

Findings from the 2018 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership Survey
Sensemaking Group

September 24, 2019

Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Methodology.....	2
Method of MSL	2
Method of Creating the Sensemaking and Participants	2
General Observations	3
Key Findings by Themes.....	4
Recommendations.....	5
Measure 1: Socially Responsible Leadership Scale.....	6
Measure 2: Resiliency	7
Measure 3: Complex Cognitive Skills	8
Measure 4: Social Perspective-Taking	9
Measure 5: Social Generativity	10
Measure 6: Hope.....	11
Environmental Construct 1: Campus Climate	12
Environmental Construct 2: Mentorship	13
Appendix A: WU Custom Questions: Global Citizenship, Ethics and Diversity.....	16

Executive Summary

The Multi-Institutional Student of Leadership (MSL), sponsored by the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs, aims to enhance institutional practice by examining influences of higher education on college student leadership development. First administered in 2006, the MSL is administered on a 3-year cycle. Washburn has participated twice, first in 2015 and again in 2018.

Methodology

Method of MSL

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership survey focuses on understanding the influences of higher education in shaping socially responsible leadership capacity and other leadership-related outcomes such as efficacy, cognitive skills, and resiliency.

The conceptual framework for MSL is adapted from Astin's (1993) "input-environment-outcome" (I-E-O) college impact model which involves the collection of data about students' knowledge and experiences prior to college as well as their experiences during college. The MSL survey questionnaire is adapted from the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS; Tyree, 1998), which measures the eight core values of the social change model (HERI, 1996). The MSL is comprised of over 400 variables, scales, and composite measures representing students' demographics and pre-college experiences, experiences during college, and key outcome measures. Other leadership-related outcomes studied in the MSL include complex cognitive skills, leadership efficacy, social change behaviors, seeing alternative social perspectives, spiritual development, racial identity, resiliency, and agency.

In 2018, 78 colleges and universities participated in the MSL, with 74 included in the national benchmark. Schools provided a random sample of 4,000 undergraduate students to the researchers. Washburn University (WU) provided a sample of 4,000 undergraduate students, and a supplementary sample (not included in the national benchmark sample) of 731. Registration data from November of 2017 was used to provide participant data.

The MSL was administered via an online survey from January to April of 2018. WU had a response rate of 33.1% ($n = 1,325$), which was higher than the national mean response rate of 29.0%. Our completion rate was 80.1%; $n = 1,062$. The data reflected in the reports that were discussed by the Sensemaking Group included the partial and completed surveys of the random sample of 4,000 ($n = 1,325$).

Method of Creating the Sensemaking and Participants

The results of the 2015 participation in the MSL were used as an assessment method for the Global Citizenship, Ethics, and Diversity University Student Learning Outcome (USLO-GED). Reporting on the results took place at the Assessment Extravaganza, organized by Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning (C-TEL), in the format of a table presentation and poster.

In 2018, the goal was to gain familiarity with the data with the hopes of integrating the data into decision making. Blaich and Wise (2017) point to sensemaking conversations with colleagues as an important step in using big data. Sensemaking is described as "talking with one another to form a consensus identifying and interpreting events of other information to pave the way for action" (Blaich & Wise, 2017, p. 27). Sensemaking begins to decrease the distance from the dataset, helping institutions and faculty and staff members to not think of the non-existent "average student," but rather the students of the institution. In other words, it begins to connect the data from the national survey to

institutional customs, culture, and programs. The data set should be used widely, which starts with a cross-campus, collaborative approach to data disaggregation. According to Banta and Kuh (1998):

And when faculty and student affairs professionals pool their perspectives on students' in-class and out-of-class experiences, they discover firsthand what the college impact research shows: that cognitive and affective development are inextricably intertwined and that the curricular and out-of-class activities are not discrete, independent events; they affect one another (sometimes profoundly) in ways that often are not immediately obvious. (p. 42)

The 2018 results were shared in the same delivery formats at the Assessment Extravaganza in February of 2019. The poster and write-up from the Assessment Extravaganza are included in Appendix A. Additionally, results were shared at an open-forum session with lunch, organized by C-TEL in March of 2019. During the open-forum, the presenters solicited volunteers to take place in the 6-session sensemaking group in the Summer of 2019. Additional follow-up emails were sent to interested participants through April and May to get as large and diverse of a sensemaking group as possible. The group met for the first time on Wednesday, May 29th.

The group included:

- James Barraclough: Director, Undergraduate Initiatives
- Joel Bluml: Associate Vice President, Student Life
- Lauren Edelman: Interim Director, Leadership Institute
- Kelly Erby: Assistant Dean- CAS/Associate Professor- History
- Christina Foreman: Student Success and Retention Specialist
- Michael Gleason: Former Director, Leadership Institute
- Chaz Havens: Director, Washburn Tech East
- Vickie Kelly: Associate Professor and Assessment Director, Academic Assessment
- Madeline Lambing: Program Coordinator, Leadership Institute
- Mindy Rendon: Director, Housing and Residential Life
- Christa Smith: Academic Effectiveness Analyst
- Keith Tatum: Adjunct Professor, Human Services

General Observations

Residential Setting was determined by one prompt during the survey. The prompt asks students where they are currently living. On-campus housing at WU is primarily occupied by under-classmen. The MSL does not account for residual effects of students who lived on-campus at one time but now live off-campus. On-campus students tend to have lower mean scores on outcomes, which may be contributed to because most on-campus students are under-classmen.

WU describes first generation college students as a student who neither parent/legal guardians completed a bachelor's degree. The MSL uses governmental standards of first generation as students whose parents have never enrolled in post-secondary education.

GPA was self-reported by selecting a range of distributions of possible scores by responding to the question "What is your best estimate of your grades so far in college? [Assume 4.00 = A]." If the GPAs reported by students in the sample were accurate (47% selected 3.50-4.00), the sample may not reflect

some of the more unprepared students at Washburn. A similar profile of the students in the national sample was not provided in the results package from the MSL.

The number of transfer students was measured by the question “Did you begin college at your current institution or elsewhere?” The percent of transfer students (those who stated that they began college elsewhere) was 37%, which was a larger percent than expected. However, if respondents perceived starting college as AP courses in high school or another interpretation, they may have responded with elsewhere.

Learning community participant was 20%, which seemed to be too high since there are not many opportunities for students to participate in these types of communities at Washburn. The question read “Which of the following have you engaged in during your college experience:” and the response option selected by 20% of respondents was “Learning community or other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together.”

For those responding that they have an on-campus job (61%), identified by the question “Are you currently working ON CAMPUS?”, the sensemaking group wondered if this was high because on-campus employees are more likely to be first or second year students. It was also noted that the value of on-campus employment may not be related to learning outcomes, but rather the connections students have with campus offices, organizations and other workplaces.

Key Findings by Themes

Community Service was determined by the sensemaking group to be a high-impact practice. Students who reported engaging in community service had statistically significant higher mean scores on many outcomes (all except social perspective-taking). The MSL instrument asked the question, firstly as “In an average month, do you engage in any community service?” (yes/no). Respondents who indicated “yes” were then asked “In an average month, approximately how many hours do you engage in community service... as part of a class? As part of a work study experience? With a campus student organization? As part of a community organization unaffiliated with your school? On your own?” Further analysis can be done on the amount of community service students self-report engaging in and in what conditions.

Secondly, Mentorship was shown to have a distinct impact on respondent's leadership development. The MSL defines a mentor as “a person who intentionally assists your growth or connects you to opportunities for career or personal development.” Higher mean scores, many statistically significant, were reported by students who said they had a mentor, of any kind (faculty/instructor, academic or student affairs professional staff, employer, community member, parent/guardian, or other student). Mentorship is further explored below (page 13). While not included in reports, the MSL did ask students to identify their most significant mentor at the university and that individual's gender and racial group. Further analysis could be done on those items; however, it is anticipated the data would reinforce and match HERI Faculty Survey 2017 data about mentor's genders and racial groups.

Students were asked how often they are involved on campus. The variable was measured on a 0-4 level scale of involvement. Patterns of statistically significant difference were found between those Never (0), Once (1), Sometimes (2) involved AND those Many Times (3) or Much of the Time (4) involved. Additionally, students were asked on a binary yes/no if they were involved in a variety of on-campus experiences. Additional information can be found in the reports regarding specific on-campus experiences.

Participation in academic experiences like research or study abroad are generally regarded as transformational for students. However, on many outcomes, there was not a statistically significant difference in mean scores between those who reported studying abroad and those that did not. Higher means were noted on just two outcomes (Citizenship and Complex Cognitive Skills). Additionally, very few majors had statistically significant differences between majors and non-majors.

A notable environment that produced statistically significant differences was the environment of an off-campus job. Compared to peers who reported having on-campus employment, students who identified as having an off-campus job had statistically significant higher means in many outcome areas (Consciousness of Self, Commitment, Collaboration, Resiliency, Leadership Efficacy, Social Perspective-taking, Hope scale - Agency). The group discussed that higher mean scored could be because students who work on-campus tend to be under-classmen. Additionally, a more relevant outcome to on-campus employment might be Sense of Belonging or mentorship, instead of leadership outcomes.

Surprisingly, formal leadership programs had varying connection to higher outcomes on many of the measures. Generally, students who reported participating in formal leadership programs had higher mean scores on the outcomes measured. However, very few means were of statistical significance. Statistically significance only existed between Never engagement and Often engagement on each of the types of leadership experiences. However, most types of leadership experiences (course, conference, retreat, lecture/workshop) did have a statistically significant effect on Leadership Efficacy.

Recommendations

Goal 1: Use data to further examine retention efforts and focus on improving retention within programs. One-time attendees are not having significantly different learning than those who have never been engaged.

Goal 2: Increase the number of students engaged in community service. Promote and encourage/incentivize students to complete community service and promote and incentivize faculty to incorporate HICEPs into their courses.

Goal 3: Continue to gather data related to campus climate. Meaningfully analyze and share results.

- Further analysis of the data provided by MSL can be used, as well as a more comprehensive campus climate survey.

Goal 4: Continue to enhance conversations around mentoring on campus. Develop shared language and encourage best practices among faculty, staff, student employers, and fellow students.

- Mentoring also has the potential of boosting retention within programs because of helping students build social capital.

Goal 5: Use the language of the MSL in leadership conversations. Increase and enhance conversations across campus about the social change model of leadership, social change behaviors, and social generativity.

Measure 1: Socially Responsible Leadership Scale

The items in this section are referred to as the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS) and relate to the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership. Leadership capacities associated with the SCM include Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Controversy with Civility, and Citizenship (the 7 Cs). The omnibus measure of the SRLS (Omnibus SRLS) combines the 7 Cs and represents students' overall capacities for Socially Responsible Leadership.

Please note, the Omnibus SRLS is on a 5-point scale in that lower scores can be attributed to a lower overall measure of leadership capacity and higher scores can be attributed to a higher overall measure of leadership capacity. There is no descriptive explanation of a response option scale point (e.g., 4 = Agree) that corresponds with this score due to the aggregation of scores from the 7 Cs to create this measure.

Responses indicated that students who participated in Community Service scored statistically significantly higher on the Omnibus SRLS than those who did not participate.

For involvement in College Organizations, the response option Much of the Time yielded the highest mean score (4.36) and yielded statistically significant differences between Never, Once, and Sometimes. Many and Never also resulted in statistically significant differences in that respondents that selected Many scored higher on the Omnibus SRLS.

For Involvement in Off-Campus Organizations, the same pattern as College organizations held, except for the relationship between Many and Never.

For Leadership Positions in Off-Campus Organizations, Much of the Time yielded the highest mean score, and was significantly different than respondents who indicated Never, Once, and Sometimes. Additionally, Many Times was significantly different than Sometimes and Never.

For Participation in Student Groups, statistically significant differences on the Omnibus SRLS were present for those who participated in the groups and who did not in relation to the following: Academic/Department/Professional, Campus-Wide Programming, Identity-Based/Multicultural Organizations, International Interest, Military, Multicultural Social Fraternities and Sororities, New Student Transitions, Peer Helper, Political, Recreational, Religious, Service, Social/Special Interest, and Student Governance.

For Social Change Behaviors and Socio-Cultural Conversations, Often yielded the highest mean score, and all response options were statistically significant to each other.

For Campus Climate, Belonging Climate and Non-Discriminatory Climate both had too small of number of respondents to produce a mean score for Strongly Disagree (less than 15). For both outcomes, the scores for Strongly Agree and Agree were statistically significantly different than Neutral. Neutral and Strongly Agree were also statistically significantly different for both concepts. For Belonging Climate, Agree and Disagree were statistically significant in their difference.

For Mentor Relationships, Often was the highest mean score for each component, and most differences in responses were statistically significant on the Omnibus SRLS.

Regarding Formal Leadership Training Experience, statistically significant results were present for Leadership Conference, Leadership Retreat, Leadership Lecture/Workshop Series, Positional Leadership

Training, and Leadership Course in that Often was the highest mean score, and Never was significantly lower. For Leadership Lecture/Workshop Series, Sometimes and Never were statistically significant and for Positional Leader Training, Never and Once were statistically significantly different than Often on the Omnibus SRLS.

For Academic College Experience, those who engaged in Experienced Internships and Learning Community Participants produced statistically significantly higher responses on the Omnibus SRLS than their counterparts.

Academic Major produced one statistically significant result, for Visual and Performing Arts, in that No responses yielded higher responses on the Omnibus SRLS than Yes responses.

Regarding demographic information, the highest mean score of the Race grouping was Latino/Hispanic at 4.20. Students with a sexual orientation of Heterosexual scored higher on the Omnibus SRLS than the other groups, and the relationship between LGBTQ+ was statistically significant in that the respondents identifying as Heterosexual scored higher (4.17). For GPA Estimate, those who reported 3.50-4.00 scored higher on the Omnibus SRLS than 3.00-3.49 and 2.00-2.49, and 3.00-3.49 scored higher than 2.00-2.49; these differences were statistically significant. Non-First Generation students scored higher on the Omnibus SRLS than First Generation students, and this difference was statistically significant. For Disability Status, those who responded with No Reported Disability scored higher on the Omnibus SRLS than those who responded with Reported Disability and this difference was statistically significant. Women and those respondents with a class standing of Senior+ scored higher on the Omnibus SRLS than others, however, these relationships were not statistically significant. Those additional student characteristic groups who scored higher on the Omnibus SRLS but the differences between groups were not statistically significant consisted of: Non-Traditional (24 or Older), Non-Transfer Student, Full-Time enrolled, and Very Liberal.

These results were not surprising to the Sensemaking group. One would expect that involvement/greater involvement in Community Service, College Organizations, Off-Campus Organizations, Mentoring Relationships, etc., would result in higher leadership capacity. What was regarded as surprising results related to items that were not statistically significant, such as off-campus and on-campus jobs, residential setting, participation in sororities or fraternities, etc. For example, one result that was surprising was no significant differences in any category based on residential setting (on/off campus). It was proposed to look at other institutions and see what norms exist around living on campus, for example, these results may differ based on number of students living on campus. The terminology used in the survey may have served to confuse respondents which reemphasized the importance of a shared language across campus regarding definitions. Deeper dives into the 2018 data and comparisons to the 2015 data may need to occur with smaller, focused groups to develop a greater understanding of responses and actionable next steps.

Measure 2: Resiliency

These items related to Resiliency or the characteristics that enable persistence despite adversity and positive coping with stress; the ability to recover readily from illness, depression, adversity, etc.

The results indicated that involvement in off-campus organizations and in leadership positions promote higher Resiliency in students who are involved Much of the Time rather than Never.

There was a substantial difference in mean scores between students who participated in campus-wide programming than those who do not.

There were statistically significant differences in Resiliency for students participating in multicultural social fraternities and sororities, but no statistically significant difference for those who participated in social fraternities or sororities. Significant differences were found for those who participated in political or recreational activities/groups (including sports and student government), but there were no statistical significance in for residential assistants, nor participation in racial/ethnic groups.

Social Change Behaviors, Socio-cultural Conversations and Campus Climate were all significant in promoting Resiliency. Belonging seemed to be more significant or important than having a non-discriminatory climate.

Resiliency was higher for those who attend leadership lectures/workshops or positional leadership training Often compared to Never. This was also higher for those who take leadership courses compared to those who never do. An interesting and statistically significant result was for those who reported attending one multicultural leadership program compared to those who never have. National trends reveal that any participation is significant.

Internships contributed to significant differences in scores, as did learning communities, but this may be due to survey definition confusion of what learning communities mean at Washburn versus the survey definition.

Research with a faculty member was not statistically significant. First-year seminar scores were not significantly different, which was surprising given Resiliency is presumably a critical component to retention.

For demographic information, Resiliency was higher for heterosexual students than for LGBTQ+. This is consistent with national trends, although the gap for the WU sample is larger. Nontraditional/older students were more resilient than traditional students. Surprisingly no statistically significant difference in Resiliency between first-generation and non-first generation students were present, which is consistent with the national trend. Since first-generation students are at higher risk, one might assume they would be more likely to be less resilient. There were no significant difference between individuals with a reported disability and those with no reported disability. One might expect the mean to be higher among those with a reported disability, but was actually lower, which is consistent with national trends. Resiliency was higher in students who work off campus than who do not.

Measure 3: Complex Cognitive Skills

The items for this measure relate to students' growth in advanced cognitive skills, including critical thinking, self-directed learning and making complex connections between topics.

Class standing was statistically significant in that Seniors were more likely than First-Year students and Sophomores to report growth in Complex Cognitive Skills. This finding correlates with students' response that they have increased their cognitive skills over time. There were no other significant differences on input measures.

There were statistically significant differences among student experiences during college. Participation in community service and living in an off-campus residential setting were statistically significantly higher

for those with more advanced Complex Cognitive Skills. Involvement in college organizations Much of the time and Many times were statistically significantly higher than Once and Never, as were leadership positions in college organizations. Involvement in off-campus organizations Much of the time was statistically significantly higher than Never, Once and Sometimes. Participation in student groups was statistically significant for Academic/Departmental/Professional groups, Campus-Wide Programming, Honor Societies, Identity-Based/Multicultural Organizations, International Interest groups, New Student Transitions, Peer Helper, Recreational, Religious, Service, Social/Special Interest, and Student Governance groups.

For the categories of Formal Leadership Training Programs, there were statistically significant differences for Leadership Conference and Leadership Retreat between Never and Often. For Leadership Lecture/Workshop Series and Positional Leadership Training, there were statistically significant differences between Never and Sometimes and Often. For Leadership Course, there were statistically significant differences between Often and Never.

For Academic College Experience, there were statistically significant differences between those who participated in Study Abroad, Experienced Internship, and Learning Community Participant in that their Complex Cognitive Skills were reported higher than their counterparts who reported no participation in these areas.

There were no significant differences by any academic major. Likewise, there were no statistically significant differences for other college experiences (e.g., living-learning program, research with faculty member, first-year seminar or freshmen course).

The results from this section indicate that involvement in groups and experiences creates a difference in how students believe their Complex Cognitive Skills have increased.

Measure 4: Social Perspective-Taking

These items related to the ability to take another person's point of view and accurately infer their thoughts and feelings.

The measurement of respondents' Social Perspective-Taking is on a 5-point scale in which lower scores may be attributed to a lower measure of this ability and higher scores may be attributed to a higher overall measure of this ability.

Students who identified as non-traditional had statistically significant higher means for social perspective taking. Class standing also had significance, with seniors having a statistically significant higher mean than freshmen and sophomores. Living off-campus and off-campus jobs also promoted higher levels of social perspective taking. This was not surprising. It is expected older, non-traditional students, as well as students with more college experience and higher class standing, to report an enhanced ability to take another's point of view. These students have had more opportunities to encounter and engage with people and ideas who are different from themselves.

Students who self-reported having an international interest had a statistically significant higher mean. Significant differences also existed between those who reported Often engaging in social change behaviors as compared to those who report Never engaging in these behaviors. Those who reported Sometimes had lower means that were statistically significantly different than those who Often

engaging in socio-cultural conversations. It is unsurprising that those who have international interests and who engage in socio-cultural conversations report greater ability for Social Perspective-taking.

Students who reported they agreed or strongly agreed that they experienced a belonging climate had a higher mean of statistical significance. Likewise, those who agreed or strongly agreed that they experienced a non-discriminatory climate self-reported a higher capacity for Social Perspective-taking. One might assume that those who have experienced some level of discrimination might have a greater capacity for empathy.

Mentor relationships with faculty/instructors and employers also led to statistically significant differences in Social Perspective-taking. This trend was mirrored in the national sample.

Measure 5: Social Generativity

This measure contains items about concern for future generations as well as engagement in current actions to advance the future of a community.

There was no significant difference in Social Generativity based on employment status on or off campus (Off-Campus Job and On-Campus Job) and with living on or off campus (Residential Setting). Participation in community service was statistically significant in that those who participated rated their social generativity higher than their counterparts; this was not a surprising finding given the definition of social generativity. For leadership positions on campus, there was a statistically significant difference in the mean score for Much of the time vs Never, Once, and Sometimes. However, when examining who reported holding leadership positions, 64% have never had positions; 10% Much of the time. None of the other environmental factors resulted in statistically significant results for this outcome measure.

Regarding participation in student groups, those who participated in Academic/Departmental/Professional were statistically significantly higher on Social Generativity. Advocacy groups was not statistically significant but yielded a larger mean than those who did not participate in these groups; only 3% of the sample population responded as participating in an Advocacy group. Participation in Campus-Wide Programming, Participation in Identity-Based/Multicultural Organizations, International Interest, Multicultural Social Fraternities and Sororities, Political, Recreational, Religious, Service, Social/Special Interest, and Student Governance were statistically significantly higher than non-participating counterparts. Participation in Military groups yielded a higher mean, but the difference was not statistically significant, and this mean score was higher for WU (5.48) than the national sample (5.19). Peer Helper, New Student Orientation, Resident Assistants, and Participation in Intercollegiate Sports was higher but not statistically significant; this was not reflected in the national sample. Participation in Social Fraternity or Sorority yielded a higher mean but was not statistically significant; again, this was unlike the national sample in that these were statistically significant. For LGBTQ, Racial/Ethnic, and Women's groups, the WU sample was small. Results for Women's groups were statistically significant, between Sometimes and Never.

There were statistically significant differences between those who engage Often in Socio-Cultural Conversations than those who engage Never, Once, and Sometimes. For Belonging Climate, there is a reverse bell curve in that higher mean scores were reported for Strongly Agree and Disagree than Neutral and Agree. The national sample responses displayed an upward trending line as involvement increased. For Non-Discriminatory Climate, results were not statistically significant, but it is interesting that disagree yielded a higher mean.

Mentorship had an obvious effect on Social Generativity whereas all responses were statistically significant between Never and Often in that Often was higher. The exception was Parent/Guardian where the Often was higher but not statistically significant. Community Member as a mentor yielded the highest mean of all the mentor relationships.

For Formal Leadership Training Experiences, it would be interesting to see social generativity taught during a retreat or training assessment; what would this look like? Responses to participating in a Leadership Course Never vs Often was statistically significant. In the national sample, Once vs Never was statistically significant, and lower than the WU sample. Social Generativity is a focus of the LE 100 course. Peer Leader Educator Team yielded a higher mean, but was not statistically significant. Likewise, Leadership Minor was not statistically significant, which was also surprising given the focus of leadership minor program. It may be that the connection needs to be made clearer.

Measure 6: Hope

These items relate to the process of thinking about one's goals, along with the motivation to move toward those goals, and the ways to achieve those goals. Hope is comprised of two factors: Agency - belief in one's ability to initiate and sustain goal-directed efforts, and Pathways – belief in one's ability to envision multiple routes to achieve goals.

Students who reported they participated in community service reported significantly higher mean scores on the hope scale than students who do not. This was similar with students involved in college organizations Much of the time compared to Never or Once.

Participation in multicultural social fraternities and sororities correlated with significantly higher mean scores on hope than for students who did not participate, but no virtually no difference in mean scores for students participating in social fraternities or sororities. This is consistent with national trends.

Participation in special topics groups and student governance were associated with higher mean scores than for those who do not participate. The more frequently students engaged in social change behaviors, the higher the hope scores for both Agency and Pathways. The results were similar for sociocultural conversations in that Often was significantly higher than Never.

In addition, belonging climate was correlated with Hope (both Agency and Pathways). Non-discriminatory climate yielded interesting findings in that the mean scores for Disagree (meaning we believe we have a discriminatory climate) were higher for Hope (both Pathways and Agency) than even for those students who strongly agree that we have a non-discriminatory climate. This is also consistent with the national trend.

When examining Hope and Mentors, faculty, employer, and community member mentorship correlated with higher Hope (Pathways) scores, especially when they occur often. Unlike Hope (Agency), student or peer mentoring was not significant in relation to pathways. There were significant differences in mean scores for Hope (Agency) for all types of mentoring relationships. While peer/student mentoring relationships didn't seem to impact Resiliency, there was a statistically significantly higher mean for students who often experience peer mentoring than for students who never or sometimes do.

For Leadership and Academic Experiences, leadership lectures/workshop series, positional leader training and courses are the only formal training experiences with statistically significant mean scores for Hope (Pathways), usually between Never and Often participates.

For Input/Student Characteristics, heterosexual students reported higher Hope (Agency) than LGBTQ+ students. Hope (Agency) was correlated with GPA in that higher mean scores were associated with higher GPAs. There were significant differences in hope scores for students with a 2.00-2.49 compared to 3.50-4.00. This is consistent with the national trend.

Nationally, transfer students reported higher scores for Hope (Agency) than non-transfer students. At WU, there were no statistically significant differences; and this is the same for first-generation students. Not surprisingly, those without reported disability had higher mean scores for Hope (Agency) than for those with a reported disability. This is in alignment with the national trend.

For Student Participation, students who work off campus had higher Hope (Agency) scores than students who do not work off campus. There was no significant difference for student working on campus. Community service correlated with higher scores on hope. Some participation in college organizations correlated with higher Hope (Agency) than never participating. Participating in leadership positions in organizations much of the time correlated to higher hope scores compared to students who never hold leadership positions, or only sometimes hold leadership positions. Involvement off-campus much of the time correlated with higher mean scores compared to students who never participate off-campus. Holding leadership positions in these organizations is less relevant.

Finally, for Leadership and Academic Experiences, students who often participated in formal leadership training experiences (co-curricular, courses and minor) had significantly higher scores in Hope (Agency) than students who never participate. Internships, capstones, and learning communities also positively affected scores.

Environmental Construct 1: Campus Climate

The MSL Sensemaking Group had an interest in how students' perception of campus climate affected their development outcomes in leadership as measured by the MSL.

Social Change Behaviors were gauged on a four-point scale from 0= Never to 3= Often. Respondents reported their frequency of engagement in ten types of activities including the following: performed community service; communicated with campus or community leaders about a pressing concern; acted to raise awareness about a campus, community, or global problem; and worked with others to address social inequality.

Socio-cultural Conversations were measured based on students' responses to the following question: During interactions with other students outside of class, how often have you done each of the following in an average school year? Students were then given prompts such as talked about different lifestyles/customs; discussed your views about multiculturalism and diversity; and held discussions with students whose political opinions were very different from your own. Respondents were asked to self-report frequency of engagement on a four-point scale from 0= Never to 3= Very Often.

In regard to Campus Climate, this measure is the degree to which students feel connected and appreciated as members of the campus community, and includes three factors: (1) Sense of Belonging: feelings of affiliation with the campus community; (2) Discriminatory Climate (Direct): concrete experiences of discrimination from community members; and (3) Discriminatory Climate (Indirect): general perceptions of a hostile campus environment.

Social Change Behaviors were an environmental factor that made a big difference in students' leadership outcomes. It seemed a little goes along way—even just answering Once to these questions leads to significant differences compared to answering Never (with exception of Commitment, Social Perspective-taking, and Hope-Pathways). On all of the outcomes measured, as frequency of Social Change Behaviors increased, so did mean scores.

Socio-cultural Conversations followed the same trend. As frequency of engagement increased, so did mean scores. However, statistically significant differences were more often between Never and Sometimes or Never and Often. Engaging in Socio-cultural Conversations once showed higher mean scores, but not of statistical significance on most outcomes. One-time engagement did lead to statistically significant higher means in the outcomes of Consciousness of Self, Citizenship, Omnibus SRLS, Leadership Efficacy, and Social Generativity.

Fewer than 15 respondents do not strongly disagree with the questions about Campus Climate. This indicates they do not strongly disagree that they belong on campus and indicates they do not strongly disagree that there is a non-discriminatory climate on campus. Respondents who do disagree that they belong, however, are statistically different across the board from those who agree and strongly agree. Statistically significant differences exist between disagree and agree and/or strongly agree on all of the outcomes measured except Social Perspective-taking. This is not surprising, but it is important to note. However, respondents who disagree that there is a Non-discriminatory Climate do not differ in a statistically different way in most cases from those who agree and strongly agree (except for Commitment and Collaboration). This is not true of the national results.

Environmental Construct 2: Mentorship

This additional environmental construct of interested to the MSL Sensemaking Group focused on students' relationships with mentors. Mentor was defined as a person who intentionally assists in growth or connects students to opportunities for career or personal development.

For Faculty/Instructor mentors, the highest ratings were for Often, in that the mentor relationships were higher for those concepts that were rated as a participation level of Often. The highest mean scores of the 7Cs was in Commitment (Often, 4.52) and the lowest was Resiliency (Often, 4.01). This could be interpreted as faculty mentorships help with commitment, but not in rebounding.

The pattern of highest scores in Commitment and lowest in Resiliency continued through all the listed types of mentors (e.g., Employer, Community Member).

For Student Affairs Professional Staff, again the highest ratings across the board were in the Often response option, and the highest rating was for in Commitment. The lowest scores were found in Resiliency, and Citizenship was a close second to last. Student affairs had some areas that spike around the Once characteristic. This could be showing that the students do not interact with this type of a mentor as often.

For Employer mentors, the highest ratings across the board were in the often sector, and again the highest rating was for Commitment. Scores were lowest in Resiliency; Citizenship and Consciousness of Self were a close second to last. Across the characteristic Once and Sometimes were very close if not identical. This could explain that there is some mentorship going on with some employers but weaker with others.

For Community Member mentors, again, the highest ratings across the board were in the Often response option, and the highest rating was for Commitment and lowest in Resiliency. Consciousness of Self was a close second to last. However, this characteristic has higher ratings in general than the other mentorships. It appears mentorships with community members may have the largest impact on the students.

For Parent Guardian mentors, again had the highest ratings in the Often area, and the highest rating was for Commitment, while the lowest was for Resiliency and Citizenship. Once yielded too low of responses to report. This could be that some students don't see their parents as mentors. Additionally, there was not much difference between scores of never and often in this characteristic. This again could be influenced by parent/child relationships in that mentors are often short-term, and parents are usually long-term mentors.

Other student mentors again had the highest ratings in the often sector with Commitment as the highest area, and Resiliency last; Consciousness of self and citizenship were second to last. There was not much difference in the Never, Once, and Sometimes answers. These answers could reflect possible confusion of student mentorships or evidence of a lack of mentorships between students.

Works Cited:

Banta, T.W., & Kuh, G.D. (1998). A missing link in assessment: Collaboration between academic and student affairs professionals. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 30(2), 40-46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091389809602606>

Blaich, C., & Wise, K. (2017). Approaching big survey data one byte at a time. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2017(159), 25-34. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20224>

Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. (2019). Retrieved January 30, 2019, from <https://www.leadershipstudy.net/>

Appendix A: WU Custom Questions: Global Citizenship, Ethics and Diversity

WU had the option to add questions to the MSL Survey, both in 2015 and 2018 administrations. The additional custom questions focused on the Global Citizenship, Ethics and Diversity (GED) University Student Learning Outcome (USLO). GED is defined as the broad understanding of peoples and cultures in the United States and around the world, and to humankind's place and effects in the world. Global citizenship includes a respect for the commonalities and differences in peoples, including an understanding of values, beliefs and customs. It places an emphasis on the economic, religious, political, geographic, linguistic, historic, environmental and social aspects that define cultures. It places an emphasis on ethics, equality and human rights, an appreciation for diversity, the interconnectedness of societies and cultures.

Custom Questions 1- 3 had response options in a 1 to 5 Likert type scale format from 1 = Significantly Decreased to 5 = Significantly Increased. Question 1 asked "Compared with when you first entered college, how would you now describe your knowledge of people from different races/cultures?"; 75.3% indicated that they increased/significantly increased in their knowledge of different races/cultures.

Question 2 asked "Compared with when you first entered college, how would you now describe your ability to get along with people of different races/cultures?"; 56.6% indicated increased/significantly increased their ability to get along with people of different races/cultures.

Question 3 asked "Compared with when you first entered college, how would you now describe your understanding of global issues?"; 72.8% indicated increased/significantly increased their understanding of global issues.

Custom Question 4 asked "How important is it that we address experiences that support your cultural identity through your involvement on campus?" response options were in a 1 to 4 Likert type scale format from 1 = Not Important to 4 = Very Important; 61.2% felt it was important/very important that WU addresses experiences that support students' cultural identity through involvement on campus.

Custom Questions 5 and 6 contained response options in a 1 to 5 Likert type scale format from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.

Question 5 stated "I feel informed about current world issues."; 65.0% agreed or strongly agreed they felt informed about current world issues. Question 6 was "I feel equipped to live in a culture different from my own."; 56.5% agreed or strongly agreed they felt equipped to live in a culture different from their own.

For Question 7, a multiple choice, select all that apply question, that stated "Global citizenship includes:", most respondents agreed that global citizenship included "a respect for the commonalities and differences in people's customs" (91.0%), "a respect for the commonalities and differences in people's values" (86.0%), "a respect for the commonalities and differences in people's beliefs" (85.0%), and "the broad understanding of peoples and cultures around the world" (83.1%).

The first six custom questions were identically worded in the 2015 and 2018 administrations of the MSL. Independent samples *t*-tests were used to determine if there were group level differences between Washburn undergraduate student responses in 2015 compared to 2018. In comparing the 2015 to 2018 group-level responses for these three questions, the differences were statistically significant at the $\leq .001$ level, and the 2018 responses were higher.

For Custom Question 1, describing knowledge of people from different races/cultures, the 2015 response mean was 3.86, and the 2018 response mean to this question was 3.95.

Custom Question 2, describing the ability to get along with people of different races/cultures, the 2015 response mean was 3.63. The 2018 response mean to this question was 3.72.

Custom Question 3, describing the understanding of global issues, the 2015 response mean was 3.84 and the 2018 response mean to this question was 3.93.

For Custom Question 4 “How important is it that we address experiences that support your cultural identity through your involvement on campus?” response options were in a 1 to 4 Likert type scale format from 1 = Not Important to 4 = Very Important. These results were statistically significant at the $\leq .000$ level. The 2015 response mean to this question was 2.42 and the 2018 response mean was 2.67.

For Custom Question 5, feeling informed about current world issues, the 2015 response mean was 3.55 and the 2018 response mean to this question was 3.72.

For Custom Question 6, feeling equipped to live in a culture different from my own, the 2015 response mean was 3.44 and the 2018 response mean to this question was 3.57.

In summary, for six custom questions, group-level responses from Washburn students in 2018 were higher than in 2015, and these results were statistically significant. In general, responses indicated an increase in knowledge, ability, and understanding of components of the GED, and increase in importance of supporting cultural identity through involvement on campus. There was also an observed increase in agreement with feeling informed about current world issues and feeling equipped to live in a culture different from their own. Global citizenship was indicated by most respondents that it includes a respect for the commonalities and differences in people’s customs, values, and beliefs.

Findings from the 2018 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL)

Global Citizenship, Ethics, and Diversity



Presenters: Michael Gleason, Madeline Lambing and Christa Smith

The MSL was developed with a core set of measures adapted from the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS: Tyree, 1998). The MSL is comprised of over 400 variables, scales, and composite measures representing students' demographics and pre-college experiences, experiences during college, and key outcome measures. Leadership-related outcomes included complex cognitive skills, leadership efficacy, social change behaviors, seeing alternative social perspectives, spiritual development, racial identity, resiliency and agency. The instrument was administered to 4,731 Washburn University students between January and April 2018 via an online survey link. The response rate was 33.1%; 80.1% of respondents completed the survey.

MSL 2018 Social Change Model of Leadership Outcomes Mean Comparison Results

Scored on a 5-point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5)								
SRLS Mean Composite Scores	Compared to MSL National Sample				Compared to Carnegie Peers: Small & Medium Masters			
	Washburn	National	Sig	Effect Size	Washburn	Peers	Sig	Effect Size
Consciousness of Self	4.00	3.98			4.00	3.98		
Congruence	4.23	4.22			4.23	4.22		
Commitment	4.39	4.37			4.39	4.38		
Collaboration	4.13	4.16			4.13	4.16		
Controversy with Civility	4.21	4.22			4.21	4.22		
Citizenship	3.87	3.91			3.87	3.88		
Resiliency	3.91	3.83	< .01	Trivial	3.91	3.85	< .01	Trivial
Omnibus SRLS	4.13	4.14			4.13	4.14		
Scored on a 4-point scale ranging from Not at All Confident (1) to Very Confident (4)								
MSL Mean Composite Scores	Compared to MSL National Sample				Compared to Carnegie Peers: Small & Medium Masters			
	Washburn	National	Sig	Effect Size	Washburn	Peers	Sig	Effect Size
Leadership Efficacy	3.04	3.09	< .01	Trivial	3.04	3.07		
Scored on a 4-point scale ranging from Not Grown At All (1) to Grown Very Much (4)								
MSL Mean Composite Scores	Compared to MSL National Sample				Compared to Carnegie Peers: Small & Medium Masters			
	Washburn	National	Sig	Effect Size	Washburn	Peers	Sig	Effect Size
Complex Cognitive Skills	3.19	3.16			3.19	3.16		
Scored on a 5-point scale ranging from Does Not Describe Me Well (1) to Describes Me Very Well (5)								
MSL Mean Composite Scores	Compared to MSL National Sample				Compared to Carnegie Peers: Small & Medium Masters			
	Washburn	National	Sig	Effect Size	Washburn	Peers	Sig	Effect Size
Social Perspective-Taking	3.96	3.91			3.96	3.90		
Scored on a 7-point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)								
MSL Mean Composite Scores	Compared to MSL National Sample				Compared to Carnegie Peers: Small & Medium Masters			
	Washburn	National	Sig	Effect Size	Washburn	Peer	Sig	Effect Size
Social Generativity	5.12	5.10			5.12	5.07		
Scored on a 8-point scale ranging from Definitely False (1) to Definitely True (8)								
MSL Mean Composite Scores	Compared to MSL National Sample				Compared to Carnegie Peers: Small & Medium Masters			
	Washburn	National	Sig	Effect Size	Washburn	Peer	Sig	Effect Size
Hope (Agency)	6.60	6.50	< .01	Trivial	6.60	6.55		
Hope (Pathways)	6.54	6.44	< .01	Trivial	6.54	6.51		

Blue = Statistically significant results for which WU scored higher than comparison group.

MSL 2018 Delta Measures: Change Over Time* for Seniors**

SRLS Traits	Washburn University			MSL National Sample			Carnegie Peers: Small & Medium Masters		
	Prior to College	Senior Year	Effect Size	Prior to College	Senior Year	Effect Size	Prior to College	Senior Year	Effect Size
Consciousness of Self	3.34	4.06	Large	3.36	4.06	Large	3.37	4.05	Moderate
Congruence	3.87	4.27	Moderate	3.87	4.27	Moderate	3.87	4.25	Moderate
Commitment	4.08	4.43	Small	4.09	4.41	Small	4.10	4.41	Small
Collaboration	3.81	4.17	Small	3.84	4.22	Moderate	3.83	4.21	Moderate
Controversy with Civility	3.82	4.25	Moderate	3.87	4.26	Moderate	3.86	4.25	Moderate
Citizenship	3.64	3.93	Small	3.75	3.97	Small	3.69	3.92	Small
Resiliency	3.38	4.01	Large	3.38	3.89	Moderate	3.39	3.91	Moderate
Omnibus SRLS	3.77	4.18	Moderate	3.80	4.20	Moderate	3.79	4.18	Moderate
MSL Constructs	Washburn University			MSL National Sample			Carnegie Peers: Small & Medium Masters		
	Prior to College	Senior Year	Effect Size	Prior to College	Senior Year	Effect Size	Prior to College	Senior Year	Effect Size
Leadership Efficacy	2.70	3.15	Moderate	2.80	3.21	Moderate	2.75	3.18	Moderate
Complex Cognitive Skills	2.89	3.34	Moderate	2.98	3.32	Moderate	2.96	3.31	Moderate
Social Perspective-Taking	3.55	4.07	Moderate	3.53	3.96	Moderate	3.51	3.94	Moderate
Social Generativity	4.66	5.28	Small	4.81	5.19	Small	4.74	5.18	Small
Hope Scale (Agency)	6.22	6.70	Small	6.25	6.58	Small	6.23	6.62	Small
Hope Scale (Pathways)	6.22	6.64	Small	6.25	6.52	Small	6.23	6.58	Small

*All results were statistically significant, p < .01.

**Only those respondents who indicated they are in their senior year were included in the table.

Blue = Statistically significant results for which WU scored higher than comparison group.

Findings from custom questions assessing Global Citizenship, Ethics and Diversity:

- Compared to when students first entered college, 75.3% felt that their knowledge of people from different races/cultures increased/significantly increased.
- 56.6% of respondents felt their ability to get along with people of different races/cultures increased/significantly increased compared to when they first entered college.
- 72.8% of respondents felt their understanding of global issues increased/significantly increased compared to when they first entered college.
- 61.2% responded that it is important/very important that we address experiences that support your cultural identity through your involvement on campus.
- Approximately 65% agreed/strongly agreed that they feel informed about current world issues.
- When asked how equipped they feel to live in a culture different from their own, 56.5% of respondents agreed/strongly agreed.
- Most respondents agreed that global citizenship included “a respect for the commonalities and differences in people’s customs” (91.0%), “a respect for the commonalities and differences in people’s values” (86.0%), “a respect for the commonalities and differences in people’s beliefs” (85.0%), and “the broad understanding of peoples and cultures around the world” (83.1%).