NCLP
National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs

Concepts & Connections

A Publication for Leadership Educators

Volume 19 Issue 1 | Leadership Rubrics advancing a Mixed Methods Approach to Leadership Assessment | 2012

Inside This Issue:

The House that Assessment Built: Using the Right Tools to Capture Learning

Ashley Finley, Ph.D.

At a time when access to information is ever more accessible through the internet, smart phones, online programs, and even "massive open online courses" (MOOCs), the role of colleges and universities should be to create environments in which students can learn how to parse that information into usable bits and connect the dots between what exists virtually in scholarship to what exists in their real, day-to-day lives. As Einstein said, "Knowledge is nothing without imagination." Students need both to succeed in college and beyond. Accordingly, in the learning spaces created inside and outside the classroom, educators must be able to evaluate students' ability to construct new knowledge using learned skills such as application, synthesis, critical thinking, and problem-solving. And at a time in which those skills are increasingly being applied to global, diverse and collaborative settings, educators must also consider how to understand the development of civic capacities, such as leadership, teamwork skills, intercultural competence, civic-mindedness, and ethical reasoning. Drawing upon historical foundations rooted in educating citizens, institutions of higher education commonly have mission statements that, in part, reflect a commitment to training and educating "future leaders," "global citizens," "graduates prepared for a multicultural world," and the like. Varied and meaningful assessment can help colleges and universities to turn these commitments into reality.

> *Accordingly, in the learning spaces created inside and outside the classroom, educators must be able to evaluate students' ability to construct new knowledge using learned skills such as application, synthesis, critical thinking, and problem-solving.*

Any approach to assessment should acknowledge one sobering fact about learning – it is complex. When students are asked to demonstrate learning they are often doing multiple things at once. For example, as they exemplify critical thinking and synthesis, they are likely doing so through some form of communication (written or oral) and displaying accurate knowledge of concepts and facts, perhaps with some application to issues of social or global significance. Learning is also non-linear. It doesn't increase by simple addition; more facts equal more knowledge which in

Continued on page 3

Connections from the Editor

Many times you could find me cowering in a corner at the mention of one dreaded word in higher education: assessment. In an attempt to avoid the inevitable internal panic attack that always took place, I would often make light of assessment with the help of the internet and the plethora of assessment jokes. When that failed, I would strategically hide from anyone that served on our institution's assessment committee. As an aside, this hiding technique proved difficult as my supervisor served on the committee.

As irony would have it, after I enthusiastically began my post as editor for this volume of Concepts and Connections, I learned that the theme of this issue focused on leadership rubrics and how they advance mixed methods approaches to, you guessed it, leadership assessment! After emerging from the corner where I went hiding, I delved into the wonderfully crafted pieces of our talented authors and learned a tremendous amount about mixed methods assessment! Furthermore, I now scoff at that corner and pleasantly greet my assessment colleagues in the hallway rather than ducking down a stairwell.

I am so excited to share this edition of Concepts & Connections – Leadership Rubrics advancing a Mixed Methods Approach to Leadership Assessment. Dr. Finley demonstrates the importance of using the right tools in our assessment efforts to ensure that where we invest our time assessing gives us useful information. She even tells us that the "majority of institutions are likely doing too much assessment!" (Is my supervisor reading this?) Dr. Tan eloquently outlines the strengths and challenges of a mixed methods approach while John Fink unknowingly demonstrates some of these strengths and weaknesses as he reflects on his experience of learning and applying a mixed methods approach with the Social Change Model rubrics. Sunshine Workman invites us into her assessment "kitchen" as she shares her recipe for assessment success (yum!) and Benjamin Correia and Dr. John Dugan give us food for thought on when and how to properly use rubrics in our scholarship and research update.

We hope you enjoy, reflect, and learn from this edition of Concepts & Connections.

Michelle L. Kusel
Concepts & Connections Editor

Want more from NCLP? Find us on the web!

Follow us on Twitter:
@ed_lead

Like us on Facebook:
National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs

NCLP STAFF

- **Dr. Craig Slack**
  Director
- **Michelle Kusel**
  Concepts & Connections Editor
- **Alice Bishop**
  Membership Services
- **Dr. John Dugan**
  Scholarship & Research Editor
- **Dr. Susan Komives**
  NCLP Scholar

turn equals greater learning. Learning must be allowed to progress and *regress*, as students apply knowledge in different contexts, reconstruct meaning, and reexamine understanding. Assessment of learning must therefore be multi-faceted enough to be able to capture a range of skills at varying points of development. To say assessment should involve "mixed methods" sounds overly technical for the purpose. Rather, assessment should be treated like a toolbox. Just as someone would not build a house with a hammer alone, student learning cannot be built with a handful of surveys or standardized tests. Those tools may be part of the process, but it is important to recognize that they often will not provide evidence of learning across a full range of outcomes and skills. The challenge, then, is how can assessment be used to more fully understand the scope of student learning as it pertains to the development of complex cognitive and civic abilities?

Any approach to assessment should acknowledge one sobering fact about learning – it is complex.

The Case for Direct Assessment of Learning

The struggle for colleges and universities is not doing assessment. By most accounts, the majority of institutions are likely doing *too much* assessment. The issue is using that assessment to say something meaningful about students' ability to improve learning overtime and to connect those gains with institutional commitments to particular learning outcomes. The other challenge is how to blend the vast amount of evidence accumulated through surveys with actual demonstrations of learning through artifacts of student work. This latter form of assessment, commonly referred to as direct assessment, is the bedrock of faculty assessment of learning within courses (e.g. research papers, essays, oral presentations). The problem is that classroom artifacts tend to be assessed for accuracy of content, often in combination with many other skills (e.g. demonstrations of critical thinking, good writing, integration and application of learning) without much clarity on what exactly those skills are or how students might make specific improvements on any one of them.

Rubrics provide means for isolating learning outcomes, articulating components, and providing a guiding framework for assessment that both faculty and students can reference. There are many ways to think about rubrics though they are sometimes viewed as rigid, unchangeable, even impersonal schematics. But it is, perhaps, most helpful to view rubrics "more like a cake than a rock (Griffen, 2010)." "[Rubrics] contain whatever we put into it, not what nature designed…[It] is the creation of the people who made it rather than mirror of some permanent absolute reality…[the] rubric is our best judgment about what matters most in the stage of human development we think out students are currently in."[1] Conceived in this way, rubrics hold great potential for both defining and articulating developmental expectations for learning around the skills most often sought within artifacts student learning. Moreover, students can benefit from this clarity of articulation for the transparency it provides regarding expectations for learning development, especially as it pertains to civic capacity-building.

A diverse population of two- and four-year colleges and universities have implemented rubrics to assess institutional development of student learning around a core set of outcomes that commonly include critical thinking, written communication, integrative learning, civic engagement, and ethical reasoning. Many of these rubrics were developed through the VALUE project coordinated by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) that organized teams of faculty nationwide to develop a set of fifteen rubrics that could be used to assess a broad set of learning outcomes.[2] To date, these rubrics have been accessed by more than eleven thousand individuals representing more than two thousand colleges and universities. Structurally, the VALUE rubrics enable complex articulations of outcomes to be organized into columns and rows that explicate the dimensions of a particular learning outcome (columns) and how demonstrations of learning on a particular dimension can become more complex over time (rows).

Rubrics are also commonly used in association with portfolios of student work because of their ability to capture learning development over time by assembling a student's work in one place, most often in an electronic format. Portfolios provide students with the ability to locate their work across multiple learning experiences and to reflect on their development. The use of portfolios in combination with the articulation of specific learning outcomes provided by rubrics enables individual students to create a unique narrative about their learning. By gathering demonstrations of learning from multiple contexts and experiences, students can make connections earlier, more intentionally, and can use reflection to self-assess their progress throughout college.

However, meaningfully connecting rubrics and portfolios to desired student learning outcomes is only part of the challenge. It is still necessary for students to have the proper catalyst to provoke effective demonstrations of learning. Therefore, both rubrics and portfolios hinge on the use of intentional assignments designed to thoughtfully connect student experience and classroom content with higher-order thinking skills and/or outcomes related to personal and social development. Mapping the course of student learning does not necessitate every assignment be carefully constructed to meet particular learning objectives but it does presuppose that a sufficient number of such assignments will be identified throughout a students' college experience. By doing so, students, faculty and other campus constituencies can trace learning development overtime using such assignments as markers along the way.

[1] *Ibid.* Page 9.
[2] For more information about the VALUE project, including access to the rubrics, see: http://www.aacu.org/value/index.cfm.

Conclusion

The approaches to meaningfully assess student learning should be considered as thoughtfully as one would choose the tools to build a house. But those tools cannot be chosen without first understanding the blueprint for what the house will look like, its style, its scale – the components that will together define the final structure. Likewise, institutions must first see the scope of learning outcomes desired before beginning to assemble the tools for assessment. Each blueprint for student learning should be fundamentally guided by the mission of the institution, strategic planning documents, and the historical and present context within which learning is occurring, both within the institution and beyond the campus' walls. Then, assessments should be chosen based upon the institution's ability to understand not only what students think they have learned, but also what they can do with regard to that learning.

Ultimately, students will find and maintain success after graduation, as professionals and citizens, if and when they are able to demonstrate their learning to others in meaningful, practical ways. Assessing their learning during college is our best way to guarantee their success.

> *The struggle for colleges and universities is not doing assessment. By most accounts, the majority of institutions are likely doing too much assessment.*

References

Griffin, Merilee. (2010). *What is a Rubric?*" in Assessing Outcomes and Improving Achievement: Tips and Tools for Using Rubric. (Terrell Rhodes). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Ashley Finley *is the Senior Director of Assessment and Research at the Association of American Colleges & Universities and national evaluator for the Bringing Theory to Practice (BTtoP) Project. She has written about and conducted national research on student learning in higher education, with a focus on engaging direct assessment of student learning and the promotion of high impact practices inside and outside of classrooms. Her work advocates for the use of rubrics and e-portfolios as integral components of developing meaningful assessment at the institutional-level. Before joining AAC&U, she was a faculty member at Dickinson College. She received a Ph.D in sociology from the University of Iowa.*

Using a mixed methods approach to understanding leadership development

Dr. Sherylle J. Tan

In leadership education and development, students learn and develop the leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities they need to be effective leaders (Riggio, Ciulla, & Sorenson, 2003). With the broad movement across institutions of higher education to introduce leadership studies as an interdisciplinary corollary or complement to a traditional liberal arts education (Riggio, Ciulla, & Sorenson, 2003), leadership assessment and evaluation is important in understanding the effectiveness and impact of these programs and their ability to develop leadership.

Leadership is a function of the leader, the follower, and the complexity of the context or situation (Avolio, 2005). Given the contextual and complex nature of leadership, assessing leadership solely through numbers and quantitative results is not enough to understand leadership and leadership development. Qualitative information can provide meaning and context to better explain the phenomena of leadership and complement quantitative information. As such, a mixed method approach, that is the coupling of quantitative and qualitative data, may provide a more appropriate framework to illustrate a more complete picture of leaders and followers.

What is a Mixed Methods Approach?

"Mixed methods research is the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative approaches (e.g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the purpose of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration" (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007, pg 123).

Quantitative assessments in leadership typically come in the form of descriptive surveys, questionnaires, and tests that measure attitudes and rate behaviors yielding numeric data that can be easily analyzed statistically (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). The focus is on numbers and frequencies rather than meaning and experience. Quantitative data includes closed-ended data that potentially provides descriptive information and measurable evidence, which is more reliable, however, does not provide in-depth and complex information.

Qualitative assessments, in contrast, focus on context and meaning. It is a systematic and rigorous form of assessment that uses data collection methods such as interviews, observations, and case studies. Qualitative assessments facilitate data collection of open-ended information where measures may not exist and provide richness and depth of understanding that quantitative assessments are unable to do (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011).

A mixed methods approach, that is the integration or combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches, allows for statistically reliable information gathered from numerical measurement to be enriched and supported by meaningful information from people's experiences (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). There are benefits and shortcomings to both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. The use of multiple strategies, approaches, and methods that have complementary strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses (Figure 1) provides the opportunity for richness and complexity in assessment allowing the use of close-ended measures (i.e., quantitative) with open-ended observations (i.e., qualitative) (Johnson et al., 2007). In other words, the use of mixed method approaches allows one to utilize the strengths of one approach to overcome the weaknesses of another approach. However, it is important to understand that mixed methods approaches also have their own set of challenges (see Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011; Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). In addition to understanding how to conduct a mixed method approach, mixed method approaches often require more time and resources to be done correctly.

Using Mixed Methods in Leadership Assessment

While quantitative data can show objective evidence that leadership behaviors occur, qualitative data may help to shed light that learning is present and that leadership is developed. A richer and more complete understanding of leadership learning may emerge from the use of mixed method approaches. However, it is important to consider that mixed methods approaches are more complex and take time. The goals and objective of the assessments need to be clearly defined in determining the best method or approach.

Given the contextual and complex nature of leadership, assessing leadership solely through numbers and quantitative results is not enough to understand leadership and leadership development.

The complexity of leadership points to mixed method approaches as having a great potential for assessing and evaluating leadership outcomes. However, mixed methods approaches do not simply collect and analyze qualitative and quantitative data; the data need to be integrated in such a way to develop a more complete understanding of the issue than when each approach is used alone. There are several options in designing a mixed method approach; two broad approaches are the sequential design and convergent design (Creswell et al., 2011).

In a sequential design, one dataset is used to build upon the results of the other. For example, focus groups are first conducted to gather information on a topic and the analyses of the feedback provided by the focus groups are used to develop a measure that is administered later. The results of the qualitative data

Figure 1

Strengths of Mixed Method Approaches	Challenges of Mixed Method Approaches
• Words, pictures, and narratives can add meaning to numbers. • Numbers add precision to words, pictures, and narratives. • Can utilize the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research methods. • Provides a comprehensive, more complete understanding of leadership. • The strengths of one method can overcome the weaknesses of another method. • Can add insight and understanding that might be missed when only one method is used. • Can answer a broader and more complete range of questions. • Can increase the generalizability of the results.	• Requires training and knowledge of multiple methods and approaches to understand how to mix them appropriately. • Can be difficult to for one to carry out both qualitative and quantitative research; it often requires the coordination of a research/assessment team. • It is more expensive. • It is time consuming. • Data analysis and interpretation may be challenging due to the differences in methods and approaches.

are used to shape the quantitative phase by guiding the development of measures and assessments. This design is best used when important variables are not known and measures are not available, there is time to conduct two phases of data collection, there are limited resources and a need to collect and analyze one data type at a time, and new questions have emerged from qualitative results.

Convergent designs are used when the intent is to collect qualitative and quantitative data concurrently. This design allows for a more complete understanding of an issue from two data sets through the corroboration of results from different methods. For example, self-ratings of transformational leadership and open-ended questions on leadership from interviews with the individuals are collected in parallel. The data sets are merged and compared. This design is best used when there is a need to collect both types of data in one phase, both types of data have equal value for understanding the issue, and extensive data collection activities can be managed individually or with a team.

A richer and more complete understanding of leadership learning may emerge from the use of mixed method approaches.

Conclusions

The rationale for using mixed methods in leadership assessment is that quantitative and qualitative methods are inadequate by themselves to capture the complexity of leadership and leadership development (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). "These studies (of leadership) have all been quantitative investigations that do not incorporate the voices of participants. One issue that arises, then, is that the quantitative results are inadequate to describe and explain the leaders' experiences" (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011, p. 97). When used in combination, quantitative and qualitative methods may complement each other and provide a more complete representation of leadership (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

References

Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made/born*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Creswell, J. W., Klassen, A. C., Plano Clark, V. L., & Smith, K. C. (2011, August). *Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences*. National Institutes of Health. Retrieved July 30, 2012 from http://obssr.od.nih.gov/mixed_methods_research

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Johnson, R. B. & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33 (7), 14-26.

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of missed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 112-133.

Riggio, R. E., Ciulla, J. B., & Sorenson, G. J. (2003). Leadership education at the undergraduate level: A liberal arts approach to leadership development. In S. E. Murphy and R. E. Riggio (Eds.), *The Future of Leadership Development* (pp.223-236). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sherylle J. Tan, Ph.D. *is the Director of Internships and KLI Research at the Kravis Leadership Institute at Claremont McKenna College. Her current research focuses on undergraduate leadership education and evaluation of leadership development programs. Specifically, the research on undergraduate leadership education seeks to establish an ongoing assessment of the long-term impact of leadership development in higher education. Dr. Tan's research applies developmental theory and methods to understanding the issues of leadership development, women and leadership, and work and family.*

Learning by Design:

Rubrics to assess the Social Change Model of Leadership

John E. Fink

The Social Change Model (SCM) rubrics are new tools for assessing socially responsible leader development that offer rich descriptions of students' enactment of leadership, as well as prompt students' development as socially responsible leaders. Rubrics are powerful tools in that they can provide direct, holistic assessments of student development. Additionally, as a formative type of assessment, rubrics are ideal tools for educators to use to simultaneously assess and promote student learning. In addition to suggesting a few opportunities for using the SCM rubrics, this article will describe our rubric development process for readers interested in developing rubrics as assessment tools.

Rubric Development

In pairs and trios assigned to one of the "C"s in the SCM, graduate students in Dr. Susan Komives' Leadership Education class spiraled through three cyclical steps in our month-long development of the SCM rubrics. First, we studied our constructs in order to establish validity and develop definitions with which to bind these complex ideas. Prior to drafting, we talked with each other and other educators about the meaning of our constructs, gathered definitions and details about our constructs from SCM literature (i.e. Cilente, 2009; HERI, 1996), and looked at the SRLS items that constituted our constructs.

Second, we organized information on our construct into draft SCM rubrics. To provide consistency across the rubrics, our class agreed on a standard format wherein rows would split the construct into three to five dimensions and columns would split developmental levels into four categories (Excelling, Achieving, Developing, Needing Improvement). We intentionally selected gerunds to describe our developmental categories to reflect our belief that development is neither static nor linear.

As my partner and I developed the Common Purpose rubric, I found it easiest to first draft the descriptions for the "Excelling" category because scholars' descriptions of SCM constructs typically focus on the presence, rather than absence, of the construct. Furthermore, we used the description of the "Excelling" category as a reference point in articulating the other three developmental categories. To accompany the rubrics, we all included a definition of the construct, framing language, and a glossary to assist raters and bolster the rubrics' reliability.

After drafting, we piloted the SCM rubrics with students and educators. Students piloted the rubrics through self-assessment and student affairs colleagues piloted the rubrics through assessment of students. We aimed to find students at varying stages of development, in order to better examine the validity of our draft rubrics. I introduced our Common Purpose rubric as one part of the SCM and encouraged the pilot testers to mark up the draft rubric with questions, points of clarity, and comments. Involving other educators and students as pilot-testers yielded critical feedback that helped us refine the SCM rubrics.

> *Leadership educators can use the SCM rubrics to categorize observations of students' behavior and attitudes, yielding direct assessments of the particular SCM outcome.*

The feedback from pilot testing prompted reexamination of the construct, including how we chose to differentiate among its dimensions and developmental levels. As we studied our construct alongside our testers' feedback, we redrafted the rubric into a second version. This version included more descriptive information within the rubric and framing language as well as more terms in the glossary. Ideally, the process of piloting, studying, and redrafting would cycle enough for the rubrics to reach a critical point of clarity, validity, and reliability. A rubric at this point would clearly define key terms, intuitively differentiate between developmental levels and dimensions of a construct, and yield consistent results across different raters.

Striving to reach this critical point with the SCM rubrics, our class worked through challenges in rubric development. We grappled with the question of how best to unpack the SCM constructs into dimensions and particularly how to create discrete categories such as "Achieving" and "Developing." The SCM literature guided our construction of the rubrics, our unpacking the SCM constructs in dimensions, and our delineation between developmental categories. Yet, we were also challenged to ensure that the scholarly lexicon resonated with students using the rubrics. We sought to develop rubrics that both students and educators could use and therefore, throughout the piloting and redrafting processes, we endeavored to translate abstract leadership concepts into precise descriptions of students' behavior and attitudes.

As a developing practitioner myself, translating abstract leadership concepts into specific descriptions of students' behaviors and attitudes helped me to better understand what to look for in students demonstrating socially responsible leadership. Furthermore, my understanding of our SCM construct was sharpened by the challenge of precisely and reliably describing students at varying developmental levels of that construct. The challenges we wrestled with in development of the SCM rubrics support the need for further refinement of the rubrics. Yet, the SCM rubrics already can be utilized in a variety of ways, and the following sections will highlight three opportunities for using the SCM rubrics.

SCM rubrics as direct assessment

Leadership educators can use the SCM rubrics to categorize observations of students' behavior and attitudes, yielding direct assessments of the particular SCM outcome. Such direct assessments are especially valuable when administered with a pre-post design. Whether administered toward the beginning and end of leadership classes and sustained co-curricular leadership programs, or at consistent progression points throughout a multi-year leadership curriculum, these rubrics reveal descriptive portraits of students' location within a developmental framework of the SCM.

Using the SCM rubrics to build programs

On a program level, leadership educators could use language from the rubrics to build learning outcomes for programs specifically designed to provide additional education around one or two "C"s. For example, an educator working with a group of student leaders might have identified a need to prompt students' development along the SCM construct of Citizenship. That educator might then use the "excelling" and "achieving" descriptions in the Citizenship rubric to create learning outcomes for a programmatic intervention. In addition to assessing students' development of socially responsible leadership, the SCM rubrics also provide leadership educators with programmatic frameworks.

As a developing practitioner myself, translating abstract leadership concepts into specific descriptions of students' behaviors and attitudes helped me to better understand what to look for in students demonstrating socially responsible leadership.

SCM rubrics as reflective tools

Leadership educators can also use the SCM rubrics as tools to foster student learning and development. In order to prompt students' reflection on their own behavior and attitudes related to socially responsible leadership, instructors of leadership courses might assign the rubrics as well as have students identify two to three close peers, advisors, or mentors to also rate the student. Students could be encouraged to not only assess where they are on the rubric but also reflect on how they might progress along the developmental spectrum. By articulating precise differences between developmental categories, the SCM rubrics can facilitate students' self-awareness, prompt insight, and catalyze growth.

Those interested in using the SCM rubrics can access them on the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Program's website: www.nclp.umd.edu.

References

Cilente, K. (2009). *An overview of the social change model of leadership development*. In S. R. Komives, W. Wagner, & Associates, Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development (pp. 43-77). A publication of the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

HERI (1996) A social change model of leadership development- Guidebook (Version III). Los Angeles: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.

***John E. Fink** is Coordinator for the Transfer2Terp Learning Community at the Adele H. Stamp Student Union – Center for Campus Life at the University of Maryland, College Park. He received his Masters of Arts in College Student Personnel from the University of Maryland.* *John would like to thank fellow SCM rubric collaborator, Ana Maia, Assistant Director for Leadership and Organizational Development at Stetson University for her contributions to this article.*

Program Spotlight:

One "Cook's" Journey

Sunshine Workman

"All poetry is supposed to be instructive but in an unnoticeable manner; it is supposed to make us aware of what it would be valuable to instruct ourselves in; we must deduce the lesson on our own, just as with life." -Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe

Over the last five years, I have assessed the impact of a variety of service and leadership development programs with varying degrees of success. It has been helpful for me to relate this work to the difference between a cook and a chef. As a cook, I can follow recipes from other people and make a totally decent meal worthy of others' enjoyment. With practice, I might start altering recipes to fit my palette, and on the rare occasion, invent my own. A chef, on the other hand, has years of formal training and can invent their own recipes. Regardless of whether or not I am a chef or a cook, dinner will be served and evaluated. This article is written from one "cook" to another; I will share how the Alternative Breaks Program at the Cal Corps Public Service Center (Cal Corps) at the University of California Berkeley currently assesses student learning utilizing a mixed-methods approach. It is important to note that I did not make the "recipe" on my own. Our assessment practices were developed over time in partnership with other colleagues including Mike Bishop, Cal Corps' Assistant Director.

> *Mixed-methods allow for deeper assessment than either quantitative or qualitative assessment alone.*

UC Berkeley's Alternative Breaks Program (AB) is a student run service-learning program which helps students explore social issues through meaningful service, education, and reflection during their academic breaks. In 2011-12 AB supported 20 student Break Leaders in co-planning 10 week-long trips coupled with a semester-long academic course for groups of 12 Cal students on issues such as environmental justice, health care, immigration, and homelessness. In 2011-12, there were 112 trip participants providing a total of 2,726 direct service hours.

Through this work, I have seen how quantitative and qualitative methods complement each other when used together. The primary goal of quantitative analysis is measurement so that one might deduce or arrive at a precise conclusion based on a general premise. Quantitative methodology is good at answering questions that begin with "what…" or "did…" (e.g. "*did* students grow in their commitment to civic engagement from the beginning to end of this program?"). The primary goal of qualitative analysis is to "attempt to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them" (Mertens, 2005, p. 229), or to infer a general conclusion about a particular instance. Qualitative methodology is good at answering questions that begin with "how" (e.g. "*how*" did students experience the service component of this program?") (Maxwell, 2005). In simple terms, you can utilize quantitative methods to assess whether or not students learned what you thought it was important for them to learn. With qualitative methods, you can unpack *how* they experienced the learning journey and what meaning they made of it along the way.

Designing Learning Outcomes Rubrics & Collecting Assessment Data

To ascertain the growth and development of Break Leaders in the program, we developed rubrics which serve as an intentional roadmap for our learning objectives, instructional strategies, and measurement strategies.

In order to measure the success of our student learning outcomes and objectives, I conducted multiple forms of assessment. First, I administered a "360-degree" assessment with the four Alternative Breaks Directors and the 20 Break Leaders. In addition to Break Leader self-reports, data was collected from trip participants, who evaluated the effectiveness of the student Break Leaders during their pre-trip courses in addition to their performance on the trip itself. With regard to quantitative data collection, the most common data collection tools are pre-experience and post-experience surveys with both program specific and center-wide learning outcomes using a 5-point likert scale response, measuring the change in self-reported responses and enabling cross-program comparisons. The most common qualitative data collection tools are open-ended questions on the survey that focus on meaning making and group observation during peer-led classes. Figure one outlines our rubric:

Figure 1

Rubric Header	Definition	Alternative Break Example
Guiding Theories	The theories and practices for which the student learning outcomes are situated	Social Change Mode (HERI, 1996): Controversy with Civility and Consciousness of Self.
Student Learning Outcomes	1-3 desired goals based on theories and key stakeholders of what we hope students will be able to know, do, or understand as a direct result of participating in the program.	Create a learning environment in which break participants can examine their beliefs and assumptions.
Objectives	Each over-arching learning outcome is broken down with further specificity into 1-3 objectives.	Create a sense of collective responsibility for the success of the group; be able to; facilitate dialogue/reflection sessions; challenge self and others appropriately.
Continuum of Development	The learning trajectory is further outlined into "emerging, developed, and advanced" categories used to determine the level at which we reached our learning objectives.	Emerging: Explore democratic facilitation and decision making models; Identify own personal beliefs and assumptions. Developed: Successfully facilitate dialogues during class discussions; Analyze and share personal assumptions of "other" identities and impact on communication. Advanced: Act as an ally to underrepresented (student and community) voices; share knowledge with participants on how to create similar environments.
Instructional Strategies	Specific workshops, trainings, readings, assignments, reflections, projects, etc.	Participate in a staff/student director-led Alternative Break weekend retreat; attend facilitation workshop; Attend Ally workshop; Create Johari Window; take MBTI; and explore salient social identities.
Measurement	The measurement tools we plan to use to assess student learning for each learning objective. Some tools for measurement are also instructional strategies.	Quantitative: Leader and Participant pre-and-post-surveys using a 5-point likert response scale; community partner surveys; and service, reflection, and education hours. Qualitative: Open-ended survey questions that focus on meaning making; group observation during peer-led classes; trip-advisor feedback; and analysis of participant post-trip scrapbooks and presentations.

Interpreting and Applying Results

Mixed-methods allow for deeper assessment than either quantitative or qualitative assessment alone. For example, last year, if I had only used quantitative methods in my assessment report, I would have seen that 90% of participants reported they examine their beliefs and assumptions before the program and 92% felt the same after the program. This finding may have led me to believe that we needed to sharpen our work in creating environments that challenge assumptions and beliefs. However, upon analyzing students' qualitative responses to open-ended questions on the post survey, it was clear that more growth had happened than was quantitatively reported. For example, many participants spoke to the power of challenging their beliefs and assumptions. One participant shared:

> *"I did not anticipate learning about how many deep-rooted prejudices I have against homeless/people who loiter on the streets. I think living in a privileged society builds these without us even noticing--for example, before this trip I thought I was a fairly open-minded person who wasn't biased against people. Now I have been able to understand myself, and really work at removing those prejudices."*

We also use demographic information and trip-specific data to identify trips that need support, variables that influence group learning and trends over time. When working in partnership with various stakeholders, I've found that sharing assessment results and tentative action steps generates a shared understanding and sense of urgency.

As student affairs professionals, we are increasingly called upon to assess the impact of our programs. Concurrently, we are pulled in other directions—to serve as many students as possible, produce multiple high-quality programs, and work collaboratively with community partners. We might not have time to become assessment chefs. Nonetheless, I encourage the assessment and evaluation "cooks" to develop mixed-methods assessment frameworks and gather quantitative and qualitative data which will support us in continually improving our programs and practices. From one cook to another, I hope that this article has been useful to you and you are inspired to get in the kitchen and mix it up. Bon appetit!

As student affairs professionals, we are increasingly called upon to assess the impact of our programs. Concurrently, we are pulled in other directions—to serve as many students as possible, produce multiple high-quality programs, and work collaboratively with community partners.

Check out the collaborative web site,

www.socialchangemodel.org

*for more information on using the **Social Change Model of Leadership Development**.*

Share resources with colleagues and find the latest resources for users of the model.

References

HERI. (1996). A social change model of leadership development, guidebook III. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.

Maxwell, J. (2005). Qualitative Research Design: An interactive approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mertens, D.M. (2005). Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

***Sunshine Workman** is the Immersion Experiences Program Manager in the Cal Corps Public Service Center at UC Berkeley. She is author of "Change" in the Leadership for a Better World: Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership (2009). Currently she manages the Shinnyo-en Peacebuilding Leadership Program, W.T. Chan Fellowship, and supports four Student Directors in running the Alternative Breaks Program. Her passion is helping others identify the relationship between one's personal vision and taking meaningful action in the community.*

Scholarship and Research Updates

Benefits of Rubric Use in Leadership Education

Benjamin P. Correia and John P. Dugan

As the public calls for greater accountability in higher education and new technologies, global issues, and diverse students continue to emerge as critical contemporary issues, faculty and administrators are turning to rubrics for transparency and better measurement of learning (Maki, 2009). To address concerns related to measurement of student learning presented by the general public as well as governmental agencies, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) developed rubrics as part of their Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) project. Faculty and administrators designed the rubrics to assess broader learning outcomes at colleges and universities that often span the curricular and co-curricular boundary (AAC&U, 2009).

Rubrics can be defined as a document that lists criteria for a learning outcome, program, or assignment and clearly articulates levels of quality in relation to each criterion (AAC&U, 2009; Andrade, 2005; Goodrich, 1997; Montgomery, 2002; Popham, 1997). Educators can create rubrics both at the micro and macro-levels. At the micro-level, rubrics can clarify expectations and requirements for a classroom assignment. Scoring fall into this category and are often used to provide specific criteria for a task or project with the intent of grading or defining a specific level of achievement. At the macro-level, rubrics are used to clarify learning objectives associated with programmatic or institutional level interventions. Educators may find macro-level rubrics to be more beneficial when assessing longitudinal growth and development.

Using Rubrics in Leadership Education

With rubrics considered to be an effective form of measurement for authentic assessment (Diller & Phelps, 2008), which is an assessment of students' abilities to perform in real world situations (Wiggins, 1990), rubric use in leadership education is appropriate. Interestingly, writing on the topic of rubric use in leadership education is rather limited and characterized by pockets of innovation in which individual programs or units are developing or using rubrics as a means to advance the quality of their assessment efforts. Leadership educators can use rubrics to clarify and explicitly articulate what leadership means, actively engage students in the learning process, and provide leadership educators with valuable feedback from which they can make intentional changes to programs.

Rubrics can provide a platform for leadership educators to discuss and clarify what leadership means on their relative campuses. Although rubrics are often thought of as purely tools for assessment, they can also serve as a means to clarify and explain learning outcomes. Several researchers noted the benefit of rubrics in first helping educators to better understand expectations for learning goals and then helping them to align instruction or programs with those learning goals (AAC&U, 2009; Andrade, 2005; Beld, 2010; Montgomery, 1997). With leadership often understood in different ways through various lenses (Roberts, 2007; Stogdill, 1974), conversations spurred by rubric development can assure that leadership educators across campus are working from the same conceptual lens. This is critical as Owen (2012) identifies a sound theoretical grounding as central to the effectiveness of leadership programs in advancing learning gains.

Additionally, rubrics help educators solidify learning outcomes to direct program and curricular design. Komives and Schoper (2006) acknowledged that sometimes educators may build programs first and then hope those programs or curricular content will match and fulfill those outcomes. Instead, educators should first identify learning outcomes and then design initiatives or classroom assignments that meet those outcomes. Rubrics can help leadership educators do the latter and, therefore, be more effective and efficient when working with students.

When used as an instructional tool, rubrics can engage students in the learning process. Whereas rubrics are often thought of as assessment tools, they can also play a role in teaching students (Reddy & Andrade, 2010; Stevens & Levi, 2005). When rubrics were distributed at the beginning of the education process, students perceived them as providing clarity in regard to educational objectives and allowed them to track developmental progress (Diller & Phelps, 2008; Reddy & Andrade). When students actively utilize rubrics for both for themselves and with peers, scholars suggest students engage in deeper learning, using higher-level thinking skills (Reitmeier, Svendsen, & Vrchota, 2004). However, to make the most of rubric use, educators must first explain the value of rubrics in the educational process and teach students how to appropriately apply them (Montgomery, 1997). When leadership educators capitalize on rubric use with students, the students themselves can play an integral role in their own leadership development, assessing their current developmental stages while also being able to understand other developmental levels.

Additionally, rubrics provide space for reflection in the educational process. Kolb's (1984) experiential learning cycle consists of four stages: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. When applied to leadership practices, students need to engage in reflection and conceptualization after participating in leadership experiences in order to learn from their actions. Rubrics can help students to engage in the reflection process as they strive to make meaning of their experiences and conceptualize how those experiences connect with leadership theories.

When rubrics from different students are examined as an aggregated group, educators and administrators can better assess programs to discern where interventions are needed. Although there is limited research in relation to rubric use for program improvement, some studies show how rubric results were used to identify program strengths and growth areas (Reddy & Andrade, 2010). In one study, Petkov and Petkova (2006) used average scores of student group projects to recognize skills or concepts groups did not fully understand. In a similar way, leadership educators can use with rubrics to discern what leadership skills or concepts need additional or more intentional attention in the classroom or within the larger campus community. In essence, how effectively are educational interventions in leveraging leadership learning?

Considerations in Using Rubrics

To assure quality results, educators must be careful to assure rubrics are valid and reliable (Reddy & Andrade, 2010). Rubric creation is not an easy process and, for beginners, they take time to create (Stevens & Levi, 2005). In terms of validity, creators must assure that rubrics measure what they intend to measure (Reddy & Andrade, 2010). Moskal and Leydens (2000) stated that one of the keys to rubric validity is knowing precise, intended learning outcomes and how students will display proficiency in these outcomes. This leads back to one of the first benefits outlined in this paper that rubric construction can result in clarity of leadership concepts and learning goals. With language being a challenging aspect of rubric validity (Reddy & Andrade, 2010), establishing a common language around leadership education is imperative on college campuses.

When used as an instructional tool, rubrics can engage students in the learning process. Whereas rubrics are often thought of as assessment tools, they can also play a role in teaching students.

Reliability relates to consistency of rubric scores; this pertains to both consistency between raters and consistency of repeated ratings by one person (Moskal & Leydens, 2000). With a variety of students and educators potentially using rubrics, careful construction and education about rubric use are paramount in order to reap valuable assessment data. When created and used appropriately, rubrics can provide critical information on how leadership educators can improve curriculum and programs.

Rubrics can be used within a variety of areas of leadership education. Classroom instruction is an obvious example where rubrics can be integrated. For leadership courses, instructors should work to create scoring rubrics for various class assignments and even expectations for participation. Macro-level rubrics can be used for a variety of purposes in the co-curricular environment. Students in a certificate or mentoring program can work with advisors or mentors to assess development in leadership capacity and efficacy. When advisors and mentors understand what developmental level each student is at, they can then intentionally recommend healthy and appropriate interventions to help students progress in their leadership development. By capitalizing on rubric use, leadership educators will not only create more effective and intentional initiatives around leadership education, but they will also be more effective in creating significant learning experiences for students.

References

Andrade, H. G. (2005). Teaching with rubrics: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *College Teaching*, 53(1), 27-30.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2009). The VALUE project overview. *Peer Review*, 11(1), 4-7.

Beld, J. M. (2010). Engaging departments in assessing student learning: Overcoming common obstacles. *Peer Review*, 12(1), 6-9.

Diller, K. R., & Phelps, S. F. (2008). Learning outcomes, portfolios, and rubrics, oh my! Authentic assessment of an information literacy program. *Libraries and the Academy*, 8(1), 75-89.

Goodrich, H. (1997). Understanding rubrics. *Educational Leadership*, 54(4), 14-17.

Maki, P. (2009). Moving beyond a national habit in the call for accountability. *Peer Review, 11*(1), 13-17.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Komives, S. R., & Schoper, S. (2006). Developing learning outcomes. In R. P. Keeling (Ed.), *Learning Reconsidered 2: A Practical Guide to Implementing a Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (17-41). Washington, DC: NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.

Montgomery, K. (2002). Authentic tasks and rubrics: Going beyond traditional assessments in college teaching. *College Teaching*, 50(1), 34-39.

Moskal, B. M., & Leydens, J. A. (2000). Scoring rubric development: Validity and reliability. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 7*(10). Retreived August 1, 2012 from http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=10

Owen, J. E. (2012). *Findings from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership Institutional Survey*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Petkov, D., & Petkova, O. (2006). Development of scoring rubrics for IS projects as an assessment tool. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology, 3*, 499-510.

Popham, W. J. (1997). What's wrong – and what's right – with rubrics. *Educational Leadership*, 55(2), 72-75.

Reddy, Y. M., & Andrade, H. (2010). A review of rubric use in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(4), 435-448.

Reitmeier, C. A., Svedsen, L. K., & Vrchota, D. A. (2004). Improving oral communication skills of students in food science courses. *Journal of Food Science Education*, 3, 15-20.

Roberts, D. C. (2007). *Deeper learning in leadership: Helping college students find the potential within*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stevens, D. D. & Levi, A. (2005). *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

Wiggins, G. (1990). The case for authentic assessment. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests Measurement and Evaluation*. Retrieved from http://bern.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/003/4006.doc

__John P. Dugan, Ph.D__ currently serves as an Assistant Professor in the Higher Education graduate program at Loyola University Chicago and is NCLP Scholarship and Research editor. Dr. Dugan teaches courses on leadership, student development theory, and multiculturalism for social justice at Loyola University. John's research interests focus on the influences of higher education in shaping college students' involvement and leadership development with a specific emphasis on marginalized voices and ideas. John currently serves as the Principal Investigator for the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL), an international research program examining the influences of higher education on socially responsible leadership and other educational outcomes (e.g., efficacy, resilience, social perspective-taking, identity development). John's research has generated 24 printed or in press publications (e.g., refereed articles, books, and book chapters), more than 60 presentations at national and international conferences.

__Benjamin Correia__ is a Project Manager and Research Assistant for the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership and is a doctoral student in the Higher Education program at Loyola University Chicago. His past professional experiences include work in residence life, student union management, student activities, and academic advising.

Coming up...

Leadership Educators Institute
December 9-11, 2012
The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio

SAVE THE DATE:
23rd Annual National Leadership Symposium
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky July 22-24, 2013

NCLP and ACU-I sponsored Webinars feature:
Civically Engaged Leadership for a Better World
October 31 at 3 p.m. Eastern

Dr. Barbara Jacoby is faculty associate for leadership and community service-learning at the Adele H. Stamp Student Union Center for Campus Life at the University of Maryland–College Park.

Examining the Design and Delivery of Collegiate Student Leadership Development Programs: Ten Key Findings
December 5 at 3 p.m. Eastern

Dr. Julie Owen is an assistant professor of leadership and integrative studies at New Century College, George Mason University

ACPA – Symposium on Service-Learning Best Practices for Engaging Students and Communities
December 5-7, 2012
Marriott Inner Harbor- Baltimore, Maryland

The International Leadership Association – Women and Leadership Affinity Group Conference
Building, Bridging and Blazing Pathways for Women and Leadership: Celebrating the Past, Present, and Future
9-12 June 2013- Asilomar Conference Grounds
Pacific Grove, California