HPO Center. (n.d.). *Openness and Action Orientation*. <https://www.hpocenter.com/hpo-factor/openness-action-orientation/>

The HPO Center. (n.d.). *Quality of Employees*. <https://www.hpocenter.com/hpo-factor/employee-quality/>

The HPO Center. (n.d.). *Quality of Management*. <https://www.hpocenter.com/hpo-factor/quality-of-management/>

The HPO Center. (n.d.). *The High-Performance Organization Framework*.

<https://www.hpocenter.com/hpo-framework/>

The Urban Institute. (2015, March 5). *State and Local Expenditures*.

<https://www.urban.org/policy-centers/cross-center-initiatives/state-and-local-finance-initiative/state-and-local-backgrounders/state-and-local-expenditures>

The U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (n.d.). *Evaluating Leadership Development Programs*. <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/human-capital-framework/reference-materials/tools/evaluating-leadership-development-tools.pdf>

The Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service. (2017). *LEAD Sample Schedule*.

<https://lead.coopercenter.org/sites/lead/files/SampleSchedule2017.pdf>

The Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service. (n.d.). *About*.

<https://coopercenter.org/index.php/about>

The Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service. (n.d.). *LEAD Application*.

<https://lead.coopercenter.org/application>

The Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service. (n.d.). *LEAD*. <https://lead.coopercenter.org/>

The Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service. (n.d.). *Upcoming LEAD Classes*.

<https://lead.coopercenter.org/upcoming-classes>

The White House. (n.d.). *State & Local Government*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/state-local-government/>

Wu, Y. and Crocco, O. (2019). *Critical reflection in leadership development*. Industrial and Commercial Training, Vol. 51 No. 7/8, pp. 409-420. <https://doi-org.proxy01.its.virginia.edu/10.1108/ICT-03-2019-0022>

APPENDIX A



LEAD AGENDA University of VA, Darden Business School

Saturday		
Meet to go to classroom	1:45 p.m.	Saunders Hall
Orientation Session Signature Leadership with Preparation for Self-Reflection/ Journaling and for the Leadership Case Study Part 1 (Logan) MBTI Leadership Styles (Roberts)	2:00 - 6:00	CR 270
Dinner in Teams	6:00 - 7:00	Ex Din Rm
MBTI, continued (Roberts)	7:00 - 8:30	CR 270
Homework: Complete Leadership Case Study Part 1		

Sunday		
Breakfast	7:00 - 8:00	Ex Din Rm
Prelude (Gillies and Rodriguez)	8:15 - 8:40	CR 270
Essence of Public Service (Gerhart)	8:40 - 10:15	CR 270
Roadmap for Learning (St.Clair)	10:25 - 10:50	CR 270
HPO - Engagement in the Workforce (Gardner/Gerhart)	10:50 - 12:30	CR 270
Lunch	12:30 - 1:30	Ex Din Rm
Team Meetings: Leadership Case Study Part 1	1:45 - 6:15	Team Rms
Dinner in Teams	6:30 - 7:30	Ex Din Rm
Teams Continue	After Dinner	Team Rms
Homework: Complete Organizational Assessment		

Monday		
Breakfast	7:00 - 8:00	Ex Din Rm
Prelude (Gillies and Rodriguez)	8:15 - 8:40	CR 270
The Learning Cycle (St. Clair)	8:40 - 9:10	CR 270
HPO - The Learning Organization/Thinking in Parallel (Gardner/Gerhart)	9:20 - 12:15	CR 270
Lunch - Optional: grab a lunch to go and return to the classroom for "MBTI Q & A" (Roberts)	12:15 - 1:50	Ex Din Rm or CR 270
HPO - Leadership at All Levels, the Networked Talent Model & Microbusinesses (Gardner/Gerhart)	1:50 - 5:30	CR 270
Dinner	5:45	Ex Din Rm
Homework: Complete EQ Assessment		

Tuesday		
Breakfast	7:00 - 8:00	Ex Din Rm
Prelude (Gillies and Rodriguez)	8:15 - 8:40	CR 270
HPO - Goal, Diagnosis, and Change: The HPO Model and Building Productive Capacity (Gardner/Gerhart)	8:40 - 12:30	CR 270
Lunch	12:30 - 1:40	Ex Din Rm

1

Video: Gillies	1:40 - 1:50	CR 270
Emotional Intelligence (Roberts)	1:50 - 4:50	CR 270
Team Bowling Instructions	4:50 - 5:00	CR 270
Meet to Carpool	5:45	Gatehouse
Dinner/Bowling/Team Building	6:00	Keglers

Wednesday		
Breakfast	7:00 - 8:00	Ex Din Rm
Prelude (Gillies and Rodriguez)	8:15 - 8:40	CR 270
HPO - Leadership Philosophy (Gardner/Gerhart)	8:40 - 12:30	CR 270
Lunch	12:30 - 1:30	Ex Din Rm
Team Building Report Out (Roberts)	1:30 - 1:40	CR 270
HPO - The HPO Model & Leadership Functions (Gardner/Gerhart)	1:40 - 5:00	CR 270
Bus leaves for Michie Tavern	6:00	Gatehouse
Homework: Complete Leadership Case Study Part 2		

Thursday		
Breakfast	7:00 - 8:00	Ex Din Rm
Prelude (Gillies and Rodriguez)	8:15 - 8:40	CR 270
Taking a Stand on Leadership (St. Clair)	8:40 - 9:15	CR 270
HPO-The Parallel Organization (Gardner/Gerhart)	9:25 - 12:00	CR 270
Lunch	12:00 - 1:00	Ex Din Rm
Twenty Minutes Legacy Exercise (Logan)	1:00 - 1:45	CR 270
Team Meetings: Leadership Case Study Part 2	2:00 - 7:00	Team Rms
Dinner on your own	After 7:15	On Own

Friday		
Breakfast	7:00 - 8:00	Ex Din Rm
Prelude (Gillies and Rodriguez)	8:15 - 8:40	CR 270
The Role of Power in the Organization (Colvard)	8:40 - 11:00	CR 270
Graduation	11:10 - 1:10	CR 270
Box Lunches to Go	1:10	CR 270

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION Leading Educating and Developing Program November 16 – 22, 2019

Please take a few moments to evaluate your experience at the LEAD Program. Please circle your rating. Your feedback will be valuable in improving this program.

YOUR TEAM FACILITATOR - _____

THE PROGRAM

Saturday: Signature Leadership: (Logan)

	Poor			Good			Excellent	
a. Overall presentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
b. Content: Did this session provide information useful for your role as a change agent?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Saturday: MBTI: Understanding Self & Others: (St. Clair)

	Poor			Good			Excellent	
a. Overall presentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
b. Content: Did this session provide information useful for your role as a change agent?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Sunday morning: Essence of Public Service: (Gerhart)

	Poor			Good			Excellent	
a. Overall presentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
b. Content: Did this session provide information useful for your role as a change agent?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday:

Building High Performance Organizations in 21st Century: (Gardner/Gerhart)

	Poor			Good			Excellent	
a. Overall presentation (Gardner)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
b. Overall presentation (Gerhart)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
c. Content: Did this session provide information useful for your role as a change agent?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Tuesday afternoon: Emotional Intelligence: (Felder)

	Poor			Good			Excellent	
a. Overall presentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
b. Content: Did this session provide information useful for your role as a change agent?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Thursday afternoon: 20 Minutes Legacy Exercise: (Harlow)

	Poor			Good			Excellent		
a. Value as a leadership/learning experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
b. Content: Did this session provide information useful and relevant to your work/life?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

Friday morning: Leader as Healer: (Allen)

	Poor			Good			Excellent		
a. Overall presentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
b. Content: Did this session provide information useful for your role as a change agent?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

TEAM SESSIONS

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree			
a. Provided an opportunity to share my views and perspectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
b. Gave me new insight about myself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
c. Helped focus my thoughts and provide direction for my future	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

TEAM FACILITATOR

RATE YOUR team facilitator's effectiveness (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE):

	Poor				Excellent			
Nancy Olivo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Tony Gardner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Molly Harlow	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Tyler StClair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Craig Gerhart	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Don Jarrett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Rate the quality of the following:

OTHER EXPERIENCES

	Poor				Excellent			
Pre-program information, including directions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Bowling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Dinner at Michie Tavern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Staff Assistance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Darden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

OVERALL PROGRAM RATING

Poor				Good				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:

Over →

APPENDIX C

Which session did you find most valuable to your role as a change agent?

Why?

Which session did you find least valuable to your role as a change agent?

Why?

How would you evaluate the Building High Performance Organizations in the 21st Century presentations?

	Very Poor	Poor	Okay	Average	Good	Great	Excellent
Content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presentation (Gardner)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presentation (Gerhart)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional comments on the content or presentation of content in the large group sessions?

Team Questions

Who was your team facilitator?

Nancy Olivo

Tony Gardner

Molly Harlow

Tyler StClair

Craig Gerhart

Don Jarrett

How would you rate your team facilitator's effectiveness?

	Very Poor	Poor	Okay	Average	Good	Great	Excellent
Rating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

My team facilitator could've improved ...

My team facilitator was especially effective at...

The team sessions...

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Provided an opportunity to share my views and perspectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gave me new insight about myself	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helped focus my thoughts and provide direction for my future	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other Experiences

Rate the quality of the following

	Very Poor	Poor	Okay	Average	Good	Great	Excellent
Pre-program information, including directions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bowling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dinner at Michie Tavern	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff Assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Darden	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Any additional comments on these experiences?

General satisfaction

Overall Program Satisfaction

	Completely Dissatisfied	Mostly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Mostly Satisfied	Completely Satisfied
Satisfaction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Any additional comments or concerns?

APPENDIX D

Follow-Up Survey

Please answer the following questions about the LEAD Program

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The LEAD program was valuable to my development as a leader.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I often think about lessons learned from the LEAD program when facing a leadership challenge.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I often use lessons learned from the LEAD program in my professional life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Given my experience at LEAD, I think my coworkers would benefit from attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel confident in my understanding of the HPO framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel confident in my application of the HPO framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I knew where my leadership abilities could improve after leaving LEAD.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I knew how to improve my ability as a leader after leaving LEAD.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Since attending LEAD, I have changed my leadership style or practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am a better leader than I was before attending LEAD.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What would've helped you apply the lessons from the LEAD program more effectively?