

**LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES NEEDED FOR EARLY-CAREER STUDENT  
AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS: A DELPHI STUDY**

A Dissertation

by

ALLISON L. DUNN

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of  
Texas A&M University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Lori L. Moore
Committee Members,	Summer F. Odom
	Gary E. Briers
	Krista J. Bailey
Head of Department,	Clare A. Gill

December 2018

Major Subject: Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications

Copyright 2018 Allison L. Dunn

## **ABSTRACT**

With the continued expansion of student affairs leadership programs and initiatives, more students receive their leadership education from student affairs offerings than from academic leadership courses. However, a problem arises as many of the student affairs professionals who coordinate these leadership programs have never completed any formal leadership education, training, or development. This raises the question of their preparation and training to be leadership educators. Using a classic Delphi approach, this research sought to identify the leadership educator competencies required of entry-level student affairs practitioners and where entry-level student affairs practitioners should learn and practice these competencies. Two context-specific expert panels were used in this study; one consisting of 17 student affairs practitioners and the other consisting of 20 of student affairs preparatory program faculty members.

There was little agreement between the two expert panels in terms of the required leadership educator competencies. Thirteen of the 140 leadership educator competencies identified were rated as required by both expert panels. However, the two panels did agree that the three most important places to learn and practice these competencies were the graduate assistantship, an academic course in leadership, and through other experiential learning opportunities such as internships or practica.

These findings support previous research that student affairs practitioners and preparatory program directors do not agree on the competencies needed to be a successful student affairs practitioner. Yet, the results only partially support previous

student affairs competency research; indicating the competencies needed to be an effective student affairs leadership educator may be different from the competencies needed to be an effective student affairs practitioner.

## **DEDICATION**

For my dad who led by example, lived his life in selfless service to others, and encouraged me to always follow my dreams. Thank you for giving me the wings to fly.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Moore, and my committee members, Dr. Odom, Dr. Briers, and Dr. Bailey, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. Not only did you all believe my idea had merit when I thought it had little, you all enthusiastically encouraged, coached, and mentored me throughout the process. I appreciate the time you took to answer all of my questions no matter how small, check in with me throughout the process, cheer me on when things got tough, and review my work. I appreciate it all more than I can express.

To the ALEC faculty and staff, thank you for challenging and supporting me through the last three years. Pausing one's life mid-career to return to school full-time is never an easy decision, but with the luxury of hindsight, I have no doubt it was the right choice for me.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not express my gratitude to my family and friends for their love and support throughout this process. The last three years would have been much less enjoyable without you all.

## **CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES**

### **Contributors**

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Professors Lori L. Moore (advisor), Summer F. Odom, and Gary E. Briers of the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications and Professor Krista J. Bailey of the Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development.

All work for the dissertation was completed by the student, under the advisement of Dr. Lori L. Moore of the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications with support from Dr. Odom, Dr. Briers, and Dr. Bailey.

### **Funding Sources**

There are no outside funding contributions to acknowledge related to the research and compilation of this document.

## **NOMENCLATURE**

Abilities/Attributes	The capacity or temperament one has to accomplish a physical or mental task
ACPA	American College Personnel Association, transitioned to ACPA-College Student Educators International
CAS	Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education
Competency	An “underlying characteristic of an individual that is causally related to criterion referenced effective and/or superior performance in a job or situation” (Spencer & Spencer, 1993, p. 9)
Division of Student Affairs	“The administrative unit on a college campus responsible for those out-of-classroom staff members, programs, functions, and services that contribute to the education and development of students” (Javinar, 2000, p. 85)
Entry-level	Positions that require less than three years of experience and do not supervise other professionals
Integrative Learning	The ability to synthesize and apply what was learned into differing contexts (Owen, 2015)
Knowledge	“The information a person has in specific content area” (Spencer & Spencer, 1993, p. 10)
Leadership Development	The umbrella term used to incorporate all types of growth processes one uses to advance and enhance their competency and capacity in leadership (Day, 2001; Nelson, 2010)
Leadership Education	A sub-set of leadership development focused on the formal or informal teaching and learning of leadership (Brungardt, 1996)

Leadership Educator	Anyone who “intentionally develops and delivers leadership initiatives” (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 4)
NASPA	National Association of Student Personnel Administrators – transitioned name to NASPA-Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education
Skills	The “ability to perform a certain physical or mental task” (Spencer & Spencer, 1993, p. 11)
Student Affairs Manager/ Practitioner	Staff within a division of student affairs/student life who are responsible for hiring and training entry-level employees
Student Affairs Preparatory Program	A master’s level academic program focused on the education and training of student affairs practitioners
Student Affairs Preparatory Program Coordinator/ Director	The faculty member who is responsible for all programmatic aspects of the master’s program in student affairs



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT .....	ii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES .....	vi
NOMENCLATURE .....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xiii
LIST OF TABLES .....	xiv
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	5
Purpose of the Study .....	8
Research Questions .....	8
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW .....	10
Leadership Development Versus Leadership Education .....	10
Purpose of Leadership Education .....	13
Can Leadership be Learned? .....	14
Methods of Leadership Learning .....	16
Teaching Leadership at the Undergraduate Level .....	20
Purpose of Student Affairs .....	23
Role of Student Affairs Practitioners .....	24
Student Affairs Practitioners as Teachers .....	25
Professional Competencies .....	29
Competencies within Student Affairs Preparatory Programs .....	30
Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education .....	32
Student Affairs Competencies .....	34

CHAPTER III METHODS .....	41
Population .....	42
Sample .....	45
Selection for Inclusion in the Delphi .....	47
Criteria for Inclusion on the Panels .....	47
Instrumentation .....	50
Round 1 – Opinion Collection .....	51
Round 2 – Rating the Opinions .....	52
Round 3 – Developing Consensus .....	52
Survey Questions .....	53
Round 1 .....	53
Round 2 .....	54
Round 3 .....	55
Research Approach and Analysis .....	56
Research Quality and Trustworthiness .....	58
Delphi Technique .....	59
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS .....	61
Research Question One .....	61
Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	63
Definition of Leadership Educator .....	63
Characteristics of Leadership Educator .....	67
Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	70
Definition of Leadership Educator .....	70
Characteristics of Leadership Educator .....	76
Summary Analysis: Definition and Characteristics of a Leadership Educator .....	77
Research Question Two .....	79
Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	80
Round 1 Data .....	80
Round 2 Data .....	81
Round 3 Data .....	87
Required Student Affairs Leadership Educator Competencies as Reported by Group A .....	92
Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	97
Round 1 Data .....	97
Round 2 Data .....	98
Round 3 Data .....	105
Required Student Affairs Leadership Educator Competencies as Reported by Group B .....	112

Summary Analysis: Required Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities/ Attributes .....	117
Research Question Three .....	118
Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	119
Round 1 Data .....	119
Round 2 Data .....	119
Round 3 Data .....	123
Necessary Places to Learn and Practice Leadership Educator Competencies as Reported by Group A .....	126
Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Managers .....	129
Round 1 Data .....	129
Round 2 Data .....	129
Round 3 Data .....	133
Necessary Places to Learn and Practice Leadership Educator Competencies as Reported by Group B .....	136
Summary Analysis: Where to Learn and Practice the Required Competencies .....	139
 CHAPTER V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	 141
Study Summary .....	141
Conclusions and Discussion .....	144
Research Question One .....	144
Student Affairs Practitioners are Leadership Educators .....	144
Interact with Student Leaders and Have Leadership-focused Job Descriptions .....	145
Organizational Context Influences Demonstration of Leadership Education .....	146
Student Affairs Leadership Educators are Mentors .....	147
Research Question Two .....	148
Required Competencies Differ by Contextual Expertise .....	148
Identified Competencies Connect to Role Within the Institution .....	150
Findings Only Partially Support Previous Research .....	154
Competencies Suggested by CAS .....	155
Competencies Suggested by the Joint NASPA/ACPA Taskforce ....	157
Competencies Identified by the Latest Meta-Analysis .....	161
Research Question Three .....	166
Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies .....	167
Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies .....	170
Recommendations .....	171
Conclusions .....	177
 REFERENCES .....	 179

APPENDIX A: ROUND 1 DATA .....	188
APPENDIX B: ROUND 2 SURVEYS .....	205
APPENDIX C: ROUND 3 SURVEYS .....	249
APPENDIX D: VITA .....	332

## LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1	“Standards for Student Leadership Programs” suggested competencies for leadership education ..... 22
Figure 2	Desired characteristics of student affairs professionals .....37
Figure 3	Suggested competencies for student affairs educators ..... 39
Figure 4	Leadership educator competencies identified as important by both Delphi groups ..... 149
Figure 5	Comparisons of Delphi group results to the “Standards for Student Leadership Programs” suggested competencies for leadership educators ..... 156
Figure 6	Comparison of Delphi group results to the suggested competencies for student affairs educators ..... 158
Figure 7	Alignment of competencies identified by student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators and the desired characteristics of student affairs professionals, emphasis added ..... 162
Figure 8	Alignment of competencies identified by student affairs practitioners/managers and the desired characteristics of student affairs professionals, emphasis added ..... 163

## LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Knowledge Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	82
Table 2	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Skills Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	84
Table 3	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	85
Table 4	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Knowledge Round 3: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	89
Table 5	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Skills Round 3: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	90
Table 6	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes Round 3: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	91
Table 7	Required Leadership Educator Knowledge: Student Affairs Practitioners/ Managers .....	94
Table 8	Required Leadership Educator Skills: Student Affairs Practitioners/ Managers .....	95
Table 9	Required Leadership Educators Abilities/Attributes: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	96
Table 10	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Knowledge Round 2: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Director/Coordinator .....	99
Table 11	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Skills Round 2: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Director/Coordinator .....	101
Table 12	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes Round 2: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	103
Table 13	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Knowledge Round 3: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators.....	107

Table 14	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Skills Round 3: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	108
Table 15	Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes Round 3: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	110
Table 16	Required Leadership Educator Knowledge: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	113
Table 17	Required Leadership Educator Skills: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	114
Table 18	Required Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	115
Table 19	Descriptive Statistics of Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	121
Table 20	Descriptive Statistics of Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	122
Table 21	Descriptive Statistics of Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies Round 3: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	125
Table 22	Descriptive Statistics of Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies Round 3: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	126
Table 23	Necessary Places to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	128
Table 24	Necessary Places to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers .....	128
Table 25	Descriptive Statistics of Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies Round 2: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	131
Table 26	Descriptive Statistics of Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies Round 2: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	132
Table 27	Descriptive Statistics of Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies Round 3: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	135

Table 28	Descriptive Statistics of Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies Round 3: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	136
Table 29	Necessary Places to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	138
Table 30	Necessary Places to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators .....	138



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The commitment institutions of higher education have to develop future leaders is evident in the increasing investment placed in leadership development programs and initiatives on college campuses today (Astin & Astin, 2000; Brungardt, 1996; Burns, 1995; Cross, 1998; Dungy, 2003; Haber, 2012; Hartman, Allen, & Miguel, 2015; Riggio, Ciulla, & Sorenson, 2003; Rocconi, 2011; Rosch, Collier, & Thompson, 2015; Shertzer et al., 2005). From academic certificates, minors, and majors, to residential leadership-themed living learning communities, to co-curricular and extra-curricular leadership development programs, students have a wide choice of leadership development opportunities from which to choose. While the academic study of leadership has increased significantly on college campuses in recent years (Brungardt, 1996; Jenkins, 2012), the increase in student leadership development opportunities and initiatives focused outside the classroom is even greater.

With the limitations of classroom availability, course enrollment, and available faculty who are trained and willing to teach leadership courses removed, student affairs practitioners have increased freedom and flexibility in how they provide leadership education on college campuses. In recent years student affairs practitioners have taken advantage of that flexibility and increased their leadership education programming. Consequently, the number of students engaged in co-curricular leadership programs and initiatives compared to the number engaged in the academic study of leadership reflects that only a small portion of the leadership learning happening on a college campus

happens in a formal classroom (Allen & Hartman, 2009; Brungardt, 1996; Hartman et al, 2015; Huber, 2002).

With the continued expansion of co-curricular leadership programs and initiatives offered through a division of student affairs/student life, students interested in and committed to their growth as a leader have a variety of opportunities from which to gain their leadership development. Instead of relying on the traditional fifteen-week academic course as the primary source for their leadership education, students now have the opportunity to select from a diverse buffet of leadership workshops, conferences, programs, and other developmental opportunities offered solely by or in partnership with a division of student affairs/student life. With varying durations, rigor, and theoretical grounding, there is a leadership development opportunity to match a range of student needs and expectations. Truly, leadership education and development has become a key component of the collegiate experience (Brungardt, 1996; Haber, 2012; Roberts, 2007). However, there is not a commonly accepted definition of “leadership education at the collegiate level” or how to achieve it (Brungardt, 1996; Jenkins & Owen, 2016; Sowcik, Lindsey, & Rosch, 2012).

Consequently, the leadership development of college students is an expanding area of interest and research within both academic and student affairs (Burns, 1995). While there is measurable evidence of the significant growth of collegiate leadership programs in recent years, the focus of much of the current research is on the attainment of leadership knowledge as opposed to one’s development as a leader (Keating, Rosch, & Burgoon, 2014), or the individual developmental route chosen (Rosch et al., 2015).

Moreover, even less research has been conducted regarding the background, preparation, or competency of collegiate leadership educators (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Jenkins, 2012; Jenkins & Owen, 2016), either within or external to a formal classroom.

However, leadership researchers from both academic and student affairs paradigms readily admit that neither side has exclusive rights to leadership education. Professors and student affairs practitioners alike recount how leadership learning transcends the formal classroom (Burns, 1995; Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018), and that the leadership learning occurring outside the classroom can be of equal value to a student's leadership learning occurring within the classroom (Buschlen & Guthrie, 2014; Nelson, 2010). The varied leadership development opportunities offered through the programmatic efforts of a division of student affairs/student life provide a natural leadership laboratory wherein students can practice and explore their leadership capabilities and competences while in a controlled and somewhat low-risk environment (Burns, 1995; Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Nelson, 2010). Nevertheless, the increased availability, wide variety, and increased access to leadership development opportunities afforded college students today reminds leadership educators on both sides, curricular and co-curricular, that leadership education efforts should be complementary, not contradictory. As a result, there has been an increased call for collaboration between academic and student affairs paradigms in regard to leadership education and learning (Burns, 1995; Roberts, 2007).

Additionally, many college students are at a developmental stage where they “may form key motives, values, and aspects of identity that could shape their future

actions and behaviors as leaders” (Waldman, Galvin, & Walumbwa, 2012, p. 158).

College is a time for personal exploration and growth and that includes learning who they are as individuals as well as how they identify as leaders (Komives, Longenecker, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006). Just as students can be influenced toward majors or professions through interaction with their professors or supervisors, college students can also be highly influenced by those engaged in teaching them leadership concepts and principles (Parks, 2005; Thompson, 2013). In 2000, Astin and Astin noted,

students will implicitly generate their notions and conceptions of leadership from interactions inside the classroom and in the residence hall, through campus work and participation in student activities, and through what is taught intentionally and unintentionally across the educational experience. (p. vi)

Thus, if researchers are to gain a better understanding of the value or impact leadership education has on college students, an examination of those responsible for teaching leadership is required (Jenkins, 2012).

One challenge with examining leadership educators, particularly in student affairs, is that many of these educators never engaged in a formal education in leadership studies, as leadership education is not seen as a primary learning objective of student affairs preparatory programs (Nelson, 2010). Thus, practitioners come to the profession of student affairs with a variety of industry and educational training and experiences (Coffey, 2010; Jenkins, 2012; Jenkins & Owen, 2016; O’Brien, 2018; Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008; Wright, 2007). A national study of more than 300 individuals who teach collegiate, academic credit-bearing leadership courses, found that only 7.9%, or 24

individuals, had advanced degrees in leadership studies (Jenkins, 2012). A similar phenomenon occurs with student affairs practitioners (Huber, 2002). As a majority of student affairs practitioners have advanced degrees in higher education administration or closely related fields such as sociology, counseling, or psychology, and not leadership education or leadership studies, their formal academic training in leadership education is limited (Dugan & Osteen, 2016). Furthermore, they likely did not begin their master's program thinking they would become a leadership educator (Huber, 2002), even though they routinely engage in leadership education through their work with students.

### **Statement of the Problem**

A key component of a student affairs practitioner's job responsibilities, especially those in entry-level positions, is to facilitate learning in their students by being an active partner in their students' educational processes (Burkard, Cole, Ott, & Stoflet, 2005; Ellerston & Thoennes, 2007). Previous research has shown that the partnering of student affairs practitioners with academic educators is vital because "for growth to occur, the work that is done in the classroom must find expression in other aspects of a student's life" (Davis & Murrell, 1993, p.286). Offices, programs, and initiatives housed within a division of student affairs/student life are some of these other aspects of a student's life. Because leadership education occurs on a college campus both within and outside the formal academic classroom (Buschlen & Guthrie, 2014; Hartman et al., 2015; Huber, 2002; Jenkins, 2012; Jenkins & Owen, 2016; Roberts, 2007), the definition of a leadership educator used in this study was broadened to include anyone who

“intentionally develops and delivers leadership initiatives” (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 4). Thus, collegiate student affairs practitioners can be considered to be leadership educators.

Specifically, many entry-level student affairs practitioners begin their careers in positions with a high level of direct student contact, such as advising a student organization or supervising undergraduate residence assistants or other student employees (Burkard et al., 2005). Within each of these roles are multiple opportunities for students to learn and develop their leadership skills and behaviors. Hence, leadership education and development become an inherent part of the advisor/supervisor’s job duties or responsibilities.

While it is understood that leadership education happens in these contexts, a challenge is that these advisors/supervisors may not have a systematic approach toward leadership education to follow, i.e. there is no consistent plan or guidebook regarding how to develop leaders (Northouse, 2016). There is no consistent, standardized set of leadership competencies to teach in co-curricular leadership programs (Rosch, Spencer, & Hoag, 2017). Instead, leadership education tends to be grounded in what the individual educator believes is leadership (Hartman, et al., 2015), and what they deem important to know for that specific context. Initially having the advisor/supervisors teach what they believe is leadership does not seem problematic, but the larger issue arises once it is understood that formal coursework in leadership studies is not routinely a part of a student affairs preparatory master’s degree program (Rosch et al., 2017).

Consequently, many student affairs practitioners are expected to be effective leadership educators in their first professional position without ever completing any formal leadership education, training, or development (Dugan & Osteen, 2016; Nelson, 2010). As a result, to gain the necessary leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities they endeavor to teach their students, student affairs practitioners have to seek out leadership learning and developmental opportunities on their own. Therefore, if entry-level student affairs practitioners are to be competent as leadership educators, the training and development must occur prior to their first professional position (Kuk & Banning, 2009; Nelson, 2010). Nevertheless, the literature is extremely limited when it comes to identifying the core competencies, the core knowledge, skills, and abilities, needed to be a leadership educator (Jenkins & Owen, 2016). Similarly, the literature is unclear when it comes to the role the graduate program plays in preparing individuals to be successful student affairs administrators (Herdlein, 2004; Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008).

Simply adding a leadership course to the core curriculum within a student affairs master's program may not be an option, as these programs tend to be extremely prescriptive in nature, with little to no room for electives. Thus, if one were to add a leadership course to the core curriculum, what course would it replace? One of the limited electives or a different core course? Is the value gained worth the cost of the knowledge or skills lost due to the removal of a previously required course? With simply adding a leadership course to the required degree plan an unlikely option, how then should leadership education be incorporated into a student affairs master's degree plan? As an applied social science, does leadership education, training, and

development more appropriately fit into an applied context, such as a graduate assistantship, internship, or practicum experience rather than an academic classroom?

Research focused on describing the student affairs leadership educator as well as identifying the knowledge and skills base of what a student affairs leadership educator should know and show competence in has implications for student affairs master's programs, professional development activities and trainings of current student affairs practitioners, and student affairs professional associations. Moreover, "exploring how to best develop the capacity of leadership educators will . . . prove vital to the continued development of competent, confident, passionate, and effective leadership educators" (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 29).

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore and identify the characteristics of a collegiate student affairs leadership educator. Once identified, the goal was to analyze the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes needed as a leadership educator in a co-curricular context. A secondary purpose was to explore how and where pre-service student affairs practitioners should learn and gain experience with the identified leadership education knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes.

### **Research Questions**

This study was guided by the following research questions:



1. How do student affairs practitioners and preparatory program directors define or identify student affairs leadership educators?
2. What does competence in leadership education entail for entry-level student affairs practitioners?
3. How and where should entry-level student affairs practitioners gain competence as leadership educators?

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Leadership education is not exclusive to academic, credit-bearing leadership studies programs (Allen & Hartman, 2009; Burns, 1995; Buschen & Guthrie, 2014; Dungy, 2003; Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Hartman et al., 2015; Huber, 2012; Jenkins & Owen, 2016; Roberts, 2007). Although the academic pursuit of leadership as a college major or minor is still an emerging and growing discipline (Jenkins, 2012; Keating et al., 2014; Rosch et al., 2017), the opportunities for leadership education associated with student affairs programs and activities are much more established (Brungardt, 1996; Burns, 1995). Without the constraints of a formal classroom or academic program, student affairs-sponsored leadership education opportunities have a much greater reach across a college campus and tend to be “optimal for the practice of leadership” (Rosch et al., 2017, p. 130). Subsequently, much of what a majority of college students learn about leadership happens outside of any formal academic leadership classroom (Brungardt, 1996; Roberts, 2007; Rost & Barker, 2000). Yet, research is limited regarding leadership educators (Jenkins, 2012; Jenkins & Owen, 2016), especially those in student affairs.

#### **Leadership Development Versus Leadership Education**

In an examination of leadership educators, it is important to distinguish differences between leadership development and leadership education. Leadership development is capacity development – the capacity of individuals to more effectively

contribute to leadership processes, to develop cognitive complexity and adaptability, and to develop the social capital to “enhance cooperation and resource exchange” (Day, 2001, p. 585). As Brungardt (1996) noted,

leadership development refers to almost every form of growth or stage of development in the life cycle that promotes, encourages, and assists in one’s leadership potential . . . therefore leadership development is a continuous learning process that spans an entire lifetime; where knowledge and experience builds and allows for even more advanced learning and growth. (p. 83)

Consequently, leadership development is the broad umbrella term for an individual’s growth or advancement in their leadership capacity and competency throughout their lifetime (Day, 2001; Nelson, 2010). Leadership development, as an approach, “is oriented toward building capacity in anticipation of unforeseen challenges” (Day, 2001, p. 582). Leadership education falls under this umbrella and can be conceptualized as a component or subset of leadership development. Leadership education focuses on the educational activities and environments intentionally designed to influence an individual’s development as a leader (Brungardt, 1996). Because educational activities and environments in general are not limited to the formal classroom setting, leadership education is not limited to an academic classroom or setting either.

On college campuses, leadership education occurs primarily in either a curricular or a co-curricular setting (Dungy, 2003). As Guthrie and Jenkins (2018) wrote, “co-curricular leadership education includes programs, activities, and services that occur

outside the classroom environment, where students do not earn an academic grade or credit” (p. 7). Alternatively, curricular leadership education happens within the context of a grade or credit-bearing course. The National Leadership Education Research Agenda recognizes the values of both contexts, as leadership education is defined as “the pedagogical practice of facilitating leadership learning in an effort to build human capacity and is informed by leadership theory and research. It values and is inclusive of both curricular and co-curricular educational contexts” (Andenoro et al., 2013, p. 3).

Regardless of the context, the central focus of leadership education is the promotion of leadership learning, where leadership is conceptualized as an amalgamation of knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes, and behaviors (Northouse, 2016). Truly, as Kezar, Carducci, and Contreras-McGavin (2006) noted, “leadership is a complex, dynamic phenomenon with few quick answers or easy solutions. . . It is a longer-term investment” (p. 158). Thus, leadership education is the means through which individuals who are committed to and engaged in the leadership process are able to learn, hone, and practice these leadership competencies over time (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Nelson, 2010; Northouse, 2016). For pre-service student affairs practitioners, leadership education could be expressed in an academic course or a “supervised practice opportunity” (Nelson, 2010, p. 22), such as a graduate assistantship, internship, or practicum experience.

## **Purpose of Leadership Education**

In order to examine what knowledge, skills, attributes, and behaviors, i.e. competencies, are necessary for leadership educators, it is important to first discuss the purpose of leadership education. Huber (2002) stated that,

the purpose of leadership education is to prepare people (and organizations) to be responsible, together, in an increasingly interdependent world. The goal of leadership education is to provide opportunities for people to learn the skills, attitudes, and concepts necessary to become effective leaders. (p. 27)

Fincher and Shalka (2009) expanded this idea when they noted that the purpose of leadership education should be preparing students with the skills and abilities needed to solve the complex leadership challenges they will face beyond their time in college. But this raises another question, to solve complex leadership challenges to what end?

Astin and Astin (2000) proposed that one of the main purposes of higher education in general and leadership education specially, is to help students feel empowered to become agents of social change; to help students develop the “special skills and talents” needed to create the positive social change needed in the world around them (p. 2). For this reason, the purpose of leadership education can be defined as the efforts to “build human capacity and is informed by leadership theory and research” (Buschlen & Guthrie, 2014, p. 59). But leadership is socially constructed as well as being contextual (Astin & Astin, 2000; Dugan & Osteen, 2016; Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Kezar et al., 2006), so it is important to understand the context before identifying

the necessary leadership knowledge, skills, attitudes, and attributes needed for success within that context.

### **Can Leadership Be Learned?**

Today, leadership is commonly seen as a relational process between leaders and followers who collectively work to achieve a common goal or objective (Northouse, 2016). Although an academic discipline unto itself, leadership also cuts across disciplines, industries, levels within organizations, and communities (Huber, 2002), causing the enhancement of leadership education to be a concern beyond the academic discipline of leadership alone (Burns, 1995). The concept of leadership as process, rather than position or innate traits cultivated over a lifetime, implies that leadership can be learned and developed (Brungardt, 1996; Northouse, 2016; Roberts, 2007).

Learning is more than the accumulation of information. Learning is an individual's holistic approach of adapting to the world around them (Kolb, 2015). King (2003) stated, "learning is both a noun and a verb, representing both an outcome and a process of education" (p. 235). As an educational outcome, learning is measured or assessed through the possession of the knowledge, skills, and abilities related to a specific field of study. Similarly, learning as an educational process relates to one's behaviors used to solve problems, gather and analyze data, process new information, and develop the strength of the arguments required when making decisions. Learning as process is influenced by the educational environment, the competencies of the teacher,

the life experiences and other individual qualities of the learner, and how learners relate to and interact with other learners (King, 2003).

Multiple studies have shown that one way, if not the best way, to learn leadership is through first-hand experience (Brungardt, 1996; Buschlen & Guthrie, 2014; Conger, 1992). Historically, leadership was learned at the college level in one of three ways – teaching in the liberal arts tradition, leadership programs with a multidisciplinary approach, and programs/initiatives within a division of student affairs/student life, of which the most common is student affairs (Burns, 1995; Rost & Barker, 2000). Thus, by encouraging students to engage in both formal and informal educational opportunities, leadership educators are able to create, develop, and sustain an environment conducive to students' leadership learning (Thompson, 2013).

But discovering how to be an effective leader does not happen simply by learning leadership models, theories, or approaches, or participating in workshops, or attending leadership conferences, or even through assuming a leadership position in an organization. Instead, learning how to become an effective leader is a life-long journey (Conger, 1992; Nelson, 2010). Subsequently, those who embark on this leader development journey have to be willing to invest time, effort, and deliberative practice. Practice is vital as there is a difference between intellectually knowing what you should do in a situation and actually doing it when the situation is upon you (Hartman et al., 2015). In other words, there must be venues provided in which individuals can connect leadership theory to practice if they are to develop the competencies needed to lead effectively (Nelson, 2010).

Typically for college students, putting theory to practice occurs in a co-curricular setting rather than an academic classroom setting. In the classroom we discuss various aspects of leadership, but in a traditional fifteen-week course, there is not enough time to dedicate to the practice of leader competency development (Hartman et al., 2015), nor is fifteen weeks always sufficient time to develop the needed competencies. Consequently, if there is a shortage of individuals who act as effective leaders it “is a reflection of neglected development rather than of a dearth of abilities” (Conger, 1992, p. 29).

### **Methods of Leadership Learning**

If leadership learning is best accomplished via deliberative practice and the typical leadership classroom does not afford the time necessary to engage in that practice, interested individuals must find an alternative venue for their practice and learning. One option is to seek out experiential learning opportunities outside the classroom, because “experiential learning contributes to the time dedicated to intentional practice of actual leader behavior” (Hartman et al., 2015, p. 465). Likewise, experiential learning is the vehicle through which individuals are able to “strengthen the critical linkages among education, work, and personal development” (Kolb, 2015, pp. 3-4). Each component is influenced by and influences the remaining two; thereby reinforcing and strengthening the connections between the classroom and the work environment. Within the field of student affairs, the graduate assistantship serves as a paraprofessional rather than a research position. Consequently, the assistantship is the vehicle through which pre-service student affairs professionals are able to connect education, work, and



professional development as they put theory to practice. A second option is for instructors to increase their “emphasis on ‘active’ versus passive learning within their courses. [This] provides opportunities to develop the individual qualities of competence and commitment” (Astin & Astin, 2000, p. 20).

Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory is one of the most cited theories when discussing the importance of experience or action in the process of learning and development. Kolb (2015) described experiential as a “holistic process of learning,” which in the context of a theory helps

explain how experience is transformed into learning and reliable knowledge.

Truth is not manifest in experience; it must be inferred by a process of learning that questions preconceptions of direct experience, tempers the vividness and emotion of experience with critical reflection, and extracts the correct lessons from the consequences of action. (p. xxi)

Thus, an individual learns from their experiences only as they repeatedly traverse the four stages of the learning cycle: concrete experiences, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation (Kolb, 2015). First, an individual must have a concrete or direct experience. Second, the individual must then invest the time necessary for critical reflection of that experience to include examination of the experience from various perspectives. Third, this reflection leads the individual to idea formation, rational conclusions, and emotional insights, all of which are then, fourth, incorporated and applied by the individual (Kolb, 2015). With each pass through the cycle, the individual deepens their understanding of the experience and gains new

insights and ways to integrate what they are learning into their behavior. Therefore, “if knowledge comes from the learner’s experiences, rather than from being transmitted by an ‘expert,’ traditional lecture-based coursework should be viewed as insufficient for teaching an applied skill like leadership” (Nelson, 2010, pp. 28-29).

The power of this cycle is found in the ability to “translate abstract ideas of academia into the concrete practical realities” of an individual’s life (Kolb, 2015, p. 6), regardless of previous formal educational experience. Subsequently, those who may not have excelled in a traditional textbook/lecture method of education and have developed their own modes of learning, or those who require relevance and applicability of concepts before integration, benefit from use of the experiential learning cycle, as they are able to employ their past experiences in their continued personal development (Kolb, 2015). Additionally, in applied fields such as leadership education and student affairs, experiential learning is important as a means to bridge theory and practice or experience, enhance the development of needed competencies, and provide opportunities for students to practice their developing leadership skills (Nelson, 2010).

Formal training programs can be seen as a subset of experiential learning. Rather than singular events or experiences serving as the point from which learning begins, formal training programs are a deliberative series of experiences designed with specific, intentional outcomes. Through his research, Conger (1992) found that leadership trainings are most effective when they employ the aspects of conceptual understanding, skill building, feedback, and personal growth experiences. For Conger, conceptual understanding is developing an intellectual comprehension of the phenomenon of

leadership and skill building includes the teaching of and opportunity to practice specific leadership skills. Employing the premise that everyone has some innate level of leadership skill, Conger proposed that feedback enables individuals to learn about their individual strengths and weaknesses as a means of self-improvement, which comes via personal growth experiences as the individual discovers who they are and their ability to lead. However, it is important to note that an individual's emergence as a leader rests with that individual's "own motivation and talent and with the receptiveness of their organizations to support and coach" them (Conger, 1992, p. 180).

This focus on experiential learning, practice, and feedback as means of leadership learning is found also within student affairs preparatory programs. As applied social and behavioral sciences, leadership and student affairs align themselves nicely and the learning of students engaged in these fields of study is amplified through experiential learning (Nelson, 2010). Hartman et al. (2015) found that co-curricular learning opportunities, like those in student activities programs and initiatives and which pre-service student affairs professionals engage in through their graduate assistantships, incorporated all four of Conger's necessary dimensions of leadership learning. Student affairs preparatory program faculty also assumed pre-service student affairs practitioners were learning leadership skills through their assistantship role and responsibilities, although the learning was not monitored nor measured (Rogers, 1991). Herdlein (2004) found that internships were the primary means for training and career decision-making of pre-service student affairs professionals.

## **Teaching Leadership at the Undergraduate Level**

Subsequently, if one submits that leadership can be learned, it logically follows that leadership can also be taught (Brungardt, 1996; Harris & Cullen, 2007; Northouse, 2016; Parks, 2005; Roberts, 2007). But without a singular, universally accepted definition of leadership, or consensus on the developmental process to become an effective leader, the curriculum to be taught in undergraduate leadership development programs, or where that program should be housed on a college campus (Rosch et al., 2017), what is it that leadership educators should be teaching? Hartman et al. (2015) commented that unlike other disciplines, where there is an agreed upon structure and course of study, “there is little agreement on even the basic fundamentals” of leadership education (p. 455), which is “problematic because a template for appropriately scaffolding information does not exist” (p.456).

The issue of not having an agreed upon structure or course of study for undergraduate leadership programs is compounded by the considerable breadth of what currently is labeled as a collegiate leadership program, and the varied goals and objectives these programs set out to accomplish (Rosch et al., 2017). Moreover, a division of student affairs/student life tends to house the vast majority of these widely different undergraduate leadership programs (Rost & Barker, 2000), yet student affairs practitioners typically do not complete academic coursework in leadership studies nor do they complete formal coursework in how to effectively teach leadership principles to their students (Wright, 2007). Consequently, it can be challenging for leadership

educators within student affairs to know the essential leadership competencies they should teach their students (Komives, Dugan, Owen, Slack, & Wagner, 2011).

The lack of agreement on the leadership fundamentals that should be taught is not the only challenge leadership educators face. When someone acknowledges another as “leader,” they place a certain level of respect, power, or influence in that person’s hands (Northouse, 2016). Therefore, it is not surprising for followers to want to emulate their leaders and begin to behave like them, i.e., to see the behaviors their leader models and adopt those behaviors themselves (Parks, 2005). Consequently, it is important for leadership educators to be aware of and understand how their behaviors are viewed by their followers, and how they are modeling effective or ineffective leadership behaviors to their followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Moore & Marsh, 2007; Thompson, 2013).

Moreover, the lack of credentialing of leadership educators also causes challenges when desiring to examine and evaluate leadership education (Roberts, 2007). As Jenkins and Owen (2016) stated, “little scholarship exists providing any direction on preparatory activities” for those who engage in leadership education (p. 101). While some efforts have been made to standardize aspects of leadership education, such as context, conceptual framework, content, teaching and learning, and outcomes and assessments (ILA, 2009), there is not much in the literature to address leadership educator preparation (Jenkins & Owen, 2016; Wright, 2007) nor the required courses for undergraduate leadership programs (Morgan, King, Rudd, & Kaufman, 2013). The closest attempt to do so for the context of student affairs comes in a list of desired competencies or professional behaviors for those who direct or coordinate co-curricular

leadership programs (see Figure 1). But the list does not address the need for formal education, training, or how student affairs practitioners are to develop the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to be effective leadership educators (Jenkins & Owen, 2016).

**Leadership educators should have:**

- Knowledge of the history and current trends in leadership theories, models, and philosophies;
- An understanding of the contextual nature of leadership;
- Knowledge of organizational development, group dynamics, strategies for change, and principles of community;
- Knowledge of how social identities and dimensions of diversity influence leadership;
- The ability to work with a diverse range of students;
- The ability to create, implement, and evaluate student learning as a result of leadership programs;
- The ability to effectively organize learning opportunities that are consistent with students' stages of development;
- The ability to use reflection in helping students understand leadership concepts;
- The ability to develop and assess student learning outcomes.

*Figure 1.* “Standards for Student Leadership Programs” suggested competencies for leadership educators (as cited in Jenkins & Owen, 2016)

If leadership can be taught and learned, then leadership educators should also be able to measure or assess the leadership learning. This implies then that leadership educators should know, agree upon, and be able to recognize the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes that should be developed in leaders, i.e., if you know what should be developed, then you can measure it. The problem is that we do not know what the “what to be developed” is (Hartman et al., 2015). So, even though institutions of higher education continue to increase leadership education offerings, there is not much

empirical evidence that these initiatives actually produce more effective or better leaders than those who did not participate in that specific leadership development initiative (Hartman et al., 2015). Additionally, as Thompson (2013) concluded,

If student leadership development is a prominent theme and objective of higher education, not to mention a mission-driven attribute, institutions should be more mindful and better equipped to reach out to ALL students, but especially those not predisposed to leadership-related activities, interactions and integrations that promote and enhance the student experience, as well one's character. (p. 5)

### **Purpose of Student Affairs**

While much of that growth and development student experience during their time in higher education comes through intellectual means (King, 2003), i.e. the academic course of study selected by the student, college is also a time of significant personal growth and development. Divisions of student affairs/student life are tasked with the primary responsibility to facilitate, monitor, and assess the holistic, personal growth and development of students (Coffey, 2010). A division of student affairs/student life is defined as “the administrative unit on a college campus responsible for those out-of-classroom staff members, programs, functions, and services that contribute to the education and development of students” (Javinar, 2000, p. 85). Examples of offices typically found within a division of student affairs/student life include but are not limited to: enrollment management, student union programming, student activities, student wellness services, counseling, multicultural programs and/or services, dining, leadership

development and civic engagement, and housing (for residential campuses) (Kuk & Banning, 2009).

### **Role of Student Affairs Practitioners**

Many of the positions we currently ascribe to a division of student affairs/student life began with the establishment of the colonial colleges (Nuss, 2003). As residential institutions, dining halls and dormitories were an essential aspect of the college experience. However, unlike modern institutions of higher education, the teaching faculty had the responsibility to oversee all aspects of “supervision and parental concern for the well being of the students” (Nuss, 2003, p. 66). This idea of *in loco parentis*, the legal concept of the college serving as authority in place of the parents, was pervasive. Students were seen as needing strict discipline and considerable guidance, as they were believed to be immature adolescents who were not able to govern themselves.

The formation of extracurricular activities, such as literary societies, debate clubs, and social societies like fraternities and eventually sororities, were the students’ response to the authoritarian and paternalistic behavior of the faculty (Nuss, 2003). Students wanted college to be more than an academic pursuit. But as the non-academic demands of students increased, the teaching faculty increasingly claimed those issues were not within their purview. Administrators realized students were engaging in extracurricular activities without supervision or assistance (Coffey, 2010), and that there were “factors influencing students’ growth and development extended beyond the classroom” (Hunter & Murray, 2007, p. 26). For these reasons among others, “student



affairs emerged out of the reluctance of faculty to become involved in the ‘hands-on’ aspect of college student life” (Blake, 2007, p. 72).

Over time, the roles and focus of student affairs practitioners have shifted from a service mindset, (e.g. staffing dining halls, overseeing residence halls, and providing academic and career counseling) to one of education and development. But through all the change, the focus of all student affairs positions has always been the development of the whole person (Nuss, 2003). Accordingly, most student affairs programs and initiatives have two basic goals: “(1) to provide cocurricular programs, activities, and other learning opportunities that contribute to . . . students by meeting their academic, social, recreational, physical, emotional, and moral development needs and (2) to promote self-direction and leadership among those students” who are involved on campus (Javinar, 2000, p. 86). Hence, “many student affairs programs emphasize leadership education as an essential part of student development” (Burns, 1995, p. 244).

### **Student Affairs Practitioners as Teachers**

Historically there were clear demarcations between collegiate educators/teachers and support staff. Educators were those who resided primarily in the classroom, while support staff, such as student affairs practitioners, were seen as “advocates, humanizers, support systems” (Rogers, 1991, p. 41) and “enablers” (Moore & Marsh, 2007, p. 4); those who provided students with the extra help and additional support they required to persist and eventually graduate from college (Coffey, 2010). While the traditional view of student affairs practitioners is one of unwarranted supporter, nonessential service

provider, or hand-holder, the “more contemporary approaches consider student affairs staff as teachers who emphasize the learning that keeps students in school while stressing the concepts that advance students through college” (Moore & Marsh, 2007, p. 4). Thereby, “student affairs professionals [became] teachers by design rather than default” (Blake, 2007, p. 66).

The shift in the mental model that student affairs practitioners are teachers by design and not by default did not happen overnight. Arguably, learning has always been at the core of student affairs work. Yet, the focus on personal, social, physical, and emotional student development, primarily outside the classroom, had many college administrators and others questioning the value and intentionality of that learning, especially during times of constricting resources and growing calls for fiscal accountability (Coffey, 2010; Dickerson et al., 2011). No longer could one merely assume learning was happening. Measurable learning outcomes and assessments were now a part of doing business on a college campus. In fact, in a national study of chief student affairs officers in 2004, Herdlein reported that chief student affairs officers are looking for new student affairs professionals who have a firm understanding of how student affairs is a partner in the teaching and learning process. For student affairs practitioners, this means increased intentionality in the learning process without sacrificing their commitment to holistic student success and development (Coffey, 2010; Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000). Integrative learning, or the ability to take knowledge gained in one context and meld and utilize it in another context (Owen,

2015), is one way through which student affairs practitioners serve as collegiate educators.

Student affairs practitioners' commitment to integrative learning can be seen in the concept that many programs and initiatives in a division of student affairs/division of student life are focused on education in action, or the integration of knowledge and life experiences (Blake, 2007; Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Hunter & Murray, 2007; King, 2003; Priest & Clegorne, 2015). Integrating knowledge is important "because it builds habits of mind that prepare students to make informed judgements in the conduct of personal, professional, and civic life" (Huber & Hutchings, 2004, p.1). However, in order to develop as an integrative learner, students need multiple opportunities and venues in which to practice what they are learning in their classrooms (Huber & Hutchings, 2004). Thus, as student affairs practitioners facilitate the learning process through thoughtful and intentional experiential learning opportunities, they are providing the variety of instances necessary for their students to gain skill at how to synthesize what they are learning across their academic fields of study (Huber, Hutchings, Gale, Miller, & Breen, 2007; King, 2003).

As Dewey (1938) noted, intentional experience and practice are vital to the learning process. Without experience, from which we ground and organize events in our lives, information is merely abstract facts, or events, easily forgotten and little understood (Dewey, 1938; Parks, 2005). Personal experience, however, is concrete and tangible. Experience provides context, which clears the path for interpretation and meaning, as well as relevance to one's life through application (Dewey, 1938). The

experiential learning that happens within the context of student affairs programs enables students the opportunity to apply what they are learning through their courses in a real-world setting. However, learning does not happen without reflection (Dewey, 1938; Kolb, 2015; Woodard et al., 2000).

The most effective and impactful teaching is not only about imparting wisdom and knowledge unilaterally from the teacher to the student. The teachers must also be active and intentional learners - gaining insight and wisdom from their own experiences, their students, and other educational activities. As a result, learning becomes a symbiotic relationship between the students and the teacher. In the role of the teacher, student affairs practitioners need to be learning themselves if they are to engage students in the learning process, where they are reflecting on their experiences and integrating their coursework with their lived experiences (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Woodard et al., 2000).

Although student affairs practitioners can and should be viewed as educators, this classification is not without its challenges. As Hunter and Murray (2007) noted, “traditional graduate preparation programs for student affairs professionals rarely include courses on teaching pedagogy. Understanding student development theory and student personnel services is not enough background for effective teaching” (pp. 30-31).

Despite the fact that many student affairs practitioners have not received formal training as teachers/educators, increasingly, they must see themselves as educators in all they do. Since learning is not restricted to time spent in a formal classroom, student affairs practitioners have a vital role to play in detailing the student learning occurring

on college campuses (Blake, 2007). But talking about student learning is not enough. In times of increased scrutiny over the purpose and cost of higher education, any program, initiative, project, or office that cannot provide empirical evidence regarding the value they provide to or impact they have on the learning process, may not survive future reductions in resources (Blake, 2007; Ellerston & Thoennes, 2007; Lovell & Kosten, 2000).

### **Professional Competencies**

A review of the competency literature did not yield, a single definition of competency. Similarly, a universal definition of competency was not found within the student affairs literature either. However, one widely referenced definition for competency was an “underlying characteristic of an individual that is causally related to criterion-referenced effective and/or superior performance in a job or situation” (Spencer & Spencer, 1993, p. 9).

Although many of the characteristics associated with competencies vary by definition, the two that appear the most often are knowledge and skills (Coffey, 2010). Within the student affairs literature, an additional characteristic, ability or disposition, was also commonly utilized (e.g. Coffey, 2010; Dickerson et al., 2011; Herdlein, Riefler, & Mrowka, 2013; Jones & Voorhees, 2002; Kuk, Cobb, & Forrest, 2007; Lovell & Kosten, 2000; Waple, 2006). Thus, for purposes of this study, professional competencies consist of the knowledge, skills, and abilities or dispositions required to be successful within a chosen profession, where knowledge is defined as “information a

person has in specific content areas” (Spencer & Spencer, 1993, p. 10), skill is defined as the learned behavior to accomplish a physical or mental task (Spencer & Spencer, 1993), and ability or disposition is the capacity or temperament one has to accomplish a physical or mental task.

### *Competencies within Student Affairs Preparatory Programs*

The concept of professional competencies is not new to student affairs (Burkard et al., 2005; Herdlein, Kline, Boquard, & Haddad, 2010; Kuk et al., 2007; Lovell & Kosten, 2000; Nelson, 2010; O’Brien, 2018; Waple, 2006). In fact, much debate has occurred over the “preparation of new professionals, competencies needed for successful practice, and professional development” (Herdlein et al., 2013, p. 250). Yet, there is little debate that an academic course of study is needed to train and prepare the next generation of competent student affairs practitioners (Waple, 2006). To do so, student affairs preparatory programs use professional standards, or competencies, against which they can measure a student’s proficiency (Dickerson et al., 2011; Kuk & Banning, 2009), the productivity of the preparatory program (Hyman, 1988; Waple, 2006), and “promote consistency and effectiveness among practitioners, especially those who enter the field from a variety of backgrounds” (O’Brien, 2018, p. 274). As Jones and Voorhees (2002) explained,

competencies are the result of integrative learning experiences in which skills, abilities, and knowledge interact to form bundles that have currency in relation to tasks for which they are assembled and demonstrations are the result of applying competencies. It is at this level that performance can be assessed. (p. 7)

Focusing on competencies is a way to systematically evaluate the professional training and development of students within a preparatory program (Jones & Voorhees, 2002). Thus, program coordinators are able to assess the developmental level, or proficiency, of each student in terms of the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to be successful in their profession post-graduation, or in other words, to ensure that the students are professionally ready and able to serve as a student affairs practitioner (O'Brien, 2018). Nevertheless, in a meta-analysis of 30 years of research on the competencies needed to be successful as a student affairs administrator, Lovell and Kosten (2000) found only two empirically-based studies focused on entry-level professionals (i.e., Newton & Richardson, 1976; Ostroth, 1981).

Despite the widely understood value of using competencies for program and individual assessments (Coffey, 2010; Herdlein et al., 2013; Hyman, 1988; Jones & Voorhees, 2002; Kuk & Banning, 2009; Lovell & Kosten, 2000; Waple, 2006), competencies are not static. What proficiency looks like and how it is determined can and does shift over time. Similarly, as an environment changes, the competencies in which one should become proficient for that environment also change (Coffey, 2010; Kuk et al., 2007; Lovell & Kosten, 2000). The field of student affairs is not immune to or exempt from this change; thus, “a reexamination of the competencies that will assist student affairs professionals in fulfilling their mission of providing student services and developing students in extracurricular settings” (Coffey, 2010) should be conducted periodically. Therefore, it is “important that we teach the capacity for learning” so that

individuals are prepared with the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to develop new competencies as the needs arise (Nelson, 2010, p. 26).

Competencies are also useful to students engaged in the preparatory program as well as to program coordinators. As Jones and Voorhees (2002) noted, using competencies as a means of evaluating student learning enables students to know the areas and behaviors that are important to the program coordinators, communicate with potential employers what they know and are able to do, and make comparisons across programs. As a result, “competencies equip students with tools to guide their self-reflection and professional journey” (Jones & Voorhees, 2002, p. 494).

*Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education*

Efforts have been made over the years to provide common guidelines or a set of professional standards for student affairs practitioners, as “any profession with an extensive history ought to be able to identify traits, qualities, skills, and knowledge bases necessary for success” (Lovell & Kosten, 2000, p. 553) in that profession. As there is not an accrediting body for student affairs as a profession (Nelson, 2010), the goal of profession-prescribed guidelines was to create a set of collaboratively agreed upon standards by which programs can evaluate and assess themselves; thereby creating performance standards and expectations for preparatory student affairs programs and the functional areas in which these students aspire to work (Nelson, 2010).

The most commonly recognized set of guidelines comes from the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). The first set of functional area standards were adopted by student affairs professionals in 1986 (CAS History, 2017a;



Waple, 2006). It should be noted, however, that these are voluntary standards and there is

no ‘quality control’ mechanisms in place to assure that preparation programs are complying with these standards. Even in the cases where programs are complying with the standards, the breath of options and approaches that are outlined within the standards do not assure that entry-level practitioners are consistently gaining the knowledge and skills from preparation programs that are expected of them from student affairs administrators in the field. (Kuk et al., 2007, p. 665)

While CAS has 12 general standards, which are applied equally to all functional areas within student affairs (i.e. Ethics; Organization and Leadership; Diversity, Equity, and Access; Technology; and Assessment), there are also 45 specialty standards that are applied only to specific functional areas/offices/programs within student affairs (i.e. housing and residential life programs; college unions; student leadership programs; career services; testing programs and services; parent and family programs; and master’s level student affairs professional preparation programs) (CAS Standards, 2017b). The competency area of leadership education is not specifically addressed within any of these standards. Student Leadership Programs are addressed, but the standards are focused more on what should be included in a leadership program rather than the education or training of those who direct or aspire to direct or teach in such programs (CAS Standards, 2017b). Master’s level student affairs preparatory programs are also

included on the list, but again, leadership education is not explicitly addressed as a specific competency.

### *Student Affairs Competencies*

Questioning the quality of training and preparation entry-level student affairs professionals receive in their master's programs has been the focus of multiple studies (e.g. Burkard et al., 2005; Coffey, 2010; Dickerson et al., 2011; Herdlein, 2004; Herdlein et al., 2010; Hyman, 1985; Hyman, 1988; Jones & Voorhees, 2002; Kuk & Banning, 2009; Kuk et al., 2007; Waple, 2006). Yet, only limited consensus of the competencies needed by entry-level student affairs professionals has been produced (Herdlein, 2004; Herdlein et al., 2013; Waple, 2006). Not only have student affairs professionals struggled to create a list of necessary competencies for entry-level professionals, but also preparatory program faculty and student affairs practitioners tend to have significant differences in their perceptions of possession of competencies in entry-level student affairs practitioners (Hyman, 1985; Kuk et al., 2007; Miles, 2007), where they should be taught/obtained (Kuk et al., 2007), and what should be taught in a preparatory student affairs program (Herdlein et al., 2013).

But even these findings are not consistent. In 2011, Dickerson et al. surveyed a national sample of student affairs preparatory program faculty and senior student affairs officials, i.e., vice presidents of student affairs/student life. Their study examined both groups' expectations and the specifically desired and current level of proficiency of entry-level student affairs practitioners on 51 distinct competencies. They found no statistically significant differences between these two groups on 49 of those

competencies; however, both groups agreed that entry-level practitioners did not have the level of proficiency they would have liked to see on many of those competencies (Dickerson et al., 2011).

In 2000, Lovell and Kosten conducted a 30-year meta-analysis of student affairs literature to create a picture of a successful student affairs professional, by identifying the knowledge, skills, and personal traits important for success as a student affairs professional. Twenty-three articles between 1967 and 1997 met the criteria of the meta-analysis. Their findings suggested the skills of administration and management and facilitation were most important; the need for knowledge of student development theory and foundational knowledge of their functional area were apparent; and the personal traits of integrity and cooperation were needed. They also found that competencies needed for success in student affairs changed depending on position within the organization, i.e., entry-level vs. mid-level manager vs. chief student affairs officer (Lovell & Kosten, 2000).

Building on Lovell and Kosten's work, Waple (2006) examined the issue of appropriate professional preparation of entry-level student affairs practitioners. A national sample of 430 student affairs professionals with less than five years of experience and who had graduated from a student affairs preparatory master's program, were given a list of 28 previously identified needed professional skills and competencies in student affairs. These professionals rated the level of competency they attained during their master's program and the use of said skill or competency in their current position. Although 21 of the identified professional skills and competencies were

perceived to be attained in a master's program and used in their current jobs at a moderate or higher degree, there was a mismatch between attainment and use for the seven remaining skills. Specifically, the four skills of supervision of staff, strategic planning, budget and financial management, and computer usage were needed on the job but were not attained in a master's program, while the opposite was true of the remaining three skills: research methods, history of higher education, and the history of student affairs were attained but not needed. These skills were expounded upon in graduate school but were not used in that entry-level position (Waple, 2006). This mismatch was later confirmed by Herdlein and his research team (Herdlein et al., 2010; Herdlein et al., 2013).

In 2013, Herdlein et al. conducted another meta-analysis of the student affairs literature published between the years of 1995 and 2012, to ascertain if any progress had been made in determining a single set of necessary competencies for successful student affairs practitioners. Their study was the first since Lovell and Kosten's meta-analysis in 2000 to synthesize a single set of needed competencies from the student affairs literature. Herdlein and his team analyzed 22 articles, 15 of which were published between 2006-2012. Thus, the topic of competencies within the field of student affairs appears to be an increasingly popular area of research (Herdlein et al., 2013). Through their analysis, Herdlein and his team noted that there was not a single, universal set of needed competencies; therefore, frequencies were used to determine a list of the most desired knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics for success as a student affairs practitioner. Their list is presented as Figure 2.

<b>Desired Characteristics of Student Affairs Professionals</b>		
<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Personal Characteristics</b>
Multicultural/Diversity Issues	Research/Assessment/Evaluation	Self-awareness
Student Development Theory	Communication	Values
Legal Issues	Administration & Management	Flexibility
Research and Assessment	Supervision	Positive Attitude
Budget & Finance	<b>Leadership</b>	Engaged is Critical Reflection
Ethics	Writing Effectiveness	Willingness to Collaborate
Campus Organization & Structure	Technology	Maturity
Counseling Theories	Problem Solving	<b>Leadership Style</b>
Higher Education History	Personnel Management	
Strategic Planning	Collaboration	
Group Dynamics	Practicing Diversity	
Departmental Positions in Student Affairs	Conflict/Crisis Management	
Management Theory	Advising Students	
Social Justice	Promoting Student Learning	
	Application – Theory to Practice	
	Implementing	
	Assessment	
	Teaching and Training	

*Figure 2.* Desired characteristics of student affairs professionals, emphasis added (adapted from Herdlein et al., 2013).

While leadership is listed as a desired skill, it refers to skill in leading others, specifically effectiveness as a positional leader within the administration, i.e., director of a department or vice president of student affairs/student life. Similarly, the personal characteristic of leadership style refers to the disposition to lead others via a formal position of leadership (Herdlein et al., 2013). The competencies listed in Figure 2 reflect the

shift in focus from a counseling and interpersonal orientation to an administrative and managerial approach. This shift is evident when comparing research data with preparation program curricula where coursework on research and assessment, legal issues, leadership and supervision, and strategic planning and budgeting are far from uniform in both required and elective courses. (Herdlein et al., 2013, p. 266)

Competencies specific to being an effective educator, not to mention a leadership educator, were not included in any of the studies analyzed in the meta-analysis.

Three key findings when comparing the Lovell and Kosten (2000) and the Herdlein et al. (2013) studies are the inclusion of knowledge of multicultural or diversity issues, the focus on assessment and evaluation, and the need for continued research on the perception of competencies needed for entry-level student affairs practitioners. Neither knowledge of diversity issues nor assessment was included in the Lovell and Kosten (2000) study. The frequency and desirability of these competency areas in the 2013 meta-analysis appears appropriate as the student population on college campuses continues to become increasingly diverse (Herdlein et al., 2013; Nuss, 2003; Pascarella, 2006), and divisions of student affairs have had to increasingly emphasize their value-added nature through student learning assessment and evaluation efforts (Blake, 2007; Ellerston & Thoennes, 2007; Lovell & Kosten, 2000). Also, Herdlein et al. (2013) suggested the need for future studies to examine how graduate education can better prepare new professionals and to gather perceptions of competencies needed for entry-level practitioners.

This trend in competency research culminated in 2015, when the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), the preeminent professional development associations for student affairs, embarked on a project to identify and categorize the competencies student affairs practitioners needed to be successful (Eanes, et al., 2015; O'Brien, 2018). The result was a list of 10 competencies ranging from technology to personal and ethical foundations (see Figure 3). Leadership, as in the competencies needed to be a positional leader within the organization, was included in this list; however, leadership education was not included (Eanes, et al., 2015). Figure 3 lists the ten professional competency areas identified for student affairs educators by NASPA and ACPA.

**Student Affairs Educators should have competency in:**

- Personal and Ethical Foundations
- Values, Philosophy, and History
- Assessment, Evaluation, and Research
- Law, Policy, and Governance
- Organizational and Human Resource
- Leadership
- Social Justice and Inclusion
- Student Learning and Development
- Technology
- Advising and Supporting

*Figure 3.* Suggested competencies for student affairs educators (taken from Eanes, et al., 2015)

Herdlein et al. (2013) found that organizational position or level influenced the proficiency and relevance of the professional competencies. Therefore, those who were

more advanced in the organization showed greater proficiency in the competencies than those who were beginning their student affairs careers. Additionally, some competencies were deemed more relevant for more experienced and senior student affairs practitioners than for entry-level practitioners. Thus, not all competencies are needed by all levels of student affairs practitioners to the same degree.

Researchers agree that student affairs practitioners are educators (Moore & Marsh, 2007) by the intent and purpose of their profession to assist in the holistic development of students during their time in college (Blake, 2007; Coffey, 2010). In fact, student affairs professionals are charged to educate and promote leadership in their students (Burns, 1995; Javinar, 2000) as intentional partners with academic affairs (Herdlein, 2004). But how do student affairs practitioners learn to be effective leadership educators? The literature is replete with studies focused on the competencies needed to be an effective student affairs professional, but absent from all of these studies was the analysis of the competencies, specifically the knowledge, skills, abilities or dispositions needed to be an effective student affairs leadership educator. This demonstrates a gap in the literature that should be explored and provides the rationale for this research study.



## CHAPTER III

### METHODS

As the purpose and objectives of this study were to elicit and refine group opinions or judgements, a classic Delphi approach was determined the most appropriate method (Buriak & Shinn, 1989; Dalkey, 1969a; Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975; Franklin & Hart, 2007; Linstone & Turoff, 1975). The Delphi technique is an iterative process of controlled-feedback interactions between the researcher(s) and their purposively selected panel of experts (Buriak & Shinn, 1989; Schmidt, 1997). The purpose of providing feedback in this iterative way was to “permit a carefully restricted exchange of information while reducing the process loss which might occur during traditional group interaction” (Rohrbaugh, 1979, p. 76).

For this study, the topic to be explored and refined was the preparation of entry-level student affairs practitioners as leadership educators, namely the competencies needed to be a student affairs leadership educator and where to learn and practice these competencies. For that reason, the goal of this study was to “capture the areas of collective knowledge . . . [while] forc[ing] new ideas to emerge” (Franklin & Hart, 2007, p. 238). In order to elicit a wide range of opinions, the researcher engaged a diverse group of qualified experts within the field of student affairs (Dalkey 1969a; Delbecq et al., 1975; Rayens & Hahn, 2000). One benefit of the Delphi technique is that the identified experts do not interact face-to-face; therefore, they do not need to be physically in the same location and the presence of a dominant personality or opinion does take over the group (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).

## **Population**

If one is to understand what an entry-level student affairs leadership educator looks like, i.e. the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes they need to possess to be successful, one needs to gather opinion and judgements from both an academic and experiential perspective (Herdlein et al., 2013; Hyman, 1985; Kuk et al., 2007). By including both student affairs practitioners and faculty members, one gained the perspectives of those who teach and train pre-service student affairs professionals both in and out of the classroom. Thus, the appropriate population needed for this study was two-fold: student affairs practitioners/managers responsible for hiring and training entry-level employees and student affairs/higher education administration preparatory program directors/coordinators responsible for curriculum design and instruction.

Student affairs practitioners who hire and train entry-level employees are typically considered managers. They also set the tone and to some extent the priorities for their area(s) of responsibility. While many student affairs managers still maintain frequent contact with students, their administrative job duties and responsibilities can pull their attention away from day-to-day programmatic events. Thus, significant amounts of their days are spent dealing with personnel and organizational issues as well as helping their entry-level staff members navigate the institutional policies and processes of “how” to put theory to practice in their individual jobs (Kuk et al., 2007). As the student affairs professionals who most closely work with entry-level practitioners and the changing needs of students who use their programs or services, student affairs managers provide a unique perspective of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and abilities

that are needed to be successful in their departments and the student affairs field as a whole. As Burkard et al. (2005) noted, “no one may be better positioned to help us understand the necessary entry-level competencies of a student affairs professional than those individuals who recruit, select, hire, and supervise such staff members” (p. 286).

But, student affairs managers are not the only ones whose perspective influences what it takes to be a successful student affairs practitioner. Those who coordinate student affairs preparatory programs also provide valuable insight and perspective into the knowledge, skills, and attributes needed to be successful in this profession (Hyman, 1985). Rather than an applied and pragmatic approach, program coordinators tend to focus on the theoretical and research basis of the profession, the “why” of the profession (Herdlein, et al., 2013; Kuk et al., 2007).

Individually, each perspective is valid and important, but provides an incomplete analysis of what it takes to be a successful student affairs leadership educator. Both perspectives were needed to determine a comprehensive list of competencies for a leadership educator, and to gain a better understanding of how and where these competencies should be learned and practiced. Because a master’s degree is generally required, and always preferred for full-time employment as a student affairs practitioner (Nelson, 2010), the population was narrowed to include only program directors or coordinators of master’s level student affairs preparatory programs.

However, not all master’s level student affairs preparatory programs are the same. Student affairs preparatory programs vary in length of study (one or two years), curriculum delivery (residential, hybrid of in-person and on-line, and entirely on-line),

and degree offered (graduate certificate, M.S., M.A., or M.Ed.). Traditionally, a student affairs preparatory program is a two-year, residential program with a required clinical paraprofessional practice such as an assistantship, internship, and/or practicum.

Therefore, to be representative of the traditional program, only program directors/coordinators of two-year, residential master's programs that had a required clinical practice component within a division of student affairs/student life were invited to participate.

Higher education master's programs (i.e. preparatory programs) tend to utilize a very prescriptive course of study, where the program administrators dictate the courses the students must take as well as the order in which they are taken (Herdlein et al., 2013; Hyman, 1985). Consequently, this prescriptive approach creates a cohort and a generalist degree -- meaning that the coursework in the preparatory program is designed to give students the broad overview of the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to be successful in any entry-level student affairs position from housing to academic advising. However, course offerings and sequencing decisions generally are made at the program or institutional level, which can add an additional layer of complexity (Roberts, 2003), as individual professor's preference toward one set of competencies over another may come into play (Kuk et al., 2007). This breadth of subject matter comes at the price of conceptual or theoretical depth in any one functional area within student affairs. If a student desires a deeper understanding of a specific functional area, then the student must seek it out through their formal experiential learning opportunities, such as

graduate assistantships, internships, and/or practica, all of which are vital components of a student affairs preparatory program.

Although the findings of this study are directed toward entry-level student affairs practitioners, entry-level student affairs practitioners were not included in the population for this study because, as is the case with many new employees, entry-level student affairs practitioners do not always know, nor do they always possess, the knowledge, skills, abilities or attributes needed to be successful in their chosen profession (Roberts, 2003). For many, that first full-time job post-graduation is the time and place to develop the professional competencies needed to be successful as a student affairs practitioner (Hall, 2014). Additionally, while entry-level student affairs practitioners are expected to effectively make use of their graduate education from their first day on the job, research has shown that recent student affairs preparatory program graduates may not be sufficiently prepared to do so (Nelson, 2010). Thus, sampling entry-level student affairs practitioners may not provide reliable data, as entry-level professionals do not always know what they do not know.

### **Sample**

When dealing with group opinions, the common perspective is the larger the group, the better the outcomes. Yet, Dalkey (1969b) reported that groups consisting of at least 13 individuals, satisfactorily answered questions of process reliability with mean correlations greater than or equal to 0.80. Therefore, for this study, 89 individuals in total were invited to participate in one of the two respondent groups (Group A - Student

Affairs Practitioners/Managers and Group B - Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators). The initial goal was 17-20 participants in each context-specific group. Attrition over the course of the study was expected; therefore, additional participants were recruited initially beyond the required 13 so that by the final round each respondent group would still have a minimum of 13 members.

Thirty-two individuals were invited via email to join Group A – Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers, and 17 agreed to participate. All 17 participants were employed at public institutions at the time of the study and had experience in a variety of functional areas within student affairs – from multicultural services to fraternity and sorority life, to leadership programs and the dean of students office. As expected, attrition occurred over the course of the study as two participants of Group A did not complete the Round 1 survey. Fifteen participants began round 2, but one participant withdrew from the study. Round 3 started with 14 participants; however, an additional participant failed to complete the survey. Consequently, Group A consisted of 13 participants at the conclusion of the study.

Fifty-seven individuals were invited via email to join Group B – Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators, and 20 agreed to participate. Both public and private institutions were represented, and all 20 participants held a higher education/student affairs faculty appointment at the time of the study. Again, as expected, attrition occurred over the course of the study. Three participants did not complete the Round 1 survey. Round 2 began with 17 participants, but 16 participants

completed it. One additional participant withdrew from the study during round 3, so at the conclusion of this study, Group B consisted of 15 participants.

#### *Selection for Inclusion in the Delphi*

A central tenant of the Delphi method is that the participants are purposively selected to be part of the panel of experts who have substantial experience or expertise in the subject matter in question (Delbecq et al., 1975; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Morgan et al., 2013; Rayens & Hahn, 2000). The weight of their experience or expertise is such that their opinions or judgements are seen as credible within their discipline or profession and can be used as representative of said discipline or profession (Delbecq, et al., 1975; Franklin & Hart, 2007). A common starting point to find eligible experts to participate in a national panel is to utilize the preeminent professional development organization(s) affiliated with the profession being studied. For student affairs, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NAPSA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) are the preeminent professional development organizations. The preeminent academic journals for each organization served as the starting point from which a search commenced for the creation of the expert panels.

#### *Criteria for Inclusion on the Panels*

A sampling frame was used for selection of both expert panels. As leadership education within student affairs was the topic under exploration, panelists needed to have demonstrated experience or expertise in (a) student affairs as a profession and (b) the leadership development of college students. For this study, the broadest definition of

leadership development was used. Additionally, demonstrated experience or expertise was determined as meeting at least three of the following five criteria:

1. Three or more years of experience as a full-time student affairs practitioner or researcher
2. Three or more years of experience with college student leadership development
3. Three or more years supervising entry-level student affairs practitioners
4. Three or more years of experience as a preparatory student affairs program director/coordinator
5. Three or more years teaching in a preparatory student affairs master's program (2 or more cohorts of students)

Potential participants were identified by first examining the NASPA and ACPA published journals, the *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* (NASPA) and the *Journal of College Student Development* (ACPA), between the years of 2008 and 2018 to identify student affairs professionals who had participated in student affairs or leadership competency research. Limiting the search to these two journals produced a pool of student affairs professionals well below the needed threshold to constitute a full Delphi panel for either respondent group. Therefore, while maintaining the original intent of this study, the search was expanded to include the *Journal of Leadership Education*, *College Student Journal*, *NASPA Journal*, *College Student Affairs Journal*, and *Research and Practice in Assessment*. Expanding the search provided a list of potential participants sufficient from which to gain a full Delphi panel for Group B:



Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators, but not a list sufficient for Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers.

The focus of this search was authors of articles related to leadership education in a student affairs context or necessary student affairs competencies. The identified authors were checked against the participant criteria and those who met the aforementioned criteria were invited via email to participate in this study. These authors were also asked to nominate a student affairs colleague or fellow student affairs preparatory program director/coordinator who met or exceeded the selection criteria, which were also included in the email. All nominated individuals were evaluated against the selection criteria, and if they met or exceeded those criteria, the individuals were invited to participate in the study. Five student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators were nominated by their peers, four of whom agreed to participate in the study. Six student affairs practitioners/managers were nominated by their peers, all of whom agreed to participate in the study. Invitations to participate ceased when each panel had 17-20 unique participants who had agreed to participate in the study.

Through these searches and the nomination process of identified authors, 32 individuals were identified for Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers. Although these searches produced a list of 57 individuals as potential participants for Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators, several of the identified program directors/coordinators declined to be part of the study or simply did not respond after three email invitations. Subsequently, the online membership roster of ACPA was searched to find preparatory student affairs program directors/coordinators

who manage in-person/residential master's programs in which clinical practice and learning (assistantships, internships, or practica) is a required component of the degree plan. Expanding the search in this way yielded the additional 10 names needed to gain a full Delphi panel for Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators.

General demographic information of the participants was not collected. In Delphi studies, participants are described and identified by the meeting of a pre-determined criteria of expertise rather than traditional demographic variables (Dalkey, 1969b). How expertise is operationalized for the study serves as the minimum threshold to which participants are identified and described.

### **Instrumentation**

Previous research has shown that that student affairs practitioners and preparatory program coordinators/faculty viewed the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes of co-curricular leadership educators differently (Hyman, 1985; Kuk et al., 2007; Miles, 2007). As a result, two separate Delphi panels were conducted simultaneously, one for each context group. Both panels started with the same three questions, which were distributed to the participants via email with a personalized link to the online Qualtrics survey. Franklin and Hart (2007) found that it is important to protect the anonymity of Delphi panelists in an effort to guard the integrity of the data and to allow “panelists to share their ideas freely without fear of embarrassment or

ridicule by their peers” (p. 242). As a result, all communication between study participants was conducted individually between the researcher and each participant.

Three rounds were needed to reach stabilization of item rating within each participant group. Participants were given a fourteen-day window to respond to the survey for each round, with a reminder emailed at day 10, and again at day 13, as needed. Each round was separated by a minimum of a ten-day window in which the responses were analyzed in preparation for the subsequent round. The start of every round for both Delphi panels was offset by one week, in an effort to even out the cyclical nature of the study.

#### *Round 1 – Opinion Collection*

A personalized link to the initial survey (details follow in Survey Questions Round 1), consisting of one closed and three open-ended questions, was emailed to each context expert who had previously agreed to participate in the study. Open-ended questions were asked in efforts to maximize the diversity of responses; thereby increasing the likelihood of producing the most important items (Schmidt, 1997). Additional data beyond the research questions were gathered to determine if the study participants considered student affairs practitioners to be leadership educators.

The initial survey was sent to both Group A and Group B. An individualized reminder email was sent to the participants who had not completed the survey 10 calendar days after the survey was sent. Using content analysis techniques (Krippendorff, 2004; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), responses from round 1 were analyzed separately for Groups A and B. Within the opinions gathered from each group, similar

statements were combined, and compound statements were separated before all unique statements were incorporated into the Round 2 instrument (see Appendix B) (Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Schmidt, 1997). The responses were not edited by the researcher.

### *Round 2 – Rating the Opinions*

A personalized link to the group-specific Round 2 survey was emailed to each expert who had successfully completed the Round 1 survey. The responses gathered from round 1 were organized into five sections or categories: leadership educator knowledge, leadership educator skills, leadership educator abilities/attributes, where these competencies should be learned, and where these competencies should be practiced. Using a 5-point response scale with *1 = Not at all Important*, *2 = Slightly Important*, *3 = Moderately Important*, *4 = Important*, and *5 = Extremely Important*, participants were asked to indicate the level of importance they associated with each statement collected from round 1 (Delbecq et al., 1975; Linstone & Turoff, 1975). At the end of each section, the participants were given the opportunity to include any other item(s) they believed important, but had not been included previously in that section. An individualized reminder email was sent to the participants who had not completed their survey 10 days after it was sent. Descriptive statistics, frequencies and counts, were then calculated per Round 2 statement per participant group.

### *Round 3 – Developing Consensus*

Frequency distributions were used to extract and hone the responses received from round 2 (Buriak & Shinn, 1989). In efforts to explore a wide variety of opinions, any statement in which at least 50% of the participants in that group responded

'important' (rating of 4) or 'extremely important' (rating of 5) were carried over to the group-specific instrument for round 3 (Buriak & Shinn, 1989; Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004; Schmidt, 1997). The threshold of 50% was set a priori. Again, a personalized link to the Round 3 survey (see Appendix C) was emailed to all those who had completed the Round 2 survey. However, for round 3, each survey was unique to that participant.

The Round 3 survey included that individual's importance rating for each statement, as reported in round 2, as well as the percentages and counts of the other members of their group who responded 'important' or 'extremely important' for each statement. Participants were able to review their item importance scores in comparison to the scores of the other members of the group and could choose to change their response to moderately important, important, or extremely important, or keep it as is. Any additional statements that emerged from round 2 were included at the end of the applicable section. Participants were asked to indicate the level of importance they associated with each statement using the same 5-point response scale as in round 2.

### *Survey Questions*

The questions asked of the panelists were as follows:

#### **Round 1:**

- 1) Do you consider student affairs practitioners to be leadership educators?

Yes or No.

If yes, how would you define or identify a student affairs leadership educator?

If no, how would you define or identify a leadership educator?

- 2) What leadership education knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes are required for entry-level student affairs practitioners?
- 3) Where should pre-service student affairs practitioners learn or practice the leadership education competencies identified in question 2?

**Round 2:**

The purpose of round 2 was to have the participants rate the importance of all responses provided from round 1. In efforts to reduce respondent fatigue, the survey was broken into five sections: knowledge, skills, attributes/abilities, where to learn them, and where to practice them (see Appendix B for a blank copy of the instrument). Each section began with the same question format, customized for that particular section. The following are examples using the knowledge section for reference.

Select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the **leadership education knowledge *required*** for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners. If you believe required knowledge was not included in the list, please include it in the other question. Use *1 = Not at all Important, 2 = Slightly Important, 3 = Moderately Important, 4 = Important, and 5 = Extremely Important.*

Leadership educator knowledge statements collected from round 1

Other **leadership education knowledge** required by entry-level Student Affairs practitioners:

**Round 3:**

As was done for round 2, the survey was broken into five sections: knowledge, skills, attributes/abilities, where to learn them, and where to practice them (see Appendix B for a blank copy of the instrument). Each section began with the same question format, customized for that particular section. The following are examples using the knowledge section for reference.

This section details the statements of **leadership education knowledge** *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

Leadership education knowledge statements carried forward from Round 2.

The following are additional knowledge items that emerged from Round 2.

Please select the level of importance (*1 = Not at all Important, 2 = Slightly*

*Important, 3 = Moderately Important, 4 = Important, and 5 = Extremely*

*Important*) you associate with the statement in terms of the **leadership education**

**knowledge required** for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.

### **Research Approach and Analysis**

Rather than hypothesis testing, a qualitative research design centered on the idea that reality is constructed through individual's "interaction with their social worlds" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 24) was used for this study. An inductive process was undertaken, as data were gathered from the study participants and then analyzed to identify each unique idea or concept. As I desired to better understand and describe the competencies needed to be an effective student affairs leadership educator, I chose an interpretive design (Berg, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

This study examined data gathered by the researcher through a classic Delphi approach. Two independent panels of experts were recruited and participated in the study. Group A consisted of student affairs practitioners/managers and Group B consisted of student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators. The data analysis methods used for this study included content analysis to address research question one, and descriptive statistics to address research questions two and three.

Content analysis was selected as the methodological frame to address the first research question because this study sought to explore systematically the attitudes and



perspectives of those engaged in the education and training of student affairs practitioners. As Bryman (2012) noted, content analysis enables researchers to infer meaning through systematic and impartial identification of the data. Participants' definitions and characteristics of a student affairs leadership educator were downloaded from the Qualtrics survey, analyzed, and then coded for thematic content. By using this open coding process (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), the researcher was able to dissect each participant's response and then reconstitute the data into potential themes. Once the list of potential themes had been created, axial coding was used to identify common themes and larger patterns within the initial categories (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The common ideas were grouped into themes and sub-themes for each participant group.

To address research questions two and three, the participants' responses were downloaded from the Qualtrics survey and sorted accordingly. The purpose of research question two was to explore and identify the three aspects of competency - knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes - for student affairs leadership educators. Repeated items were noted and each unduplicated item (see Appendix A) was included in the round 2 survey for rating. The purpose of research question three was to explore and identify where and how these student affairs leadership educator competencies should be learned. The participants' responses were downloaded from the Qualtrics survey and sorted into the two applicable categories: where to learn and how to learn these competencies. Repeated items were noted and each unduplicated item (see Appendix A) was included in the round 2 survey for rating. Responses were unique for each participant group; therefore, the round 2 survey was participant group-specific.

### *Research Quality and Trustworthiness*

Maintaining trustworthiness is vital in qualitative research. Dependability was increased through an audit trail, where all data were separated by context-specific Delphi panel and coded accordingly. Through unique coding for each Delphi panel, each participant's responses were separated and identified. Participant responses from Group A, student affairs practitioners/managers, were coded 1 to 15. Participant responses from Group B, student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators, were coded A to Q, the seventeenth letter in the alphabet. The use of representative quotes for each research theme or category gives voice to all participants in the study and provides potential for transferability of the study.

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) note the importance of researchers sharing their background and perspectives in efforts to identify how their personal experiences and/or beliefs could influence the research and its findings. Additionally, sharing this information provides a lens through which the study's credibility may be viewed. My previous experience includes over a decade serving as a student affairs leadership educator and supervisor within a division of student affairs/student life at multiple universities across the United States. My scholarly knowledge of and experience in the field of leadership education were used to scrutinize the data (Berg, 1998; Franklin & Hart, 2007; Krippendorff, 2004; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I was cognizant of my previous experience and worked to remain objective; however, I acknowledge the possibility that my previous experiences and views may have influenced how the data were categorized and analyzed.

Credibility was also achieved through peer debriefing, and my reflexive journal (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To help enhance credibility, I engaged in a peer debriefing with one who had graduated from a student affairs preparatory program and has nine years of experience as a student affairs leadership educator. After review of the data, the peer reviewer agreed with my classification and categorization of the data. I used a reflexive journal throughout the entire research process to record my thoughts and reactions to the research process as a whole and to capture my ideas and impressions for the conclusions of and implications for this research and line of inquiry.

#### *Delphi Technique*

As the Delphi technique is a means to “eliciting and refining group opinions” (Buriak & Shinn, 1989, p. 14), it was the most appropriate method to address research questions two and three. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and counts, were used to determine the statements carried forward between Delphi rounds, as descriptive statistics can be used to determine patterns and describe relationships between groups (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Moreover, Agresti and Finlay (2009) detailed that descriptive statistics can be used as a means to determine differences in attitudes of separate and unique groups. In this study, descriptive statistics were used to help facilitate consensus within each group while identifying the divergence of opinions between groups (Rayens & Hahn, 2000). Stability, or the lack of variance in attitudes or opinions of the Delphi experts, can be seen as a sign of congruence or consensus on an item (Crisp, Pelleteir, Duffield, Adams, & Nagy, 1997). For this study, a supermajority

of 75% or greater participant agreement of an item being 'important' or 'extremely important' was used as the measure that the item's stability.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDINGS**

The purpose of this study was to explore and identify the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes, required of a collegiate student affairs leadership educator. A secondary purpose was to explore how and where pre-service student affairs practitioners should learn and gain practical experience with the identified leadership education knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes. After a discussion of the research approach taken and analysis techniques used, this section documents the data collected, organized by two levels: first, the research question, and second, the context-specific expert panel. As needed and appropriate, tables are included to describe and clarify the data.

#### **Research Question One**

The first research question focused on how student affairs leadership educators are defined or identified. To address the first research question, study participants were asked two questions. First, each participant was asked if they considered student affairs practitioners to be leadership educators. Second, they were asked how they define or identify a student affairs leadership educator. Thirteen of the fourteen participants (92.9%) in the student affairs practitioners/managers panel (Group A) responded that they considered student affairs practitioners to be leadership educators. Similarly, sixteen of the seventeen participants (94.1%) in the student affairs preparatory program

directors/coordinators panel (Group B) responded that they considered student affairs practitioners to be leadership educators.

As a follow-up question, regardless of their previous answer, all participants were asked to provide their definition of a student affairs leadership educator. Content analysis of the responses illuminated how each context-specific group defined and characterized student affairs leadership educators. Influenced by their previous experience working with student affairs practitioners, graduate students in student affairs preparatory programs, and college student leadership development, collectively the participant's definitions of student affairs leadership educators were organized into two main categories: **those with direct interaction with student leaders** and those **whose job descriptions included leadership-focused initiatives**. Only the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers group (Group A), had a third major category emerge, which was previous formal experience with leadership.

In terms of how leadership educators are characterized, one common theme emerged from the two participant groups: **leadership educators mentor students**. For Group A, three additional themes emerged. Student Affairs leadership educators are characterized as those who: (a) have a theoretical understanding of leadership, (b) practice integrative learning, and (c) use student development theory in their roles as student organization advisors or student employee supervisors. For Group B, no additional themes emerged.

This section begins with the presentation of the responses of Group A: student affairs practitioners/managers, with the Group B: student affairs preparatory program

directors/coordinators' responses immediately following. This section ends with a brief summary of the analysis between these two groups.

*Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers*

**Definition of Leadership Educator**

Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (Group A) viewed leadership education as an intentional act, requiring leadership educators to put theory to practice as they encourage and support their students' leadership learning and development. These intentional acts are associated with leadership educators having direct interactions with students and/or having job duties or responsibilities for providing co-curricular leadership programming. For a majority of these participants, opportunities for leadership learning and development were not exclusive to students currently serving in positional leadership roles. Rather, the participants of Group A share the philosophy that as a learned behavior, leadership is available to anyone willing to put the time and effort in to develop their leadership skills and abilities. Several of the respondents provided these insights through the following definitions:

- [A leadership educator is] someone who actively engages in interactions with students to develop them as leaders. (2)
- Leadership educators focus their interactions with students toward skill building and developing personal awareness. (11)

- [A leadership educator is] anyone who works in student affairs directly with students engaging in personal, career, academic, and leadership development initiatives, programs, or services. (13)

While many of the members of Group A took an emergent view of leadership, in that neither position nor title were required to be classified as a leader, there were two participants who provided an alternative perspective. For these two participants, student affairs leadership educators have a primary responsibility to guide and train students who serve as positional leaders. This sentiment is expressed in the following definitions.

- [A leadership educator is] someone who in their student affairs role has had direct contact with student leaders. (2)
- Student activities staff are leadership educators if they create ways for students to reflect on their leadership behavior while serving as a student organization leader. If they disregard this important part of student activity or student organization participation, then they are failing in the leadership educator role. (3)

The second emergent theme was that student affairs leadership educators have leadership programming as a key part of their job duties or responsibilities. This idea reinforces how leadership education is an intentional act and not merely a byproduct of working in co-curricular settings with students. Furthermore, these leadership development programming opportunities provide the setting and circumstances in which



student affairs leadership educators are able to have direct and meaningful interactions with the students. These insights are demonstrated in the following statements.

- [A leadership educator is] any professional who is responsible for actively providing leadership development programs for students. (8)
- [A leadership educator is] someone who is working in short-term and long-term leadership programming that includes creating, participating, facilitating programs and classes based in the values of leadership that focus on the growth of the individual and how that individual influences a group towards positive change. (12)
- Student Affairs staff, as educators, should be contributing specifically to this leadership development [developing students to be future leaders] in very tangible ways. (9)

Notwithstanding the focus of providing formal leadership development programming as part of one's job responsibilities, Group A participants also detailed that student affairs practitioners can choose to incorporate leadership development concepts or principles into how they perform their jobs. Thus, a student affairs leadership educator can be anyone who identifies as one, has the desire to assist students on their leadership journey, and infuses leadership development concepts into job duties. One participant noted:

- I remind my colleagues they all have the responsibility and potential to be leadership educators - if they put the effort and consideration into it. (3)

This idea that student affairs leadership educators need a solid foundation in leadership concepts is reinforced in these responses.

- [A leadership educator is] one who utilizes human development theory and leadership theory in their practice as they work to shape and mold the engaged student leaders with whom they work. (7)
- [A leadership educator is] anyone who intentionally considers and includes leadership development as part of their work with students. (3)

A third theme also emerged in Group A; that leadership educators are those who have previous experience with leadership. For one practitioner, leadership educators were those who had prior experience in a positional leadership role. This participant noted a leadership educator was one who:

- [H]as past experience in some type of leadership role (can be varied – student leader, committee leader, title leader, etc.) (2)

Although previous leadership experience brings unique insights, another participant responded that a conceptual understanding of leadership was most important. For this participant, a leadership educator is:

- Someone with some sort of formalized class, training, or knowledge about basic leadership theories. (2)

### **Characteristics of Leadership Educator**

In an effort to gain a clearer picture of who a student affairs leadership educator is, participants in Group A were asked to identify the characteristics of a student affairs leadership educator. One theme emerged: **leadership educators mentor students**.

Three sub-themes also emerged. Student Affairs leadership educators are characterized as those who: (a) have a theoretical understanding of leadership, (b) practice integrative learning, and (c) use student development theory in their roles as student organization advisors or student employee supervisors.

Student affairs practitioners/managers believe leadership educators possess a theoretical understanding of leadership. Included in this understanding is an appreciation for the various components of leadership development and how social identity influences one's leadership conceptualization, as detailed in the following statements. A leadership educator:

- [Needs] knowledge of leadership theory. (1)
- Understand[s] identity development -- social identities including leader identity. (1)
- Understands the difference between leadership training, education, and development. (1)

- Understands how to help students find the answer to [the question] “leadership for what?” (1)

Even the lone practitioner who does not believe student affairs practitioners are leadership educators concurred with their colleagues. They responded that leadership educators are,

- One[s] who understand leadership theory and practice (6)

The participants of Group A consider student affairs leadership educators as the conduits bridging what students are learning in and out of their classrooms. This view is demonstrated in the following statements.

- Through connections of what is occurring inside and outside of the classroom, [student affairs] practitioners are vibrant components of leadership education. (14)
- [A leadership educator] integrates student leadership competencies and learning outcomes throughout their programs, infrastructure, and initiatives. (5)
- [A leadership educator] can deploy that knowledge [knowledge of leadership theory] in executing co-curricular opportunities. (1)
- [A leadership educator] can facilitate and teach. (1)

- [Leadership educators] understand some instructional design [principles] for retreats and conferences. (1)

Once again, the participant who does not believe student affairs practitioners are leadership educators agreed with their colleagues as they mentioned,

- [Leadership educators] can engage students in learning through designing experiential opportunities that produce results around building leadership capacity towards producing positive change or influence. (6)

Student affairs practitioners/managers characterized leadership educators as those who use student development theory and reflective practices in their jobs to guide students through the development process. As a student organization advisor or student employee supervisor, student affairs leadership educators are able to mentor student leaders. A majority of Group A participants shared these views in the following statements:

- Student affairs professionals can act both as coaches and as guides, offering intentional opportunities for intentional reflection and skill-building. (11)
- [A leadership educator] guide students in all areas of their co-curricular experiences fostering social belonging. (4)

- [A leadership educator] provides scenarios where students are learning, practicing, and receiving feedback in these [identity development, self-efficacy, and working with others]. (10)
- [A leadership educator] knows how to give feedback and does so. (1)
- They [student affairs practitioners] create ways for students to reflect on their leadership behavior while serving as a student organization leader. (3)
- [Leadership educators] advise or supervise students or student organizations; particularly ones that have a role to contribute to all of student life or campus culture. (1)
- [Leadership educators are] some [student affairs practitioners] who supervise student employees. (7)
- [Leadership educators] utilize leadership identity development and student leadership development theories and concepts into their daily work and interactions with students. (5)

*Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators*

**Definition of Leadership Educator**

Student Affairs Preparatory Program Coordinators/Directors (Group B) identified leadership education as a specialized area of expertise within student affairs, making leadership education a functional area within a division of student affairs/student life

much like housing or career services. Thus, leadership educators are those who have specific positions or job titles and are responsible for the development of leadership capacity and competency in both students and professional colleagues. Additionally, a majority of respondents in Group B saw leadership education as applicable only to those students who are, or aspire to be, positional leaders. Due to the specialized nature of their job responsibilities, leadership educators work closely with student leaders while providing opportunities for leadership learning.

When describing the direct interactions leadership educators have with student leaders, three sub-themes emerged. Leadership educators serve as guides outside the classroom, model effective leadership competencies, and train student leaders. In terms of the first sub-theme of serving as a guide outside the classroom, a leadership educator is:

- Anyone who uses positional, referent, or expert power to actively guide and inform colleagues and students on practices that promote effective leadership (motivating toward a common goal, intended outcome). (I)
- An individual who helps college students foster leadership skills through out-of-classroom experiences. (O)
- Our work is leadership, so students are exposed to leadership in practice as we engage with our students. (G)
- Someone whose primary role includes either working directly with students or working to directly impact students. (F)

But participants in Group B indicated that a leadership educator's responsibility did not end with merely guiding students through a developmental process. Instead, they repeatedly mentioned the need for leadership educators to model the competencies of effective leadership they were teaching their students. This philosophy is shown in the following quotes:

- The role of leadership educator may refer to the leadership role the Student Affairs professional plays on campus and, thus as a role model, demonstrates to students what it means to serve as a leader. (N)
- Student Affairs professionals serve as leadership educators in their day-to-day engagement with students through content delivery in workshops, advising student organizations, role modeling, problem-solving conversations, and mentoring. (G)
- Brining a leadership mindset is critical as they are leading students, their unit, their own work, etc. (F)
- One who through advising, modeling, counseling, and directing enables students to grow and develop as leaders. (K)

Providing leadership training was also an important way for leadership educators to interact with student leaders. Two participants mentioned the need for leadership training.



- One who may need to impart leadership training or leadership competencies upon student leaders. (L)
- One who helps to encourage students to understand their roles as leaders. (D)

With regards to the second emergent theme, the leadership-focus of their job descriptions, three sub-themes emerged from Group B. For respondents in Group B, leadership educators facilitate learning, use reflective practice and develop leadership competencies in both non-students and students. As to facilitating learning, leadership educators:

- Are helping students become leaders and learn about leadership theory and practice. (H)
- Are those campus administrators who are committed to educating students both formally and informally. (N)
- May refer to teaching students about becoming leaders. (N)
- May not include the formal role of a classroom educator [in their practice], their daily work with students focuses on teaching, challenging, and supporting -- the hallmarks of an educator. (N)
- [Are] one[s] who work with emerging professionals in the field to introduce key literature/concepts necessary for practice. (C)

One teaching strategy mentioned repeatedly by Group B participants, was that of reflective practice to enhance the learning process. Therefore, leadership educators are:

- Those who engage students in reflective practice around issues of leadership. (D)
- Any campus leader and/or administrator who thoughtfully engages theory, personal experience, and reflective insight to support student success on a college/university campus. (A)

Student affairs leadership educators also have a responsibility to develop leadership competencies in others. This development process begins with self. Once they have demonstrated competence themselves, then leadership educators work with emerging student affairs professionals, and expand their efforts to other members of the campus community. Thereby leadership educators fulfill and magnify their job responsibilities to provide leadership-focused education and programming. The following quotes capture this sentiment.

- One who may need to develop leadership qualities/abilities in order to more effectively lead students. (L)
- Leadership is a critical skill for the 21st century, and every person should develop the skills, dispositions, and knowledge that can help them realize their leadership potential. (B)

- One who works with emerging professionals in the field (i.e., master's and Ph.D. students) to help develop leadership competencies. (C)
- The profession of student affairs is about creating conditions to cultivate human flourishing; education about the choices these leaders make to foster human flourishing is required. (Q)
- Any campus leader and/or administrator who trains others in the campus community to thoughtfully engage theory, personal experience, and reflective insight to support student success on a college/university campus. (A)

Once the leadership educator has developed the necessary effective leadership competencies in themselves, then they are able to develop the competencies in their students. This view was shared by several respondents as is noted in the following quotes. A leadership educator is:

- [One who understands] the first step in leadership education is self-leadership. This may be the most common form of student affairs leadership education. But it soon progresses to students leading groups, programs, and teams. (K)
- One who encourages students to develop as leaders in the context of student affairs engagement. (D)

- A professional who is committed to help develop the leadership capacity and efficacy of students and colleagues with whom they work. (B)
- Any HESA [higher education student affairs] educator with a formal job position working with students in any capacity that builds leadership-related skills including any general learning and development opportunity to develop individuals who can potentially contribute to society. (P)
- A professional who works with students to develop their innate abilities to inspire others. (E)

### **Characteristics of Leadership Educator**

Participants in Group B were asked also to identify the characteristics of a student affairs leadership educator, with the aim being to gain a better insight into student affairs leadership educators. One theme emerged: leadership educators mentor students and no additional themes emerged for the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators. Participants in Group B underscored the developmental, helpful, and action-oriented aspects of mentoring students, as these four respondents noted.

- The student affairs leadership educator should be prepared to help the student through an understanding of the process [types of leadership choices, assess effectiveness of their activities and reflect on any learning that occurred] and pitfalls (K)

- [A leadership educator is] someone who has the ability to mutually construct desired goals and outcomes with others. (J)
- [A leadership educator is] someone who has vision. (J)
- [All ] student affairs practitioners have the responsibility to lead by example. (Q)

An alternative perspective was shared by the one Student Affairs Preparatory Program Director/Coordinator who did not believe student affairs practitioners were leadership educators when the person mentioned:

- A leadership educator can work with Student affairs, but they have a passion for leadership development, a good understanding of contemporary leadership theories, may conduct research or contribute to scholarship on leadership, teach leadership classes, present on leadership, and/or attend leadership-centered conferences (ALE, LEI, ILA, etc.). (M)

*Summary Analysis: Definition and Characteristics of a Leadership Educator*

Both student affairs practitioner/managers and student affairs preparatory program directors believe that student affairs practitioners are in fact leadership educators. Furthermore, both panels agreed that the defining characteristic of a student affairs leadership educator is that they actively mentor students. Only one participant per context-specific expert panel, meaning two of the thirty-two participants who completed round one or 6.3% of the total respondents, reported that student affairs

practitioners were not leadership educators. Even so, there was agreement within these two dissenting voices. They both denoted that leadership educators are those who know and practice leadership theories, teach academic credit-bearing leadership courses, and/or conduct leadership research; not typical job duties or responsibilities of entry-level student affairs practitioners.

Overall, two themes emerged from the data related to how leadership educators are defined. First, leadership educators have direct contact with students. Second, leadership educators have job descriptions that include leadership-specific initiatives. For the student affairs practitioners/managers, leadership education was seen as part of a larger, emergent leadership development process, where any student interested in developing their leadership capacity was welcomed and encouraged to participate. However, the student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators viewed leadership education to be more selective and to be most appropriate for those students currently serving in campus leadership positions or roles.

Yet, even though there was a high level of agreement that student affairs practitioners are leadership educators, there was disagreement between the two panels in the ways in which student affairs practitioners demonstrate leadership education. The student affairs practitioner panel viewed leadership and leadership education as a process. Thus, anyone who intentionally chooses to make leadership education a part of their job responsibilities while working directly with college students can and should be considered a leadership educator. To the contrary, the student affairs preparatory program director panel viewed leadership and leadership educators as a position or

functional area within a division of student affairs/student life requiring job-specific competence. Another difference was that only the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers panel mentioned the need for leadership educators to have previous experience with leadership, either in the classroom or through a leadership position.

While there was not agreement between the two panels pertaining to what it means to be a student affairs leadership educator, both panels did agree that a student affairs leadership educator could be characterized as a mentor. But once again, there was a difference between the two panels in how that characteristic was displayed. For the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers, leadership educators are mentors to their students. But the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors have a much broader view of mentoring. They feel leadership educators have a responsibility to mentor not only their undergraduate students, but also their fellow current and pre-service student affairs practitioners.

### **Research Question Two**

The second research question in this study was, What does competence in leadership education entail for entry-level student affairs practitioners? To address this research question, the following query was asked of all study participants: What leadership education knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes are required for entry-level student affairs practitioners?

This section documents the progression through each of the three Delphi rounds within the context of each expert panel, Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers and Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators. The analysis begins with Group A, and is broken down by competency area: knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes. The analysis culminates in listings of required leadership educator knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes, one listing each, for entry-level student affairs practitioners. Once the data for Group A is concluded, the data for Group B is presented in a similar manner. At the conclusion of this section, a summary comparing both sets of required competencies is discussed.

*Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers*

Seventeen Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (Group A) were included in this study in round 1. Two individuals withdrew from the study before the completion of round 1, an additional participant withdrew from the study in round 2, and another participant withdrew from the study in round 3, thereby leaving 13 members of the student affairs practitioners/managers context group at the end of the study.

**Round 1 Data**

Open-ended questions were used to solicit the maximum variation of opinion and breadth of responses from the participants. Separate space was not provided for the participants' responses to each component of the question, thus all of the data were mixed together. While some participants labeled their responses with the main categories of knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes, many did not. Consequently, the researcher had to separate the responses and place them into the appropriate category or



classification. Content analysis techniques were applied to group similar responses into unique statements or items (see Appendix A). At the conclusion of round 1, participants of Group A had identified 26 unique knowledge items, 32 unique skills items, and 35 separate abilities/attributes.

### **Round 2 Data**

The 93 unique statements regarding required leadership educator knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes generated from round 1 were included in the Round 2 survey. For readability and to reduce participant fatigue, the Round 2 survey was divided into component-specific blocks: required leadership educator knowledge (26 items), required leadership educator skills (32 items), and required leadership educator abilities/attributes (35 items).

In round 2, each participant was asked to rate the level of importance they associated with each of the statements generated from round 1, using a 5-point scale (*1 = Not at all Important, 2 = Slightly Important, 3 = Moderately Important, 4 = Important, and 5 = Extremely Important*). When determining which statements would be carried forward to round 3, a threshold was set a priori. In efforts to explore a wide variety of opinions, any statement where at least 50% ( $n \geq 8$ ) of the participants responded with either 'important' (rating of 4) or 'extremely important' (rating of 5) were carried over to the round 3 survey (Buriak & Shinn, 1989; Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004; Schmidt, 19997). An 'other' question was included at the end of each block to capture any additional items a participant felt was important but had not been included previously in the survey.

Tables 1 to 3 detail the round 2 responses for Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers regarding the knowledge (Table 1), skills (Table 2), and abilities/attributes (Table 3), required to be a successful entry-level student affairs leadership educator. Descriptive statistics, namely response percentages and frequency counts, were used to analyze the data. Items were organized within the tables in descending order, from the responses with the highest percentage ‘extremely important’ rating to the least. Of the 93 items included in the Round 2 survey, 71 items (19 knowledge, and 26 each for skills and abilities/attributes) met the aforementioned criteria to be carried forward to round 3. Additionally, the five items that emerged from the ‘other items’ question (4 knowledge items and 1 skills item) were also carried forward to round 3 for initial rating.

Table 1  
*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Knowledge Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (N = 14)*

Item	Responses % ( <i>f</i> )				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Knowledge of diversity and inclusion**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	78.6 (11)
Knowledge of experiential learning**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	21.4 (3)	64.3 (9)
Knowledge of self-understanding and understanding of others**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	35.7 (5)	57.1 (8)
Knowledge of community building**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	35.7 (5)	50.0 (7)
Knowledge of student development theory**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)
A willingness to explore leadership theories**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	42.9 (6)
Understanding of intentional program development**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	71.4 (10)	28.6 (4)
Knowledge of the theory of team and group dynamics**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	57.1 (8)	28.6 (4)

Table 1 (continued)

Knowledge of campus-based information**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	42.9 (6)	28.6 (4)
Basic understanding of leadership theories**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	35.7 (5)	35.7 (5)	28.6 (4)
Understanding of the leadership education desired at their particular institution**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	57.1 (8)	21.4 (3)
Understanding of the constructs of leader and leadership**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	57.1 (8)	21.4 (3)
Knowledge of leadership identity development**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	35.7 (5)	21.4 (3)
Knowledge of trends in student issues**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	64.3 (9)	14.3 (2)
Knowledge about leadership instruments/assessments**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	42.9 (6)	42.9 (6)	14.3 (2)
Knowledge of change agency and change processes**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	42.9 (6)	14.3 (2)
Core knowledge of ways to practice leadership**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	71.4 (10)	7.1 (1)
Understanding of where their own learning occurred**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)	7.1 (1)
Not one single set of core knowledge needed to be a leadership educator**	21.4 (3)	7.1 (1)	7.1 (1)	50.0 (7)	7.1 (1)
Progression of leadership theory	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	35.7 (5)	42.9 (6)	0.0 (0)
Research on leadership development	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	42.9 (6)	14.3 (2)	21.4 (3)
Knowledge of organizational management	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)
Knowledge of the social sector	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	57.1 (8)	14.3 (2)	7.1 (1)
Familiarity with the Leadership Competency outlined in the ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	42.9 (6)	21.4 (3)	14.3 (2)
Knowledge of the history of higher education	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	35.7 (5)	14.3 (2)	14.3 (2)
Knowledge of leadership competencies highlighted in Seemiller and Murray's work	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	50.0 (7)	28.6 (4)	0.0 (0)
<b>Other Items***</b>					
Knowledge of when to be a follower					
Knowledge of social justice					
Knowledge of how students learn leadership					
Knowledge of instructional strategies for leadership education, which expands curricular and co-curricular programs					

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

\*\*\* Items were included in Round 3 for initial rating.

Table 2  
*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Skills Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (N = 14)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Relationship building**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	35.7 (5)	64.3 (9)
Self-awareness**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	64.3 (9)
Awareness of others**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	64.3 (9)
Professionalism**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	21.4 (3)	64.3 (9)
Effective oral and written communication**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	57.1 (8)
Cultural competencies**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	42.9 (6)	50.0 (7)
Critical thinking**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	42.9 (6)	50.0 (7)
Reflection**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	57.1 (8)	35.7 (5)
Problem solving**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	7.1 (1)	50.0 (7)	35.7 (5)
Life-long learner**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	7.1 (1)	57.1 (8)	28.6 (4)
General leadership**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	50.0 (7)	28.6 (4)
Effective conflict negotiation**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	57.1 (8)	21.4 (3)
Student advocacy**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	50.0 (7)	21.4 (3)
Project and event planning**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	42.9 (6)	21.4 (3)
Well-organized**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	35.7 (5)	35.7 (5)	21.4 (3)
Effective teaching skills/strategies**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	35.7 (5)	21.4 (3)
Time management**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	35.7 (5)	35.7 (5)	21.4 (3)
Counseling/listening/ advising**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	85.7 (12)	14.3 (2)
Assessment practices**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	64.3 (9)	14.3 (2)
Effective presentation and facilitation**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	57.1 (8)	14.3 (2)
Administrative management**	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	14.3 (2)	50.0 (7)	14.3 (2)
Curriculum development**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	35.7 (5)	35.7 (5)	14.3 (2)
Meeting management	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	35.7 (5)	28.6 (4)	14.3 (2)

Table 2 (continued)

Coaching**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	64.3 (9)	7.1 (1)
Creative thinking**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	64.3 (9)	7.1 (1)
Mentoring**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	57.1 (8)	7.1 (1)
Communicating their perspective and offering insight to action**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	57.1 (8)	7.1 (1)
Leading multi-generational teams	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	50.0 (7)	35.7 (5)	0.0 (0)
There is not one set of core leadership education skills	21.4 (3)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	35.7 (5)	7.1 (1)
Objectively observe and summarize situations in need of intervention or organizational process in need of review	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	42.9 (6)	42.9 (6)	0.0 (0)
Practical strategic planning	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	42.9 (6)	35.7 (5)	0.0 (0)
Effective supervision	7.1 (1)	35.7 (5)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	0.0 (0)

**Other Item\*\*\***

Skill to understand policies and procedures

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

\*\*\* Item was included in Round 3 for initial rating.

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (N = 14)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Openness towards and inclusivity of all identities**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	92.9 (13)
Ability to communicate across differences**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	78.6 (11)
Ability to be an ethical decision-maker**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	14.3 (2)	71.4 (10)
Ability to work on a team**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	64.3 (9)
Ability to be a critical thinker**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	21.4 (3)	64.3 (9)
Desire to learn**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	57.1 (8)
Being a continuous learner**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	42.9 (6)	50.0 (7)
Ability to have difficult conversations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	35.7 (5)	50.0 (7)

Table 3 (continued)

Ability to work independently**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)
Ability to set goals**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	7.1 (1)	42.9 (6)	42.9 (6)
Ability to carry out a plan beyond a single event or program**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	57.1 (8)	35.7 (5)
Innovative**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	42.9 (6)	35.7 (5)
Patience**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	42.9 (6)	35.7 (5)
Positive attitude**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	42.9 (6)	35.7 (5)
Ability to hold people accountable**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	35.7 (5)	35.7 (5)
Ability to challenge students appropriately**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	57.1 (8)	28.6 (4)
Ability to focus on positive change**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	50.0 (7)	28.6 (4)
Ability to create strategies mapped to learning outcomes**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	42.9 (6)	28.6 (4)
Student empowerment and delegation**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	64.3 (9)	21.4 (3)
Desire to teach students**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)	21.4 (3)
Ability to help students identify ways to practice and find opportunities that will help them engage in challenge areas**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)	21.4 (3)
Willingness to provide constructive feedback to students**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	71.4 (10)	14.3 (2)
Ability to translate desired leadership education into learning outcomes for co-curricular**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	42.9 (6)	14.3 (2)
Ability to help students & others dig deep**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	64.3 (9)	7.1 (1)
Loosely bound to student performance – you can't force students to be better leaders, they have to do the work**	7.1 (1)	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)	7.1 (1)
Creative and innovative spirit**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	57.1 (8)	0.0 (0)
Direct experience leading a group	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	57.1 (8)	21.4 (3)	0.0 (0)
Event planning experience	7.1 (1)	7.1 (1)	50.0 (7)	21.4 (3)	14.3 (2)
Focus on youth development	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	42.9 (6)	28.6 (4)	0.0 (0)
Ability to relate to novice leaders	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	42.9 (6)	28.6 (4)	14.3 (2)
There is not one set of core leadership education abilities or attributes	21.4 (3)	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	7.1 (1)
Ability to facilitate consensus	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	42.9 (6)	35.7 (5)	0.0 (0)

Table 3 (continued)

Ability to develop a written long-term plan	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	57.1 (8)	21.4 (3)	7.1 (1)
Ability to communicate steps in a long-term plan to others	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	71.4 (10)	14.3 (2)	7.1 (1)
Ability to generate ideas/be creative	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	42.9 (6)	28.6 (4)	14.3 (2)

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

### Round 3 Data:

The focus of round 3 was developing consensus among the experts within the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (Group A) context group. Because the Delphi technique is an iterative process, each participant was provided the opportunity to review their item importance scores from round 2 in comparison to the item aggregate 'important' or 'extremely important' frequencies and counts of their fellow context group members. Participants were also given the opportunity to change their response to 'moderately important,' 'important,' or 'extremely important;' or to not make a change. Twelve of the thirteen Group A participants elected to change at least one of their round two scores.

At the end of round 3, Group A produced a grand total of 923 responses (13 participants x 71 items). More than 85% of these responses (n = 789) were not changed from round 2. This stability in the data indicates a certain level of confidence in the participants' responses. Of the 134 responses that were changed, 79.85% (f = 107), were changed to a higher level of importance; thereby only reinforcing the importance the participants associated with these items.

Five additional statements emerged from round 2 and were included at the end of the applicable section in the Round 3 survey. Participants were asked to indicate the level of importance they associated with each of these additional statements using the same 5-point scale as in the previous round.

Tables 4 to 6 detail the results from the Round 3 survey regarding required leadership educator knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes, respectively. Once again, the items were ordered from highest to lowest 'extremely important' frequency of response ratings. The threshold used to determine if an item moved to the next phase of the study was set a priori. At this stage of the study, the goal was not maximum variation in responses, but the consolidation or congruence of opinions. To that end, at the conclusion of round 3 any item for which 10 or more of the 13 participants, 75% or greater ( $n \geq 10$ ), rated an item as 'important' or 'extremely important' when the frequencies of both response options were summed, was deemed important and required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators. Of the five additional items advanced from round 2 to round 3, only two (both from the knowledge category) were deemed to be required for effective entry-level student affairs leadership educators.



Table 4  
*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Knowledge Round 3: Student Affairs  
 Practitioner/Managers (N = 13)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Diversity and inclusion**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	92.3 (12)
Experiential learning**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (4)	69.2 (9)
Self-understanding & understanding of others**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (4)	69.2 (9)
Student development theory**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	69.2 (9)
Willingness to explore leadership theories**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	23.1 (3)	53.8 (7)
Community building**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	53.8 (7)	46.2 (6)
Understanding of intentional program development**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	61.5 (8)	38.5 (5)
Theory of team and group dynamics**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	69.2 (9)	30.8 (4)
Understanding of the leadership education desired at their institution**	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	61.5 (8)	30.8 (4)
Basic understanding of leadership theories	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (4)	38.5 (5)	30.8 (4)
Campus-based information	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	38.5 (5)	30.8 (4)	30.8 (4)
Understanding of leader & leadership constructs**	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	7.7 (1)	61.5 (8)	23.1 (3)
Leadership identity development**	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	7.7 (1)	69.2 (9)	15.4 (2)
Leadership instruments/assessments**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)	15.4 (2)
Trends in student issues**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)	15.4 (2)
Change agency and change processes**	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	15.4 (2)	61.5 (8)	15.4 (2)
Ways to practice leadership**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	76.9 (10)	7.7 (1)
Not one single set of core knowledge needed	15.4 (2)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	61.5 (8)	7.7 (1)
Understanding of own learning	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	69.2 (9)	0.0 (0)
<b>New Items from Round 2</b>					
When to be a follower**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	69.2 (9)	15.4 (2)
Knowledge of social justice**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	61.5 (8)	30.8 (4)
How students learn leadership	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	46.2 (6)	30.8 (4)	23.1 (3)

Table 4 (continued)

Instructional strategies that expand curricular & co-curricular programs	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	46.2 (6)	23.1 (3)
--	---------	---------	----------	----------	----------

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

Table 5  
*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Skills Round 3: Student Affairs Practitioner/Managers (N = 13)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Professionalism**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	7.7 (1)	84.6 (11)
Relationship building**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	76.9 (10)
Self-awareness**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	76.9 (10)
Awareness of others**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	76.9 (10)
Effective oral and written communication**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	69.2 (9)
Cultural competencies**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	38.5 (5)	61.5 (8)
Critical thinking**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	38.5 (5)	53.8 (7)
Reflection**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	61.5 (8)	38.5 (5)
Time management	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	38.5 (5)	30.8 (4)	30.8 (4)
Problem solving**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	76.9 (10)	23.1 (3)
Counseling/listening/advising**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	76.9 (10)	23.1 (3)
Life-long learner**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	61.5 (8)	23.1 (3)
Student advocacy**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	53.8 (7)	23.1 (3)
Effective conflict negotiation**	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	15.4 (2)	53.8 (7)	23.1 (3)
Curriculum development	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	30.8 (4)	38.5 (5)	23.1 (3)
General leadership**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	69.2 (9)	15.4 (2)
Project and event planning**	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	15.4 (2)	61.5 (8)	15.4 (2)
Well-organized**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)	15.4 (2)
Effective presentation and facilitation**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)	15.4 (2)

Table 5 (continued)

Administrative management	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (4)	53.8 (7)	15.4 (2)
Effective teaching skills/strategies	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	23.1 (3)	46.2 (6)	15.4 (2)
Coaching**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	84.6 (11)	7.7 (1)
Communicating their perspective of a situation and offering insight to action**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	76.9 (10)	7.7 (1)
Assessment practices**	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	15.4 (2)	69.2 (9)	7.7 (1)
Mentoring**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	69.2 (9)	7.7 (1)
Creative thinking	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)	7.7 (1)
<b>Other Item from Round 2</b>					
Skill to understand policies and procedures	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	46.2 (6)	23.1 (3)

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes Round 3: Student Affairs Practitioner/Managers (N = 13)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Openness towards and inclusivity of all identities**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	100 (13)
Communicate across differences**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	92.3 (12)
Work on a team**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	84.6 (11)
Ethical decision-maker**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	76.9 (10)
Critical thinker**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	38.5 (5)	61.5 (8)
Desire to learn**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	30.8 (4)	61.5 (8)
Have difficult conversations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)
Work independently**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)
Hold people accountable**	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	15.4 (2)	30.8 (4)	46.2 (6)
Being a continuous learner**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	46.2 (6)	42.6 (6)
Set goals**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	38.5 (5)	42.6 (6)

Table 6 (continued)

Carry out a devised plan beyond a single event or program**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	53.8 (7)	38.5 (5)
Create strategies mapped to learning outcomes**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	46.2 (6)	38.5 (5)
Patience**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	46.2 (6)	38.5 (5)
Positive attitude**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	46.2 (6)	38.5 (5)
Focus on positive change**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	46.2 (6)	30.8 (4)
Challenge students appropriately**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	76.9 (10)	23.1 (3)
Desire to teach students**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	69.2 (9)	23.1 (3)
Student empowerment and delegation**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	76.9 (10)	15.4 (2)
Willingness to provide constructive feedback to students**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	69.2 (9)	15.4 (2)
Initiative	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (4)	53.8 (7)	15.4 (2)
Translate desired leadership education into learning outcomes for co-curricular learning	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	38.5 (5)	38.5 (5)	15.4 (2)
Help students and others dig deep**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	92.3 (12)	7.7 (1)
Help students identify ways to practice and find opportunities that will help them engage in challenge areas**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	69.2 (9)	7.7 (1)
Loosely bound to student performance – you can't force students to be better leaders, they have to do the work	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)	7.7 (1)
Creative and innovative spirit	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	53.8 (7)	38.5 (5)	0.0 (0)

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

## Required Student Affairs Leadership Educator Competencies as Reported by

### Group A

To answer Research Question 2, what are the required leadership educator competencies of entry-level student affairs practitioners, the data from round 3 were treated as dichotomous data. An item was either “required” or “not required.” For purposes of this study, required was determined by summing the frequency counts of the

'important' and 'extremely important' responses from the specific expert panel to create an absolute value score. Any item with an absolute value score greater than or equal to 10 (greater than a supermajority of 75%) was deemed required. All other items were categorized as not required and were removed from the study.

Tables 7 to 9 detail the required knowledge (Table 7), skills (Table 8), and abilities/attributes (Table 9) for entry-level student affairs practitioners. Table 7 details the 17 knowledge items deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators. The items were organized in descending order, from the highest absolute value score to the least. When there was a tie in the scores, the higher frequency count for 'extremely important' was used to break the tie, and that item was placed ahead of the other(s). If there was a tie with the absolute value scores and the 'extremely important' counts were the same, then the researcher used the counts of the subsequent categories in order, (important, then moderately important, etc.) to break the tie. Rank ordering the items by the absolute value score provided a means to measure the strength of the importance placed on each item.

Table 7  
*Required Leadership Educator Knowledge: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (N = 13)*

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Diversity and inclusion	1
Experiential learning	2 (tied)
Self-understanding and understanding of others	2 (tied)
Community building	4
Understanding of intentional program development	5
Theory of team and group dynamics	6
Student development theory	7
Social justice	8
Understanding of the leadership education desired at their institution	9
Understanding of the constructs of leader and leadership	10
When to be a follower	11
Leadership identity development	12
Ways to practice leadership	13
Willingness to explore leadership theories	14
Leadership instruments/assessments	15 (tied)
Trends in student issues	15 (tied)
Change agency and change processes	17

Table 8 specifies the 21 skills required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators. The items were organized in a similar fashion to the required knowledge items. The same method was used when dealing with ties. The absolute value scores were employed to measure the strength of the importance Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers placed on each item. Responses that did not meet the 75%

threshold were categorized as non-important for entry-level student affairs leadership educators and removed from the study.

Table 8  
*Required Leadership Educator Skills: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (N = 13)*

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Relationship building	1 (tied)
Self-awareness	1 (tied)
Awareness of others	1 (tied)
Cultural competencies	4
Reflection	5
Problem solving	6 (tied)
Counseling/listening/ advising	6 (tied)
Professionalism	8
Effective oral and written communication	9
Critical thinking	10
Coaching	11
Life-long learner	12
General leadership	13
Communicating their perspective and offering insight to action	14
Student advocacy	15
Effective conflict negotiation	16
Well-organized	17 (tied)
Effective presentation and facilitation	17 (tied)
Project and event planning	19
Mentoring	20
Assessment practices	21

Table 9 lists the 22 abilities or attributes judged necessary for entry-level student affairs leadership educators. The items were organized in descending order, from the highest absolute values score to the least. The abilities and attributes data were handled in the same manner as the knowledge and skills data. Once again, the strength of the importance placed on each item was measured by ranking the absolute value scores. Those responses that did not meet the 75% cut off point were categorized as non-important for entry-level student affairs leadership educators.

Table 9  
*Required Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers*  
 (N = 13)

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Openness towards and inclusivity of all identities	1
Communicate across differences	2
Work on a team	3
Ethical decision-maker	4
Critical thinker	5
Challenge students appropriately	6
Help students and others dig deep	7
Desire to learn	8
Being a continuous learner	9
Carry out a devised plan beyond a single event or program	10
Desire to teach students	11
Student empowerment and delegation	12
Have difficult conversations	13 (tied)



Table 9 (continued)

Work independently	13 (tied)
Set goals	15
Patience	16 (tied)
Positive attitude	16 (tied)
Create strategies mapped to learning outcomes	16 (tied)
Willingness to provide constructive feedback to students	19
Hold people accountable	20
Focus on positive change	21
Help students identify ways to practice and find opportunities that will help them engage in challenge areas	22

*Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators*

Twenty Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (Group B) were included in this study in round 1. Three individuals withdrew from the study in the first round, one additional faculty member withdrew from the study in round 2, and another faculty member withdrew from the study in round 3; thereby leaving 15 members of the student affairs faculty context group at the end of the study.

**Round 1 Data**

Open-ended questions were used to garner the maximum variation of opinion and range of responses from the participants. Separate space was not provided for the participants' responses to each component of the question; therefore, the data for the three competency components were combined. While some participants labeled their responses in accordance with the main categories of knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes, many did not. Consequently, the researcher separated the responses

and grouped them in the appropriate category or classification using content analysis techniques. For a complete listing of all initial items, see Appendix A. At the conclusion of round one, participants of Group B had identified 34 unique knowledge items, 30 unique skills items, and 53 separate abilities/attributes.

### **Round 2 Data**

There were 117 unique statements generated from round 1 and included in the Round 2 survey. To reduce participant fatigue and for ease of analysis, the Round 2 survey was divided into component-specific blocks: required leadership educator knowledge (34 items), skills (30 items), and abilities/attributes (53 items).

As was done with Group A, each participant in Group B was asked to rate the level of importance they associated with each statement generated from round one, using a 5-point scale (*1 = Not at all Important, 2 = Slightly Important, 3 = Moderately Important, 4 = Important, and 5 = Extremely Important*). When determining which statements would be carried forward to round 3, a threshold was set a priori. In efforts to explore a wide variety of opinions, any statement where at least 50% ( $n \geq 8$ ) of the participants responded with either ‘important’ (rating of 4) or ‘extremely important’ (rating of 5) were carried over to the Round 3 survey (Buriak & Shinn, 1989; Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004; Schmidt, 1997). An ‘other’ question was included at the end of each block to capture any additional items the participants felt were important but had not been included previously in the survey.

Tables 10 to 12 detail the round 2 responses for Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators regarding the leadership educator

knowledge (Table 10), skills (Table 11), and abilities/attributes (Table 12), required of entry-level student affairs practitioners. Descriptive statistics, namely response percentages and frequency counts were used to analyze the data. Items were organized within the tables in descending order, from the responses with the highest percentage ‘extremely important’ rating to the least. Of the 117 items included in the Round 2 survey, 100 items (25 knowledge, all 30 skills, and 45 abilities/attributes) met the aforementioned criteria to be carried forward to round 3. Additionally, the six items that emerged from the ‘other items’ question (four knowledge items and one each for skills and abilities/attributes) were also carried forward to round 3 for initial rating.

Table 10  
*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Knowledge Round 2: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 16)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Knowledge of when to refer a student to other campus resources**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	81.3 (13)
Theoretical underpinning of student development theory**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	75.0 (12)
An understanding of how identity plays into the experience of college for diverse subpopulations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	68.8 (11)
Practical and conceptual understanding of the college experience and different pathways thereof**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	62.5 (10)
Understanding of diverse student subpopulations throughout higher education at large**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	62.5 (10)
Deep understanding of diversity, inclusion, privilege, oppression, and power dynamics**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	62.5 (10)
Knowledge of self **	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	31.3 (5)	62.5 (10)
Knowledge of ethical standards**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	31.3 (5)	62.5 (10)

Table 10 (continued)

Understanding of diverse student subpopulations within specific institution**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	25.0 (4)	62.5 (10)
Theoretical understanding of college environments and organizations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	43.8 (7)	56.3 (9)
Knowledge of how to infuse practice with theory**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	37.5 (6)	43.8 (7)
Understanding of group dynamics **	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	43.8 (7)	37.5 (6)
Knowledge of research about college students**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	56.3 (9)	31.3 (5)
Knowledge of program evaluation and assessment**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	50.0 (8)	31.3 (5)
Understanding of one's role within the institution**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	43.8 (7)	31.3 (5)
Basic understanding of leadership theory**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	6.3 (1)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)
An understanding of the political campus environment and how to navigate it**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)
Understanding of the important role of context in leadership development and education**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	37.5 (6)	31.3 (5)	25.0 (4)
Knowledge of social justice**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	62.5 (10)	18.8 (3)
Knowledge of higher education governance**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	18.8 (3)	50.0 (8)	18.8 (3)
Understanding of the emergence and growth of student affairs as a profession**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	31.3 (5)	31.3 (5)	18.8 (3)
Knowledge that leadership does not require a position/ title**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	37.5 (6)	43.8 (7)	12.5 (2)
Understanding of the history of US higher education**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	31.3 (5)	43.8 (7)	12.5 (2)
Deep understanding of the inner workings of a particular functional area **	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	25.0 (4)	37.5 (6)	12.5 (2)
Knowledge of the fundamentals of higher education law**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	56.3 (9)	6.3 (1)
Understanding of enrollment trends	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	50.0 (8)	43.8 (7)	0.0 (0)
Deep understanding of multiple functional areas	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	43.8 (7)	31.3 (5)	0.0 (0)
Knowledge of ACPA/NASPA professional competency in leadership	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	37.5 (6)	43.8 (7)	0.0 (0)
Knowledge of ACPA/NASPA professional competencies in general	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)	18.8 (3)
An understanding of at least the Social Change Model	0.0 (0)	37.5 (5)	31.3 (5)	37.5 (6)	0.0 (0)
Understanding of development as an avenue to impact positive change	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	43.8 (7)	43.8 (7)	0.0 (0)
Understanding team motivation	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	25.0 (4)	37.5 (6)	6.3 (1)

Table 10 (continued)

Knowledge of the evolution of leadership theory	6.3 (1)	43.8 (7)	37.5 (5)	12.5 (2)	6.3 (1)
---	---------	----------	----------	----------	---------

**Other Items\*\*\***

Concept of managing from the middle

Knowledge of how to accept feedback and make behavioral modifications

Relational aspects of leader-follower relationships/opportunities

Personal definitions of leadership

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

\*\*\* Items were included in Round 3 for initial rating.

Table 11

*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Skills Round 2: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 16)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Problem solving**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	81.3 (13)
Listening**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	81.3 (13)
Effective oral & written communication **	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	81.3 (13)
Critical thinking**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	75.0 (12)
Effectively work with diverse individuals**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	31.3 (5)	68.8 (11)
Interpersonal**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	25.0 (4)	62.5 (10)
Excellent time management**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	31.3 (5)	18.8 (3)	50.8 (8)
Effectively working with teams**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	6.3 (1)	43.8 (7)	43.8 (7)
Effective self-reflection**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	18.8 (3)	31.3 (5)	43.8 (7)
Organization**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	6.3 (1)	50.0 (8)	37.5 (6)
Resilience**	6.3 (1)	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	37.5 (6)	37.5 (6)
Running an effective meeting**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	6.3 (1)	43.8 (7)	31.3 (5)
Conflict resolution/ management**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	12.5 (2)	43.8 (7)	31.3 (5)
Learn the culture of the office**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	12.5 (2)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)

Table 11 (continued)

Effective dialogue**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	18.8 (3)	37.5 (6)	25.0 (4)
Group facilitation**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	18.8 (3)	56.3 (9)	18.8 (3)
Event/program planning**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	25.0 (4)	37.5 (6)	18.8 (3)
Create and sustain healthy environments**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	6.3 (1)	75.0 (12)	12.5 (2)
Public speaking**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	68.8 (11)	12.5 (2)
Build programs to meet desired outcomes**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	62.5 (10)	12.5 (2)
Crisis/emergency management**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	56.3 (9)	12.5 (2)
Supervision**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	18.8 (3)	50.0 (8)	12.5 (2)
Advising student orgs**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	31.3 (5)	50.0 (8)	12.5 (2)
Counseling **	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	31.3 (5)	50.0 (8)	12.5 (2)
Delegation**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	18.8 (3)	50.0 (8)	12.5 (2)
Enhancing group morale**	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	12.5 (2)	50.0 (8)	12.5 (2)
Restorative practices**	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	25.0 (4)	43.8 (7)	12.5 (2)
Basic research/assessment**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	18.8 (3)	62.5 (10)	6.3 (1)
Establish a strong vision for a group**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	37.5 (6)	50.0 (8)	6.3 (1)
Entrepreneurial thinking with an eye towards innovation**	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	18.8 (3)	56.3 (9)	0.0 (0)

**Other Items**

Creativity\*\*\*

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

\*\*\* Item was included in Round 3 for initial rating.

Table 12  
*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes Round 2: Student Affairs  
 Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 16)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Learn from mistakes**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	81.3 (13)
Respect for all students**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	31.3 (5)	68.8 (11)
Trustworthiness**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	68.8 (11)
Multicultural competence**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	68.8 (11)
Willing to learn/grow**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	68.8 (11)
Sensitivity to the needs and experiences of individuals and diverse subpopulations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	31.3 (5)	62.5 (10)
Flexibility or adaptability**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	31.3 (5)	62.5 (10)
Committed to equity and inclusion**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	31.3 (5)	62.5 (10)
Enjoys working with students**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	18.8 (3)	62.5 (10)
Willing to mentor and be mentored**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	6.3 (1)	31.3 (5)	56.3 (9)
Willing to be challenged and questioned**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	31.3 (5)	50.0 (8)
Support those with whom personal values and beliefs may differ**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	50.0 (8)	43.8 (7)
Authenticity**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	12.5 (2)	31.3 (5)	43.8 (7)
Can articulate the importance of student affairs and its impact on student success, engagement, learning, and development**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	18.8 (3)	31.3 (5)	43.8 (7)
Motivation/ being a self-starter**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	37.5 (6)	37.5 (6)
Understanding one's own needs**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	18.8 (3)	37.5 (6)	37.5 (6)
Empathetic**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	25.0 (4)	25.0 (4)	37.5 (6)
Hard working**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	56.3 (9)	31.3 (5)
Developed sense of responsibility**	6.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	50.0 (8)	31.3 (5)
Compassion**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	50.0 (8)	31.3 (5)
Ask clarifying questions**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	12.5 (2)	43.8 (7)	31.3 (5)
Develop leadership capacity in diverse students in or out of the classroom**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	68.8 (11)	25.0 (4)
Build community**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)

Table 12 (continued)

Can articulate the importance of college for students**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	18.8 (3)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)
Patience**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	43.8 (7)	25.0 (4)
Desire to contribute to a better world**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	43.8 (7)	25.0 (4)
Effectively communicate with multiple stakeholders**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	37.5 (6)	25.0 (4)
Conscious choice-making**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	37.5 (6)	31.3 (5)	25.0 (4)
Analyze situations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	62.5 (10)	18.8 (3)
Willing to challenge and question others**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	12.5 (2)	56.3 (9)	18.8 (3)
Insight into the ways actual college experiences deviates from the theoretical**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	12.5 (2)	50.0 (8)	18.8 (3)
Foresee possible outcomes of decisions/actions**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	50.0 (8)	18.8 (3)
Can articulate the impact leadership experiences and skills may have on students**	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	18.8 (3)	43.8 (7)	18.8 (3)
Build effective teams**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	25.0 (4)	37.5 (6)	18.8 (3)
Think outside the box**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	31.3 (5)	37.5 (6)	18.8 (3)
Communicate conceptual ideas through practical lens**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	31.3 (5)	37.5 (6)	18.8 (3)
Persistence to help students recognize and internalize mistakes, good decisions, missed opportunities, and to celebrate achievements**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	6.3 (1)	68.8 (11)	12.5 (2)
Develop alternative pathways when advising students**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	56.3 (9)	12.5 (2)
Self-confidence**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	56.3 (9)	12.5 (2)
Understand and support institutional policy**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	56.3 (9)	12.5 (2)
Mediate and bring groups to consensus**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	18.8 (3)	56.3 (9)	12.5 (2)
Develop others**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	31.3 (5)	50.0 (8)	12.5 (2)
Respond to broad-based constituencies and issues**	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	25.0 (4)	37.5 (6)	12.5 (2)
Have vision for the “big picture”**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	37.5 (6)	50.0 (8)	6.3 (1)
Calculated risk-taking**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	31.3 (5)	50.0 (8)	0.0 (0)
Charismatic (but not necessarily extroverted)	12.5 (2)	31.3 (5)	43.8 (7)	12.5 (2)	0.0 (0)
Capacity to persuade, argue, and debate	6.3 (1)	18.8 (3)	62.5 (10)	12.5 (2)	0.0 (0)



Table 12 (continued)

Capacity to negotiate	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	62.5 (10)	25.0 (4)	12.5 (2)
Strong personal vision	6.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)	18.8 (3)
Political acumen/political savvy	6.3 (1)	18.8 (3)	31.3 (5)	37.5 (6)	6.3 (1)
Patience to observe “failure”	6.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	43.8 (7)	37.5 (6)	6.3 (1)
Being able to envision, plan and affect change in an organization	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	43.8 (7)	31.3 (5)	0.0 (0)
Help others become active citizens in their community	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)	6.3 (1)

**Other Items**

Understanding of service-learning\*\*\*

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

\*\*\* Item was included in Round 3 for initial rating.

**Round 3 Data**

Round 3 was focused on cultivating consensus among the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Director/Coordinator experts within Group B. Due to the iterative process that is a Delphi, each participant was presented with the opportunity to review their individual item importance score from round 2 in comparison to the item aggregate ‘important’ or ‘extremely important’ frequencies and counts of their fellow context group members. Participants had the chance to change their response to ‘moderately important,’ ‘important,’ or ‘extremely important;’ or to keep it as was from round 2. All but three of the Group B participants chose to change at least one of their round 2 item scores. A total of six additional statements emerged from round 2 and were included at the end of the applicable section.

At the end of round 3, Group B provided 1,500 item responses (15 participants x 100 items). Of these responses, over 86% (n = 1,296) were not changed from round 2.

This stability in the data represents a level of confidence in the participants' responses. Of the 204 responses that were changed, 89.22% (n = 182) were changed to a higher level of importance; reinforcing the initial importance the participants associated with these items.

A total of six additional statements emerged from round 2 and were included at the end of the applicable section in the Round 3 survey. Participants were asked to indicate the level of importance they associated with each of these additional statements using the same 5-point scale as in the previous round.

Tables 13 to 15 detail the results from the Round 3 survey regarding required leadership educator knowledge (Table 13), skills (Table 14), and abilities/attributes (Table 15). Once again, the items were ordered from highest to lowest 'extremely important' frequency of response ratings. The threshold used to determine if an item moved to the next phase of the study was set a priori. At this stage of the study, the goal was not maximum variation in responses, but the consolidation or congruence of opinions. To that end, at the conclusion of round 3 any item where a supermajority, 75% or more (n ≥ 12), of participants rated an item as 'important' or 'extremely important' when the frequencies of both response options were summed, was deemed important and required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators. Of the six additional items advanced from round 2 to round 3, only one knowledge item was deemed to be required for effective entry-level student affairs leadership educators.

Table 13  
*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Knowledge Round 3: Student Affairs  
 Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Theoretical underpinning of student development theory**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	80.0 (12)
When to refer a student to other campus resources**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	80.0 (12)
Understanding of diverse student subpopulations within institution**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	13.3 (2)	80.0 (12)
Understanding of how identity plays into the experience of college for diverse subpopulations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	13.3 (2)	80.0 (12)
Practical and conceptual understanding of the college experience and different pathways thereof**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	66.7 (10)
Understanding of diverse student subpopulations throughout higher education at large**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	66.7 (10)
Deep understanding of diversity, inclusion, privilege, oppression, and power**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	66.7 (10)
Ethical standards**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	66.7 (10)
Knowledge of self **	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	20.0 (3)	66.7 (10)
Theoretical understanding of college environments and organizations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (6)	60.0 (9)
How to infuse practice with theory**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	33.3 (5)	46.7 (7)
Research about college students**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	66.7 (10)	33.3 (5)
Understanding of group dynamics**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	46.7 (7)	33.3 (5)
Basic understanding of leadership theory**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	66.7 (10)	26.7 (4)
Program evaluation and assessment**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	60.0 (9)	26.7 (4)
Understanding of the political campus environment and how to navigate that environment**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	53.3 (8)	26.7 (4)
Understanding of the important role of context in leadership development and education	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	40.0 (6)	26.7 (4)
Social justice**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	73.3 (11)	20.0 (3)
Higher education governance**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	66.7 (10)	20.0 (3)
Understanding of one's role within the institution**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	60.0 (9)	20.0 (3)

Table 13 (continued)

Understanding of the emergence and growth of student affairs as a profession	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	20.0 (3)	53.3 (8)	20.0 (3)
Understanding of the history of US higher education**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	13.3 (2)	66.7 (10)	13.3 (2)
Leadership does not require a position/title	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	60.0 (9)	13.3 (2)
Deep understanding of the inner workings of a particular functional area	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	33.3 (5)	40.0 (6)	6.7 (1)
Fundamentals of higher education law**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	73.3 (11)	6.7 (1)
<b>New Items from Round 2</b>					
Concept of managing from the middle	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	40.0 (6)	20.0 (3)	6.7 (1)
Knowledge of how to accept feedback and make behavioral modifications**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	53.3 (8)	40.0 (6)
Relational aspects of leader-follower relationships/ opportunities	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	26.7 (4)	46.7 (7)	13.3 (2)
Personal definitions of leadership	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	53.3 (8)	33.3 (5)	0.0 (0)

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

Table 14

*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Skills Round 3: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Problem solving**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	86.7 (13)
Listening**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	86.7 (13)
Effective oral & written communication**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	86.7 (13)
Critical thinking**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	86.7 (13)
Interpersonal**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	73.3 (11)
Effectively work with diverse individuals**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	66.7 (10)
Effective self-reflection**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	33.3 (5)	60.0 (9)
Excellent time management**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	33.3 (5)	53.3 (8)
Effectively working with teams**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	53.3 (8)	46.7 (7)
Resilience	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	26.7 (4)	46.7 (7)

Table 14 (continued)

Organization**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	46.7 (7)	40.0 (6)
Learn the culture of the office**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	53.3 (8)	33.3 (5)
Conflict resolution/ management**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	46.7 (7)	33.3 (5)
Effective dialogue	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	13.3 (2)	40.0 (6)	33.3 (5)
Running an effective meeting**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	60.0 (9)	26.7 (4)
Group facilitation**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	80.0 (12)	20.0 (3)
Crisis/emergency management**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	66.7 (10)	20.0 (3)
Event/program planning	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	53.3 (8)	20.0 (3)
Create and sustain healthy environments**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	80.0 (12)	13.3 (2)
Building programs to meet desired outcomes**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	80.0 (12)	13.3 (2)
Restorative practices**	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	6.7 (1)	66.7 (10)	13.3 (2)
Advising (student orgs)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	60.0 (9)	13.3 (2)
Supervision	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	26.7 (4)	53.3 (8)	13.3 (2)
Public speaking**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	80.0 (12)	6.7 (1)
Establish a strong vision for a group**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	73.3 (11)	6.7 (1)
Counseling	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	66.7 (10)	6.7 (1)
Delegation	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	13.3 (2)	66.7 (10)	6.7 (1)
Enhancing group morale	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	26.7 (4)	60.0 (9)	6.7 (1)
Basic research/assessment**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	86.7 (13)	0.0 (0)
Entrepreneurial thinking with an eye towards innovation	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	26.7 (4)	60.0 (9)	0.0 (0)
<b>New Item from Round 2</b>					
Creativity	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	46.7 (7)	46.7 (7)	6.7 (1)

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

Table15  
*Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes Round 3: Student Affairs  
 Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Learn from mistakes**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	86.7 (13)
Committed to equity and inclusion**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	80.0 (12)
Trustworthiness**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	73.3 (11)
Willing to learn/grow**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	73.3 (11)
Flexibility or adaptability**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	73.3 (11)
Enjoys working with students**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	73.3 (11)
Multicultural competence**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	66.7 (10)
Respect for all students**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	66.7 (10)
Sensitivity to needs and experiences of individuals & diverse subpopulations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	26.7 (4)	66.7 (10)
Articulate the importance of student affairs and its impact on student success, engagement, learning, & development**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	20.0 (3)	66.7 (10)
Willing to mentor and be mentored**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	33.3 (5)	60.0 (9)
Authenticity**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	33.3 (5)	60.0 (9)
Willing to be challenged & questioned**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	26.7 (4)	60.0 (9)
Motivation/being a self-starter**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	33.3 (5)	46.7 (7)
Support those with whom personal values and beliefs may differ**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	46.7 (7)	40.0 (6)
Understanding one's own needs**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	46.7 (7)	40.0 (6)
Empathetic**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	46.7 (7)	40.0 (6)
Compassion**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	53.3 (8)	33.3 (5)
Ask clarifying questions**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	53.3 (8)	33.3 (5)
Develop leadership capacity in diverse students in or out of the classroom**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	73.3 (11)	26.7 (4)
Hard working**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	66.7 (10)	26.7 (4)
Developed sense of responsibility**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	60.0 (9)	26.7 (4)

Table 15 (continued)

Effectively communicate with multiple stakeholders**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	53.3 (8)	26.7 (4)
Articulate the impact leadership skills and experiences have on students**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20. (3)	53.3 (8)	26.7 (4)
Communicate conceptual ideas through practical lens**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	53.3 (8)	26.7 (4)
Can articulate the importance of college for students	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	20.0 (3)	46.7 (7)	26.7 (4)
Conscious choice-making	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	26.7 (4)	40.0 (6)	26.7 (4)
Analyze situations**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	80.0 (12)	20.0 (3)
Foresee possible outcomes of decisions**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	80.0 (12)	20.0 (3)
Willing to challenge & question others**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	73.3 (11)	20.0 (3)
Build community**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	66.7 (10)	20.0 (3)
Patience**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	66.7 (10)	20.0 (3)
Desire to contribute to a better world**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	60.0 (9)	20.0 (3)
Insight into how college experiences deviate from the theoretical**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	60.0 (9)	20.0 (3)
Respond to broad-based constituencies and issues	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	20.0 (3)	53.3 (8)	20.0 (3)
Think outside the box	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	46.7 (7)	20.0 (3)
Persistence to help students recognize mistakes, good decisions, missed opportunities, & celebrate deeds**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	80.0 (12)	13.3 (2)
Understand & support institutional policy**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	73.3 (11)	13.3 (2)
Develop others**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	66.7 (10)	13.3 (2)
Self-confidence**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	66.7 (10)	13.3 (2)
Develop alternative pathways when advising students	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	60.0 (9)	13.3 (2)
Build effective teams	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	20.0 (3)	53.3 (8)	13.3 (2)
Mediate and bring groups to consensus**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	73.3 (11)	6.7 (1)
Have vision for the “big picture”**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	73.3 (11)	6.7 (1)
Calculated risk-taking	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	26.7 (4)	60.0 (9)	0.0 (0)
<b>New Item from Round 2</b>					
Understanding of service-learning	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	80.0 (12)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

## **Required Student Affairs Leadership Educator Competencies as Reported by Group B**

To answer Research Question 2, what are the required leadership educator competencies of entry-level student affairs practitioners, the scale data from round 3 were treated as dichotomous data. An item was either “required” or “not required.” For this study, required was determined by summing the frequency counts of the ‘important’ and ‘extremely important’ responses per expert panel; thereby creating an absolute value score. Any item with an absolute value score greater than or equal to 12 (the supermajority of 75%) was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators. All other items were categorized as not required and were removed from the study.

Tables 16 to 18 detail the required knowledge (Table 16), skills (Table 17), and abilities/attributes (Table 18) for entry-level student affairs practitioners as reported by the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators expert panel. Table 16 details the 22 knowledge items deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators. The items were organized in descending order, from the highest absolute value score to the least. In cases of a tie, the higher frequency count for ‘extremely important’ was used to break the tie, and that item was placed ahead of the other(s). If the ‘extremely important’ counts were the same, the researcher used the counts of the subsequent categories in order, (important, then moderately important, etc.) to break the tie. Ordering items by the absolute value score provided a measure of the strength of the importance placed on each item.



Table 16  
*Required Leadership Educator Knowledge: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/  
 Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Theoretical underpinning of student development theory	1 (tied)
When to refer a student to other campus resources	1 (tied)
Practical and conceptual understanding of the college experience and different pathways thereof	3 (tied)
Understanding of diverse student subpopulations throughout higher education at large	3 (tied)
Deep understanding of diversity, inclusion, privilege, oppression, and power dynamics	3 (tied)
Ethical standards	3 (tied)
Theoretical understanding of college environments and organizations	7
Research about college students	8
Understanding of diverse student subpopulations within specific institution	9 (tied)
Understanding of how identity plays into the experience of college for diverse subpopulations	9 (tied)
Knowledge of how to accept feedback and make behavioral modifications	11
Social justice	12
Basic understanding of leadership theory	13
Knowledge of self	14
Program evaluation and assessment	15
Higher education governance	16
How to infuse practice with theory	17
Understanding of group dynamics	18
Understanding of the political campus environment and how to navigate that environment	19
Understanding of one's role within the institution	20
Understanding of the history of US higher education	21
Fundamentals of higher education law	22

Table 17 specifies the 21 skills required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators. The items were organized in a similar fashion to the required knowledge items. The same methodology was used when dealing with ties. The absolute values scores were employed to measure the strength of the importance Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers placed on each item.

Table 17  
*Required Leadership Educator Skills: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/  
 Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Problem solving	1 (tied)
Listening	1 (tied)
Effective communication (oral and written)	1 (tied)
Critical thinking	1 (tied)
Interpersonal	5
Effectively work with diverse individuals	6
Effectively working with teams	7
Group Facilitation	8
Effective self-reflection	9
Create and sustain healthy environments	10 (tied)
Building programs to meet desired outcomes	10 (tied)
Excellent time management	12
Organization	13
Learn the culture of the office	14
Running an effective meeting	15
Crisis/emergency management	16

Table 17 (continued)

Public speaking	17
Basic research/assessment	18
Conflict resolution/ management	19
Restorative practices	20
Establish a strong vision for a group	21

Table 18 lists the 37 abilities or attributes judged necessary for entry-level student affairs leadership educators. The items were organized in descending order, from the highest absolute value score to the least. The ordering of the abilities and attributes data was handled in the same manner as the knowledge and skills data. Once again, the strength of the importance placed on each item was measured by ranking the absolute value scores. Those items that did not meet the 75% cut off point were categorized as non-important for entry-level student affairs leadership educators.

Table 18  
*Required Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes: Student Affairs Preparatory Program  
 Directors/Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Learn from mistakes	1
Committed to equity and inclusion	2
Willing to learn/grow	3 (tied)
Flexibility or adaptability	3 (tied)
Trustworthiness	3 (tied)
Respect for all students	6 (tied)

Table 18 (continued)

---

Multicultural competence	6 (tied)
Develop leadership capacity in diverse students in or out of the classroom	8
Analyze situations	9 (tied)
Foresee possible outcomes of decisions/actions	9 (tied)
Enjoys working with students	11
Sensitivity to the needs and experiences of individuals & diverse subpopulations	12
Authenticity	13 (tied)
Willing to mentor and be mentored	13 (tied)
Hard working	15
Willing to challenge and question others	16
Persistence to help students recognize and internalize mistakes, good decisions, missed opportunities, and to celebrate achievements	17
Articulate the importance of student affairs and its impact on student success, engagement, learning, and development	18
Willing to be challenged and questioned	19
Understanding one's own needs	20 (tied)
Empathetic	20 (tied)
Support those with whom personal values and beliefs may differ	20 (tied)
Developed sense of responsibility	23
Compassion	24
Ask clarifying questions	25
Build community	26 (tied)
Patience	26 (tied)
Understand and support institutional policy	28
Motivation/being a self-starter	29
Articulate the impact that leadership experiences and skills have on students	30 (tied)
Communicate conceptual ideas through practical lens	30 (tied)
Effectively communicate with multiple stakeholders	32
Desire to contribute to a better world	33 (tied)

---

Table 18 (continued)

Insight into the ways college experiences deviate from the theoretical	33 (tied)
Develop others	35 (tied)
Self-confidence	35 (tied)
Mediate and bring groups to consensus	37 (tied)
Have vision for the “big picture”	37 (tied)

*Summary Analysis: Required Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities/Attributes*

In terms of the required leadership educator competencies, i.e., the knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes, entry-level student affairs leadership educators should possess, there was little overlap between the two groups. Alternatively, each group appears to have responded with items analogous to their respective roles or duties within their institution. For instance, the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers have experience with a variety of student affairs leadership programs and initiatives, which draw a wide array of students with a range of leadership experience and competence. Thus, it was not surprising that they identified lists of knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes laden with practical, hands-on concepts. These items represent the competencies a leadership educator would need on a daily basis to fulfill their job duties or responsibilities working with a wide variety of students interested in developing their leadership skills or abilities.

The Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators, however, identified lists of knowledge, skills and abilities/attributes that were more conceptual. A significant portion of a Student Affairs Preparatory Program Director’s job is the dissemination of knowledge in the form of models, theories, philosophies, or

approaches. Therefore, it was not surprising that the Program Directors identified competencies with a more conceptual leaning, as that is where their scholarship and expertise lie. Likewise, the general applicability of these competencies to any student affairs practitioner, regardless of functional area of interest was not unexpected. Traditionally, Student Affairs Program Directors/Coordinators are not involved in the day-to-day, programmatic aspects of student affairs work. Subsequently, it is understandable that the competencies identified by this group take a more elevated view of what is needed to be an entry-level student affairs leadership educator. Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators have a responsibility to train student affairs generalists, not functional area experts; therefore, an emphasis on competencies needed for general professional practice is expected.

### **Research Question Three**

The third research question in this study was, How and where should entry-level student affairs practitioners gain competence as a leadership educator? To address this research question, the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers were asked the following: Where should pre-service student affairs practitioners learn or practice the leadership education competencies identified in Question 2?

This section documents the progression through each of the three Delphi rounds within the context of each expert panel, Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (Group A) and Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (Group B). The analysis begins with Group A; the analysis led me to identify where to learn these

competencies and then where to practice them. The analysis culminates in a listing of necessary places for entry-level student affairs practitioners to learn as well as to practice the aforementioned required leadership educator competencies. Once the data for Group A is concluded, the data for Group B is presented in a similar manner. At the conclusion of this section, a summary comparing both sets of necessary locations to learn and practice the required leadership educator competencies is discussed.

*Group A: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers*

**Round 1 Data**

Open-ended questions were used to solicit the widest assortment and range of responses from the participants. Although separate space was not provided for the participants' responses to each component of the question, phrases associated with where to learn and where to practice the competencies tied to being a leadership educator were included in most of the individual responses. Hence, the separation of responses into the appropriate sub-groups of learning and practice was fairly straightforward. Similar responses were grouped together to create a list of unique statements for subsequent rounds. At the conclusion of round 1, participants of Group A (Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers) had identified 23 unique statements of where to learn the leadership educator competencies and 21 unique statements of where to practice those competencies (see Appendix A).

**Round 2 Data**

The 44 unique statements associated with where to learn and practice the leadership educator competencies generated from round 1 were included in the Round 2

survey. For readability and to reduce participant fatigue, the Round 2 survey was divided into component-specific blocks: necessary places to learn leadership educator competencies (23 items) and necessary places to practice these competencies (21 items).

In round 2, each participant was asked to rate the level of importance they associated with each of the statements generated from round 1, using a 5-point scale (*1 = Not at all Important, 2 = Slightly Important, 3 = Moderately Important, 4 = Important, and 5 = Extremely Important*). When determining which statements would be carried forward to round 3, a threshold was set a priori. With the goal to investigate a wide variety of opinions, any statement for which at least 50% of the participants ( $n \geq 8$ ) responded with either 'important' (rating of 4) or 'extremely important' (rating of 5) were carried over to the Round 3 survey (Buriak & Shinn, 1989; Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004; Schmidt, 1997). An 'other' question was included at the end of each block to capture any additional items the participants believed were important but had not been identified in round 1 and thus was not included in round 2.

Tables 19 and 20 detail the round 2 responses regarding where to learn the required leadership educator competencies (Table 19) and where to practice the required leadership educator competencies (Table 20). Descriptive statistics, namely response percentages and frequency counts were used to describe the data. Items are ordered within the tables in descending order from the highest percentage 'extremely important' ranking to the least. Of the 44 items included in the Round 2 survey, 28 items (14 each where to learn and where to practice these competencies) met the aforementioned criteria to be carried forward to round 3. Additionally, the six items that emerged from



the ‘other items’ question (five where to learn items and one where to practice item) were also carried forward to round 3 for initial rating.

Table 19  
*Descriptive Statistics of Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (N = 14)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (7)	50.0 (7)
Mentoring relationships, either during their undergraduate or graduate programs**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	42.9 (6)	50.0 (7)
On the first job post-master’s **	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	57.1 (8)	42.9 (6)
Being mentored by senior leadership educator**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	28.6 (4)	42.9 (6)
A required course in master’s coursework**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	57.1 (8)	28.6 (4)
Internship and/or practicum**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	57.1 (8)	21.4 (3)
Formal course in master’s program**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	57.1 (8)	14.3 (2)
Involvement on campus committees in the field**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	42.9 (6)	35.7 (5)	14.3 (2)
Graduate advisor to a student organization**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	64.3 (9)	7.1 (1)
Team participation**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	64.3 (9)	7.1 (1)
Undergraduate extra-curricular activities**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	21.4 (3)	57.1 (8)	7.1 (1)
Involvement with professional associations**	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	21.4 (3)	50.0 (7)	7.1 (1)
Professional development training (external)**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	35.7 (5)	42.9 (6)	7.1 (1)
Workshops or trainings (internal)**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	42.9 (6)	42.9 (6)	7.1 (1)
Participating in the Multi-institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) research	21.4 (3)	42.9 (6)	14.3 (2)	14.3 (2)	7.1 (1)
Participation in professional leadership conference (ILA or LEI/NCLP)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	14.3 (2)
Their undergraduate classes	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	35.7 (5)	14.3 (2)	0.0 (0)
Prior employment	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	14.3 (2)
Group work in the classroom	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	57.1 (8)	35.7 (5)	0.0 (0)
Volunteering and community service	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	50.0 (7)	28.6 (4)	7.1 (1)

Table 19 (continued)

Participating in leadership programs as undergraduates	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	35.7 (5)	35.7 (5)	7.1 (1)
Presenting at professional conferences	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)	14.3 (2)	0.0 (0)
Reading journals or books seminal to the discipline	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	50.0 (7)	28.6 (4)	7.1 (1)

### Other Items

Part-time or full-time employment\*\*\*

Communities of Practice\*\*\*

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

\*\*\* Item was included in Round 3 for initial rating.

Table 20

*Descriptive Statistics of Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies Round 2: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (N = 14)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Graduate assistantship **	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	35.7 (5)	57.1 (8)
On the first job post-master's**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)
Internship and/or practicum**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (7)	42.9 (6)
Previous mentoring relationships **	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	7.1 (1)	28.6 (4)	42.9 (6)
Involvement in professional organizations**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	28.6 (4)	35.7 (5)
Identify something they are passionate about greater than themselves & can't control**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	14.3 (2)	35.7 (5)	35.7 (5)
Volunteering and community service**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	35.7 (5)	28.6 (4)
Team participation**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	7.1 (1)	64.3 (9)	14.3 (2)
Formal class in master's program**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	14.3 (2)	50.0 (7)	14.3 (2)
Their undergraduate extracurricular activities	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	35.7 (5)	21.4 (3)	14.3 (2)
Graduate advisor to a student organization**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	57.1 (8)	7.1 (1)
Group work in the classroom**	0.0 (0)	7.1 (1)	21.4 (3)	57.1 (8)	7.1 (1)
A required course in master's coursework**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	14.3 (2)	57.1 (8)	7.1 (1)

Table 20 (continued)

Involved on campus committees**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	50.0 (7)	7.1 (1)
Professional development training (external)**	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	28.6 (4)	42.9 (6)	7.1 (1)
Presenting at professional conferences	0.0 (0)	21.4 (3)	28.6 (4)	35.7 (5)	7.1 (1)
Attend leadership conference (ILA, LEI, NCLP)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (2)	35.7 (5)	35.7 (5)	7.1 (1)
Their undergraduate classes	0.0 (0)	50.0 (7)	14.3 (2)	21.4 (3)	7.1 (1)
Prior employment	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	7.1 (1)
Workshops or trainings (internal)	7.1 (1)	7.1 (1)	42.9 (6)	35.7 (5)	0.0 (0)
Participating in leadership program in college	0.0 (0)	28.6 (4)	28.6 (4)	35.7 (5)	0.0 (0)

**Other Item\*\*\***

Communicating across difference

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

\*\*\* Item was included in Round 3 for initial rating.

**Round 3 Data**

Round 3 focused on developing consensus among the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers participants (Group A). Congruent with the iterative nature of the Delphi technique, each participant was given the opportunity to review and compare their individual item scores to the item aggregate ‘important’ or ‘extremely important’ frequencies and counts of their fellow context group members. Group A participants also had the opportunity to change their responses to ‘moderately important,’ ‘important,’ or ‘extremely important;’ or to keep it as it was recorded in round 2. Only one participant kept all of their scores as they were in round 2. Six additional statements, five where to learn and one where to practice, emerged from round 2 and were included at the end of the applicable section. Group A participants were asked to

indicate the level of importance they associated with each statement using the same 5-point scale as in round 2.

Altogether at the end of round 3, Group A participants provided 364 total responses (13 participants x 28 items). More than 82% of those responses (n = 302) were not changed from the recorded round 2 responses. This stability in the data indicates a certain level of confidence in the participants' responses. Furthermore, of the 62 responses that were changed, 88.71% (f = 55), were changed to a higher level of importance; thereby underscoring the importance the participants had previously associated with these items.

Tables 21 and 22 detail the results from the Round 3 survey regarding where to learn these necessary leadership competencies (Table 21) and where to practice them (Table 22). Once again, the items were ordered from highest to lowest 'extremely important' frequency of response ratings. The threshold used to determine if an item was carried to the next phase of the study was set a priori. As the Delphi technique advances through multiple rounds, the goal of the rounds shifts from maximum variation in responses, to the consolidation or congruence of opinions. Consequently, at the conclusion of round 3, the items deemed important and necessary for entry-level student affairs leadership educators were any item for which a supermajority, 75% or more, of the participants (n ≥ 10) rated it as 'important' or 'extremely important' when the frequencies of both response options were summed. Of the six additional items advanced from round 2 to round 3, only one from the where to practice question block was deemed to be necessary for entry-level student affairs leadership educators.

Table 21  
*Descriptive Statistics of Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies Round 3: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (N = 13)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	38.5 (5)	61.5 (8)
Being mentored by senior leadership educator**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	15.4 (2)	61.5 (8)
Previous mentoring relationships**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	38.5 (5)	53.8 (7)
On the first job post-master's**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	53.8 (7)	46.2 (6)
A required course in master's coursework**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	61.5 (8)	23.1 (3)
Internship and/or practicum**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	69.2 (9)	15.4 (2)
Formal course in master's program	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (4)	53.8 (7)	15.4 (2)
Undergraduate extra-curricular activities	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	30.8 (4)	46.2 (6)	15.4 (2)
Involvement on campus committees	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	38.5 (5)	38.5 (5)	15.4 (2)
Graduate advisor to a student organization	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (4)	61.5 (8)	7.7 (1)
Team participation	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (4)	61.5 (8)	7.7 (1)
Involvement with professional associations	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	15.4 (2)	53.8 (7)	7.7 (1)
Workshops or trainings (internal)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	38.5 (5)	46.2 (6)	7.7 (1)
Professional development training (external)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	38.5 (5)	53.8 (7)	0.0 (0)
<b>Other Items from Round 2</b>					
Part-time or full-time employment	7.7 (1)	30.8 (4)	38.5 (5)	15.4 (2)	7.7 (1)
Communities of Practice	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	38.5 (5)	38.5 (5)	15.4 (2)
Community engagement and volunteering	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	46.2 (6)	23.1 (3)	15.4 (2)
Seemiller and Priest's work on Leadership Educator Professional Identity Development Model	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	30.8 (4)	23.1 (3)	7.7 (1)
Book club/Working group	23.1 (3)	46.2 (6)	15.4 (2)	15.4 (2)	0.0 (0)

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

Table 22  
*Descriptive Statistics of Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies Round 3:  
 Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers (N = 13)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	84.6 (11)
On the first job post-master's**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	76.9 (10)
Internship and/or practicum**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	46.2 (6)	53.8 (7)
Previous mentoring relationships**	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	53.8 (7)
Identify something they are passionate about that is greater than themselves or their ability to control**	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	7.7 (1)	38.5 (5)	42.6 (6)
Involvement with professional associations	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	23.1 (3)	23.1 (3)	42.6 (6)
Team participation**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	69.2 (9)	23.1 (3)
Volunteering and community service**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)	15.4 (2)
Group work in the classroom**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	23.1 (3)	61.5 (8)	15.4 (2)
Graduate advisor to a student organization**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	84.6 (11)	7.7 (1)
Formal class in master's program**	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	7.7 (1)	69.2 (9)	7.7 (1)
Involved on campus committees	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	30.8 (4)	61.5 (8)	7.7 (1)
A required course in master's coursework	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	23.1 (3)	53.8 (7)	7.7 (1)
Professional development training (external)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (2)	30.8 (4)	53.8 (7)	0.0 (0)
<b>New Item from Round 2</b>					
Communicating across difference**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.7 (1)	38.5 (5)	53.8 (7)

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

## **Necessary Places to Learn and Practice Student Affairs Leadership Educator**

### **Competencies as Reported by Group A**

To answer Research Question 3, where should entry-level student affairs practitioners learn and practice the necessary leadership educator competencies, the

Likert-scale data from round 3 were handled as dichotomous data. As was done for the previous items, the place to learn or to practice these leadership educator competencies was determined either “required” or “not required,” using the same procedure as was previously outlined for the competencies themselves. The responses that did not meet the 75% ( $n \geq 10$ ) threshold were categorized as non-important places at which entry-level student affairs leadership educators should learn and were removed from the study

Table 23 details the six places where the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers believe the previously identified leadership educator competencies should be learned. Table 24 lists the eleven places where Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers believe entry-level student affairs leadership educators should practice the previously identified leadership educator competencies. The items in both tables were organized in descending order, from the highest summed frequency score of ‘important’ and ‘extremely important,’ to the least.

Importance was determined by summing the frequency score of ‘important’ and ‘extremely important,’ for each item to create an absolute value score. Once again, the strength of the importance placed on each item was measured by ranking the absolute value scores. The higher the absolute value score, the more important an item was, and thus the higher rank that item earned. When there was a tie in the absolute value scores, the higher frequencies of ‘extremely important’ broke the tie and earned the item a higher ranking.

Table 23  
*Necessary Places to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies: Student Affairs  
 Practitioners/Managers (N = 13)*

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning	1
On their first post-mater's job	2
Previous mentoring relationships	3
A required course in master's coursework	4
Internship and/or practicum	5
Being mentored by senior leadership educator	6

Table 24  
*Necessary Places to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies: Student Affairs  
 Practitioners/Managers (N = 13)*

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning	1
On their first post-master's job	2
Internship and/or practicum	3
Communicating across difference	4
Team participation	5
Graduate advisor to a student organization	6
Identify something they are passionate about that is greater than themselves or their ability to control	7
Previous mentoring relationships	8
Group work in the classroom	9 (tied)
Volunteering and community service	9 (tied)
Formal class in master's program	11



*Group B: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators*

**Round 1 Data**

With the objective being to gather the widest assortment and range of responses from the participants, open-ended questions were used for round 1. Although separate space was not provided for the participants' responses to each component of the question, phrases associated with where to learn and where to practice the leadership educator competencies were included in most of the individual responses. Hence, the separation of responses into the appropriate sub-groups of learning and practice was fairly straightforward (see Appendix A). Similar responses were grouped together to create a list of unique statements for subsequent rounds. At the conclusion of round 1 participants of Group B (Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators) had identified 20 unique statements of where to learn leadership educator competencies and 16 unique statements of where to practice those competencies.

**Round 2 Data**

The 36 unique statements generated from round 1 were included in the Round 2 survey. For readability and to reduce participant fatigue, the Round 2 survey was divided into component-specific blocks: necessary places for entry-level student affairs practitioners to learn and places to practice the leadership educator competencies identified previously.

In round 2, each participant was asked to rate the level of importance they associated with each of the statements generated from round 1, using a 5-point scale (*1 = Not at all Important, 2 = Slightly Important, 3 = Moderately Important, 4 = Important,*

*and 5 = Extremely Important*). When determining which statements would be carried forward to round 3, a threshold was set a priori. In efforts to explore a wide variety of opinions, any statement where at least 50% ( $n \geq 8$ ) of the participants responded with either 'important' (rating of 4) or 'extremely important' (rating of 5) were carried over to the Round 3 survey (Buriak & Shinn, 1989; Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004; Schmidt, 1997). An 'other' question was included at the end of each block to capture any additional items the participants felt were important but had not been included previously in the survey.

Tables 25 and 26 detail the round 2 responses regarding where to learn the required leadership educator competencies (Table 25) and where to practice the required leadership educator competencies (Table 26). Descriptive statistics, namely response percentages and frequency counts were used. Items are ordered within the tables in descending order from the highest percentage 'extremely important' ranking to the least. Of the 36 items included in the Round 2 survey, 24 items (13 items where to learn and 11 items where to practice these competencies) met the aforementioned criteria to be carried forward to round 3. Additionally, the three items that emerged from the 'other items' question (one where to learn item and two where to practice items) were also carried forward to round 3 for initial rating.

Table 25  
*Descriptive Statistics of Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies Round 2: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 16)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Graduate assistantship	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	62.5 (10)
Engaging teaching methods**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	6.3 (1)	43.8 (7)	43.8 (7)
Core course in master's program**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	62.5 (10)	37.5 (6)
Graduate practicum(a) **	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	56.3 (9)	31.3 (5)
Internships**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	50.0 (8)	31.3 (5)
On the job training**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	68.8 (11)	25.0 (4)
Being mentored**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	12.5 (2)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)
Elective course in master's program**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	81.3 (13)	12.5 (2)
Reading current leadership journals/books	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	31.3 (5)	43.8 (7)	12.5 (2)
Employment (non-assistantship)**	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	18.8 (3)	37.5 (6)	12.5 (2)
Professional development opportunities off-campus (professional associations)**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	56.3 (9)	6.3 (1)
Professional development opportunities on-campus (workshops/trainings)**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	31.3 (5)	50.0 (8)	6.3 (1)
Side conversations before, after, or during meetings**	0.0 (0)	31.3 (5)	18.8 (3)	50.0 (8)	0.0 (0)
In daily interactions	6.3 (1)	37.5 (6)	25.0 (4)	31.3 (5)	0.0 (0)
Mentoring others	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	62.5 (10)	12.5 (2)	12.5 (2)
Teach a leadership course	25.0 (4)	12.5 (2)	56.3 (9)	6.3 (1)	0.0 (0)
Facilitate leadership trainings or workshops	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	43.8 (7)	18.8 (3)	6.3 (1)
Co-author journal articles	18.8 (3)	37.5 (6)	37.5 (6)	6.3 (1)	0.0 (0)
Participation in student organization (member)	0.0 (0)	43.8 (7)	31.3 (5)	18.8 (3)	6.3 (1)
Participation in student organization (student leader)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	31.3 (5)	25.0 (4)	6.3 (1)

**Other Items**

Attending conferences\*\*\*

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

\*\*\* Item was included in Round 3 for initial rating.

Table 26  
*Descriptive Statistics of Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies Round 2:  
 Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 16)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Graduate assistantships**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (4)	75.0 (12)
Graduate internship(s) or practicum(a)**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	43.8 (7)	56.3 (9)
On the job**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	43.8 (7)	50.0 (8)
Helping students understand and engage in challenges to defend their beliefs/core values**	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	12.5 (2)	56.3 (9)	25.0 (4)
Involvement in campus activities beyond class and graduate assistantships**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	37.5 (6)	31.3 (5)	18.8 (3)
Engaging in professional communities**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	75.0 (12)	12.5 (2)
Advising student groups**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	12.5 (2)	56.3 (9)	12.5 (2)
Creating and/or facilitating a campus event/program**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	50.0 (8)	12.5 (2)
Presenting at professional conferences**	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	31.3 (5)	43.8 (7)	12.5 (2)
Representing an office on a campus committee**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	31.3 (5)	37.5 (6)	12.5 (2)
Training student leaders**	0.0 (0)	18.8 (3)	31.3 (5)	37.5 (6)	12.5 (2)
Volunteering in the local community	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	43.8 (7)	6.3 (1)	6.3 (1)
Actively working to enhance the off-campus community	6.3 (1)	37.5 (6)	43.8 (7)	6.3 (1)	6.3 (1)
Through interpersonal interactions	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	25.0 (4)	25.0 (4)	12.5 (2)
Mentoring others	0.0 (0)	12.5 (2)	50.0 (8)	25.0 (4)	12.5 (2)
Taking student leaders to professional conferences	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	43.8 (7)	12.5 (2)	6.3 (1)

**Other Items**

Participation in webinars\*\*\*

In the graduate classroom\*\*\*

\*\* Item was carried forward to Round 3.

\*\*\* Item was included in Round 3 for initial rating.

### **Round 3 Data**

Round 3 was focused on developing consensus among the experts within the context-specific expert panel, in this case, the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (Group B). Each participant was provided the opportunity to review their individual item importance score in comparison to the item aggregate 'important' or 'extremely important' frequencies and counts of their fellow context group members. Participants then had the chance to change their response to 'moderately important,' 'important,' or 'extremely important;' or to keep it as was from round 2. A total of three additional statements emerged from round 2 and were included at the end of the applicable section, one 'where to learn' and two 'where to practice' these competencies. Participants were asked to indicate the level of importance they associated with each statement using the same 5-point response scale as in round 2.

Consistent with the Delphi technique process, each participant was given the opportunity to review and compare their individual item scores to the item aggregate 'important' or 'extremely important' frequencies and counts of their fellow context group members. Participants also had the opportunity to change their responses to 'moderately important,' 'important,' or 'extremely important;' or to keep it as it was recorded in round 2. Three of the Group B participants decided to keep all of their scores as they were in round 2.

At the end of round 3, there were a total of 360 responses (15 participants x 24 items). More than 92% of the Group B responses from round 2 (n = 332) were not changed. This extensive stability in the data indicates a high level of confidence in the

participants' responses. Furthermore, a sizeable majority of the 28 responses that were changed, 82.1% ( $f = 23$ ), were changed to a higher level of importance; thereby emphasizing the importance the participants had previously associated with these items.

Tables 27 and 28 detail the results from the Round 3 survey regarding where to learn these necessary leadership competencies (Table 27) and where to practice them (Table 28). Once again, the items were ordered from highest to lowest 'extremely important' frequency of response ratings. The threshold used to determine if an item was carried to the next phase of the study was set a priori. As the Delphi technique advances through multiple rounds, the goal shifts from maximum variation in responses, to the consolidation or congruence of opinions. Consequently, at the conclusion of round 3, the items deemed important and necessary for entry-level student affairs leadership educators were any item where a supermajority of 75% or more of the participants ( $n \geq 12$ ) rated it as 'important' or 'extremely important' when the frequencies of both options were summed. None of the three additional items advanced from round 2 to round 3, were deemed to be necessary for entry-level student affairs leadership educators.

Table 27  
*Descriptive Statistics of Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies Round 3: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Responses % (f)				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Graduate assistantship**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	73.3 (11)
Engaging teaching methods (team projects, case studies, role plays, etc.)**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	46.7 (7)	46.7 (7)
Core course in master's program**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (9)	40.0 (6)
Graduate practicum(a)**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	66.7 (10)	33.3 (5)
Internships**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	60.0 (9)	33.3 (5)
On the job training**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	73.3 (11)	26.7 (4)
Being mentored**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	60.0 (9)	26.7 (4)
Elective course in master's program**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	80.0 (12)	13.3 (2)
Reading current leadership journals/books	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	26.7 (4)	53.3 (8)	13.3 (2)
Employment (non-assistantship)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	26.7 (4)	46.7 (7)	13.3 (2)
Professional development opportunities off-campus (professional associations)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	60.0 (9)	6.7 (1)
Professional development opportunities on-campus (workshops or trainings)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	26.7 (4)	60.0 (9)	6.7 (1)
Side conversations before, after, or during meetings	0.0 (0)	26.7 (4)	13.3 (2)	60.0 (9)	0.0 (0)
<b>New Item from Round 2</b>					
Attending conferences	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	60.0 (9)	40.0 (6)	0.0 (0)

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

Table 28  
*Descriptive Statistics of Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies Round 3:  
 Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Responses % ( <i>f</i> )				
	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important	Extremely Important
Graduate assistantships**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (3)	80.0 (12)
Graduate internship(s) or practicum(a)**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (5)	66.7 (10)
On the job**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (6)	53.3 (8)
Helping students understand and engage in challenges to defend their beliefs/core values**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	73.3 (11)	20.0 (3)
Creating and/or facilitating a campus event or program**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	73.3 (11)	13.3 (2)
Advising student groups**	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	73.3 (11)	13.3 (2)
Training student leaders	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	33.3 (5)	46.7 (7)	13.3 (2)
Presenting at professional conferences	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	26.7 (4)	46.7 (7)	13.3 (2)
Involvement in campus activities beyond class and graduate assistantships	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	40.0 (6)	40.0 (6)	13.3 (2)
Engaging in professional communities**	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	80.0 (12)	6.7 (1)
Representing an office on a campus committee	0.0 (0)	13.3 (2)	33.3 (5)	46.7 (7)	6.7 (1)
<b>New Items from Round 2</b>					
Participation in webinars	6.7 (1)	20.0 (3)	66.7 (10)	6.7 (1)	0.0 (0)
In the graduate classroom	0.0 (0)	6.7 (1)	20.0 (3)	40.0 (6)	33.3 (5)

\*\* Item was deemed required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators

### **Necessary Places to Learn and Practice Student Affairs Leadership Educator Competencies as Reported by Group B**

To answer Research Question 3, where should entry-level student affairs practitioners learn and practice the necessary leadership educator competencies, the Likert-scale data from round 3 was handled as dichotomous data. As was done for the previous items, the place to learn or to practice these leadership educator competencies



was determined either “required” or “not required,” using the same procedure as was previously outlined. The responses that did not meet the 75% ( $n \geq 12$ ) cut off point were categorized as non-important for entry-level student affairs leadership educators and were removed from the study

Table 29 lists the six places where Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (Group B) believe the previously identified leadership educator competencies should be learned. Table 30 lists the eleven places where Group B believes entry-level student affairs practitioners should practice these leadership educator competencies. The items in both tables were organized in descending order, from the highest summed frequency score of ‘important’ and ‘extremely important,’ to the least.

Importance was determined by summing the frequency score of ‘important’ and ‘extremely important’ for each item to create an absolute value score. Once again, the strength of the importance placed on each item was measured by ranking the absolute value scores. The higher the absolute value score, the more important an item was, and thus the higher rank that item earned. When there was a tie in the absolute values scores, the higher frequency of ‘extremely important’ broke the tie and earned the item a higher ranking.

Table 29  
*Necessary Places to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Graduate assistantship	1
Core course in master's program	2
Graduate practicum(a)	3
On the job training	4
Engaging teaching methods	5
Internships	6
Elective course in master's program	7
Being mentored	8

Table 30  
*Necessary Places to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (N = 15)*

Item	Ranked Order
	Extremely Important to Important
Graduate assistantships	1
Graduate internship(s) or practicum(a)	2
On the job	3
Helping students understand and engage in challenges to defend their beliefs/core values	4
Creating and/or facilitating a campus event or program	5
Advising student groups	6
Engaging in professional communities	7

*Summary Analysis: Where to Learn and Practice the Required Competencies*

The two panels had similar response as to where entry-level student affairs leadership educators should learn and practice leadership educator competencies. Each of the six ways to learn the required leadership educator competencies identified by the panel of Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers were also identified by the panel of Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators; with the panel of Program Directors identifying two additional places to learn these competencies. With the exception of graduate assistantships, identified as the most important place to learn by both panels, the order of the other places in which to learn these competencies differed between the two panels.

Although there were considerable similarities between the generated lists from both panels, there were some subtle differences. A required or core course in leadership was identified as necessary by both panels, yet the panel of Student Affairs Program Directors/Coordinators also included an elective leadership course as a necessary, but less important place to learn these competencies. Similarly, being mentored was identified as a necessary way to learn these leadership competencies by both panels, but the panel of Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers was more specific and split mentoring into two items: having been mentored previously (more important) and being mentored by senior student affairs professionals (less important).

Conversely, in relation to places where entry-level student affairs practitioners should practice the previously identified leadership educator competencies, there was not a great degree of overlap between the two panels. Out of a combined list of eighteen

items, only four (graduate assistantship, on the job, graduate internships and/or practica, and advising a student organization) were identified by both panels. Three of the four common items were the top three places, the places identified as most important to practice the required leadership educator competencies, for both context-expert groups. As was the case with where to learn, the graduate assistantship was identified as the most important place to practice the leadership educator competencies. The order of items two and three, on the job and graduate internships/practica, were reversed between the two context groups. The fourth common item, graduate advisor to a student organization, was equally ranked in sixth place by each group.

It is also worth noting that only the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers group identified an academic setting as a necessary place to practice the leadership educator competencies. This group identified two items: a formal class in leadership within the master's program (less important) and group work within the classroom (more important). All of the other places or ways to practice identified by the groups revolved around 'learning by doing' in non-academic settings, which signifies the applied nature of leadership and the benefit of experiential learning opportunities.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

While several statistical findings were noted in the previous section, this section focuses on the researcher's primary findings, conclusions, and recommendations made for further research and professional practice within a division of student affairs/student life. Conclusions were reached by integrating current literature regarding student affairs and leadership educator competencies with the data collected in this study. After a brief summary of the study, this section details the findings, conclusions, and recommendations organized by research question. The treatment of conclusions and recommendations is limited to entry-level student affairs practitioners and student affairs preparatory programs.

#### **Study Summary**

While the academic study of leadership has increased significantly on college campuses in recent years (Brungardt, 1996; Jenkins, 2012), the increase in student leadership development opportunities and initiatives focused outside the classroom is even greater. As a result, the student affairs practitioners who coordinate and manage these leadership development opportunities can be classified as leadership educators. However, leadership education is not a primary learning objective of student affairs preparatory programs (Nelson, 2010). So, many student affairs practitioners are expected to be effective leadership educators without ever engaging in formal education in leadership studies in their preparatory program.

Further complicating the issue is that the literature is extremely limited. Few studies have been conducted identifying the core knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes, needed to be a leadership educator (Jenkins & Owen, 2016); and even less research has been conducted on the background, preparation, or competence of collegiate leadership educators (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Jenkins, 2012; Jenkins & Owen, 2016), regardless of their role within the institution. Therefore, if researchers are to gain a better understanding of the impact leadership education has on college students, an examination of those responsible for teaching leadership, both within and outside the classroom, is required (Jenkins, 2012).

The purpose of this study was to explore and identify the characteristics of entry-level collegiate student affairs leadership educators. Once identified, the goal was to analyze the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes needed as a leadership educator in a student affairs context. A secondary purpose was to explore how and where these entry-level student affairs practitioners should learn and gain experience with the identified leadership educator knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes. “Exploring how to best develop the capacity of leadership educators will . . . prove vital to the continued development of competent, confident, passionate, and effective leadership educators” (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 29).

For this study, the topic to be explored and refined was the preparation of entry-level student affairs practitioners as leadership educators, namely the competencies needed to be a student affairs leadership educator and where to learn and practice these competencies. A classic Delphi approach was used to elicit a wide range of opinions

(see the Methodology section for details). Previous research indicated that student affairs practitioners and preparatory program faculty members do not agree on the competencies needed to be a successful as a student affairs practitioner (Hyman, 1985; Kuk et al., 2007; Miles, 2007). Therefore, the researcher conducted two independent, but simultaneous, Delphi studies: one using a panel of student affairs practitioners and a second using a panel of student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators (i.e., faculty). Three rounds were needed to reach data stability and agreement among the experts. Thirteen student affairs practitioners/managers completed all three rounds, whereas seventeen student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators completed all three rounds; thereby meeting or exceeding the threshold required for process reliability of 0.80 (Dalkey, 1969b).

Content analysis techniques were used to define a student affairs leadership educator and to analyze the responses for the three subsets of competence: knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes. Open and axial coding were utilized to analyze the responses. Two themes common to both panels emerged when defining or characterizing a student affairs leadership educator. First, leadership educators have direct contact with students. Second, leadership educators have job descriptions that include leadership-specific initiatives. Both panels also agreed that student affairs leadership educators are mentors. Yet, the two panels did not agree on how leadership education is demonstrated in a student affairs context.

Frequency counts were used in rounds 2 and 3 of the Delphi as a data reduction technique. At the end of this process, 17 knowledge items, 21 skills items, and 22

abilities/attributes emerged from the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers group, while 22 knowledge items, 22 skill items, and 37 abilities/attributes emerged from the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators group. The Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers agreed on six places to learn these competencies and 11 places to practice them. On the other side, the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators agreed upon eight places to learn and seven places to practice the identified student affairs leadership educator competencies.

## **Conclusions and Discussion**

### *Research Question One*

How do student affairs practitioners and preparatory program directors define or identify co-curricular leadership educators?

### **Student Affairs Practitioners are Leadership Educators**

Both Student Affairs Practitioner/Managers and Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators believe that student affairs practitioners are in fact leadership educators, with 93.8% (n = 32) of the participants in agreeance. Only one participant per context-specific expert group, i.e., two of the 32 participants who completed round 1 or 6.3% of the total respondents, reported that student affairs practitioners were not leadership educators. Even so, there was agreement within these two dissenting voices. They both framed an educator in a classical sense, meaning that leadership educators are those who know and practice leadership theories, teach



academic credit-bearing leadership courses, and/or conduct leadership research; not typical job duties or responsibilities of entry-level student affairs practitioners.

### **Interact with Student Leaders and Have Leadership-focused Job Duties**

Two main themes or categories emerged from the data. Student affairs leadership educators are defined as those who have direct interaction or contact with student leaders and those whose job descriptions include leadership-focused initiatives. Additionally, the defining characteristic of a student affairs leadership educator is that they mentor students. Although there appeared to be agreement in the definition of a student affairs leadership educator, there was a philosophical difference between the two groups in who was meant by the term “student leaders” and how leadership education should be demonstrated in a student affairs context.

For the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers, “student leader” was an inclusive term referring to any student interested in developing their leadership capacity. Thus, leadership education is an intentional act, requiring leadership educators to put theory to practice as they encourage and support their students’ leadership learning and development. Accordingly, leadership was deemed an emergent process, where being considered a leader was not reliant on holding a specific title or position. However, the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators saw a “student leader” as one currently holding, or aspiring to hold, a leadership position. Consequently, they viewed leadership education to be more selective and targeted in scope. This emphasis to single out positional leaders as the lone recipients of leadership education implies that for Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators, leadership is assigned.

## **Organizational Context Influences Demonstration of Leadership Education**

The philosophical differences between the two groups continued into the discussion of how leadership education should be demonstrated within the context of student affairs. The Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers expert group responded that leadership education is an intentional act and not merely a by-product of working with students in a student affairs setting. But this intentional act is not limited to any one specific functional area within a division of student affairs/student life. Thus, a student affairs leadership educator can be anyone who identifies as one, has the desire to assist students along their leadership journeys, and infuses leadership education and development concepts into their job duties regardless of their functional area or specific job title or responsibilities.

Conversely, the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators expert group identified leadership education as a specialized area of expertise within the field of student affairs, making leadership education a functional area within a division of student affairs/student life much like housing or career services. Subsequently, leadership educators require job-specific competence, including previous experience with leadership, either in the classroom or through a leadership position. As a functional area, student affairs leadership educators are seen as experts within a division of student affairs/student life, to be called upon whenever a leadership development issue arises throughout the division. Thus, their responsibility extends beyond the students with whom they work, as they are called upon to develop the leadership competence in emerging student affairs professionals and their student affairs colleagues. Part of this

responsibility comes in the form of modeling the behavior they expect to see in others and spending time developing leadership competence in their students.

Elevating leadership education to a functional area, i.e. department or office, within a division of student affairs/student life demonstrates the importance and value the institution places on leadership development. Having a central location to refer students and other student affairs colleagues to can be effective and efficient in promoting a common message or perspective, for example, a centralized leadership development office may promote to students that the administration espouses a servant leader mindset; however, divisions of student affairs/student life are large, complex organizations with a variety of needs. If these leadership offices are not appropriately staffed, having all student affairs leadership development initiatives rest on the shoulders of a few staff members can be overwhelming and can lead to professional burnout. More importantly, having a centralized leadership office may be interpreted that leadership education is only the responsibility of those in that office, which supports the results of the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators panel. However, including leadership education as a functional area within student affairs contradicts the results of the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers panel, who identified leadership education as applicable to all functional areas within student affairs.

### **Student Affairs Leadership Educators are Mentors**

While there was not agreement between the two groups pertaining to what it means to be a student affairs leadership educator, both groups did agree that a student affairs leadership educator could be characterized as a mentor. But once again, there

was a difference between the two groups in how that characteristic should be displayed. For the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers, leadership educators are mentors exclusively to their students. But the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators have a much more inclusive view of mentoring. They responded that student affairs leadership educators have a responsibility to mentor not only their undergraduate students, but also current and pre-service student affairs practitioners. This difference was not surprising considering that Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers viewed leadership education as an intentional choice regardless of functional area, while Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators viewed leadership education as a functional area unto itself.

#### *Research Question Two*

What does competence in leadership education entail for entry-level student affairs practitioners?

#### **Required Competencies Differ by Contextual Expertise**

After review of all responses, the lists of the required leadership educator competencies, specifically the knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes entry-level student affairs leadership educators should possess, generated by the two Delphi groups were fairly distinctive (see Tables 7-9 for Student Affairs Practitioners and Tables 16-18 for Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors). This finding is consistent with previous research (Hyman, 1985; Kuk et al., 2007; Miles, 2007) that student affairs practitioners and student affairs preparatory program faculty do not agree on the competencies needed to be a successful student affairs practitioner.

In total, 140 competencies were identified between the two Delphi groups. Sixty competencies were identified by the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers expert group (17 knowledge, 21 skills, and 22 abilities/attributes) and 80 competencies were identified by the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators expert group (22 knowledge, 21 skills, and 37 abilities/attributes). Consensus was reached for only one of the 140 identified competencies. The Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers group unanimously identified the ability/attribute of ‘openness towards and inclusivity of all identities’ as ‘extremely important.’

Overall, 13 competencies (9.29%) were duplicated between the lists of required knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes, as detailed in Figure 4. The most duplication came in the skills list, with seven of the 42 items (16.7%) repeated. Interestingly, the least amount of duplication occurred in the lists with the greatest number of items, abilities/attributes. Here, only three of the 59 items (5.1%) were shared (see Figure 4).

<b>Leadership Educator Competencies Identified as Important by Both Delphi Groups</b>		
<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Abilities/Attributes</b>
Self-understanding	Reflection	Challenge Students Appropriately
Team and Group Dynamics	Problem-solving	Being a Continuous Learner
Social Justice	Listening	Patience
	Effective Oral and Written Communication	
	Critical-thinking	
	Effective Conflict Negotiation/Management	
	Organization	

*Figure 4.* Leadership educator competences identified as important by both Delphi groups

The lack of duplication was also seen within the lists of competencies identified by each Delphi group. Three of the 60 competencies (5%) identified by the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers group were included on multiple internal lists. One item was on both the knowledge and abilities/attributes lists (change process), while two items were included on both the knowledge and skills lists (self-awareness and awareness of others). As to the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators group, none of the 80 competencies identified were repeated internally between lists.

### **Identified Competencies Connect to Role Within the Institution**

One potential reason for the divergence of competencies between the two groups is that each group appears to have responded with items analogous to their respective roles or duties within the institution. For instance, the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers have experience with a variety of student affairs leadership programs and initiatives, which draw a wide array of students with a range of leadership experience and competency. Thus, it was not surprising that they identified lists of knowledge, skills, and abilities/attributes laden with practical, hands-on concepts closely tied to leadership development, training, and education, as well as competencies that are good professional practice in student affairs regardless of functional area.

The competencies identified represent the competencies a student affairs leadership educator would need daily to fulfill their job duties or responsibilities to work with a wide variety of students interested in developing their leadership skills or abilities. Given that Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers viewed leadership education

as an intentional action people choose to incorporate into their work, it follows that the required competencies would reflect specific aspects of leadership theory and practice applicable to a broad audience with varying levels of leadership proficiency. Another potential reason the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers group focused on the practical hands-on competencies could be because they have not had experience with a formal leadership course and therefore are not as familiar with the theoretical or conceptual aspects of leadership education.

This conclusion highlights an inconsistency with the data. At the beginning of this study, the Practitioners/Managers group characterized student affairs leadership educators as those who *have previous experience* with leadership, either in the classroom or through a leadership position. But when the Practitioners/Managers group was asked to rank the importance of direct experience leading a group in round 2 of the Delphi (see Table 3), a majority of group members (57.1%, n = 14) rated it as only ‘moderately important.’ Consequently, direct experience leading a team was not advanced through the study. In the future, it may prove useful to conduct additional research to explore the specific types of previous leadership experience student affairs practitioners do find important for entry-level student affairs leadership educators.

In contrast, the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators group identified lists of knowledge, skills and abilities/attributes that were more conceptual in their approach. A significant portion of a student affairs preparatory program director/coordinator’s job is the dissemination of knowledge in the form of models, theories, philosophies, or approaches. Therefore, it was not surprising that the

Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators group identified competencies with a more conceptual leaning, as that is where their scholarship and expertise lie. Likewise, the general applicability of the identified competencies to any student affairs practitioner was not surprising. Traditionally, student affairs preparatory program faculty are not involved in the day-to-day, programmatic aspects of student affairs work. Thus, it is understandable that the competencies identified by this group take a more elevated or idealistic view of what is needed to be an entry-level student affairs leadership educator, as student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators have a responsibility to train student affairs generalists, not functional area experts.

What was unexpected was the lack of specific leadership theory and practice concepts identified by the Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators group, when the purpose of the study was specifically to identify required competencies for *leadership educators*. Only four of the 22 items on the knowledge list can be directly connected to leadership education principles or concepts (ethical standards, base understanding of leadership, understanding of group dynamics, and self-understanding). The skills list is not much better. Of the 21 items listed, only three moved beyond desired skills of general student affairs professional practice to an aspect of leadership education, theory or practice: effectively working with teams, self-reflection, and establishing a strong vision for a group. While the abilities/attributes list contains highly desirable qualities, only five of the 39 items are easily connected back to aspects of leadership education, theory or practice (develop leadership capacity in diverse students, authenticity, build



community, desire to contribute to a better world, and have a vision for the “big picture”).

As data reduction is a prominent component of the Delphi technique, the final results are only as good as the data provided at the beginning of the process. Subsequently, the researcher went back to the initial data provided by the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (see Tables 10, 11, and 12) to determine if items more closely connected to leadership education principles or concepts were ever proposed or were simply deemed less important than other items presented. In terms of required knowledge (see Table 10) several items closely related to leadership education were proposed but failed to make the cut to the next round. In fact, the item this group found least important of all was “knowledge of the evolution of leadership theory.” However, two of the four new items proposed in round 2, personal definitions of leadership and relational aspects of leader-follower relationships/opportunities, were clearly connected to leadership education theory and practice. Yet, neither of these items met the criteria to be moved forward to the final round of the study. Interestingly, all of the skill items from round 2 were advanced to round 3 (see Table 11), so for this area of competence the lack of leadership education specific items at the end is a direct result of not having any with which to begin. Three items closely related to leadership education principles and concepts were part of the original abilities/attributes items (develop others to be active citizens, strong personal vision, and plan and affect change), but once again none of them met the criteria to be moved to the next round (see Table 12).

## **Findings Only Partially Support Previous Research**

As was mentioned previously, the exploration and examination of professional competencies is not new to the field of student affairs (Herdlein et al., 2010; Kuk et al., 2007; Lovell & Kosten, 2000; Nelson, 2010; Waple, 2006). But, there is not one universally accepted list of professional competencies for student affairs practitioners. Therefore, for this study, three sets of competencies serve as reference points: the suggested competencies for staff who manage Student Leadership Programs proposed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS); suggested competencies for student affairs educators from the joint NASPA/ACPA taskforce (Eanes et al., 2015); and the desired characteristics of student affairs professionals, as compiled from the latest meta-analysis conducted by Herdlein et al. in 2013. This section compares the findings of this study with each of these three reference points.

When taken collectively, the lists of required competencies, as identified by the two Delphi groups in this study, accounted for slightly more than half of the previously published lists of competencies. There were some competencies that both groups missed, but for the most part if a competency was missed by one Delphi group, it was identified by the other group. Of the three lists of competencies used as reference points in this study, the lists generated by the student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators most closely aligned with 55% agreement, with the competencies proposed by Herdlein et al. (2013) (see Figure 7) and had the least agreement with the competencies suggested by the joint NASPA/ACPA taskforce, at 50% (see Figure 6). The list of competencies identified by student affairs practitioners/managers most

closely aligned with those suggested by CAS, with 88.9% agreement (see Figure 5) and had the least alignment with the competencies suggested by Herdlein et al. (2013), with only 50.0% agreement (see Figure 8). A detailed exploration of these findings follows. The three referenced studies are discussed in order from most specific to leadership education, professional competencies of those who manage co-curricular student leadership programs as suggested by CAS, to most general, a meta-analysis of professional competencies for success as a student affairs professional regardless of functional area or role within the institution.

#### *Competencies Suggested by CAS*

There are nine proposed professional standards for the leadership educators who oversee co-curricular leadership programs suggested by CAS (Figure 1). Five of these nine competencies were identified by both the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers and the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators (Figure 5). As was previously mentioned, the list of competencies identified by the Student Affairs Practitioners group was almost in complete alignment with this list. However, there was one professional competency that was not included in either the Practitioners/Managers or Program Directors/Coordinators lists, and that was understanding how social identity influences one's leadership.

Understanding one's own identity, how one views themselves, is an important part of young adulthood (McEwen, 2003). One's social identities are how individuals views themselves in relation to the other groups around them, which influences the way they see the world around them (Abrams & Hogg, McEwen, 2003). While social

identity theory has been discussed and researched widely in the field of social psychology for several decades, the research regarding social identities and their relationship to leadership capacity and competency is not as prolific (Hogg, 2001). Therefore, it is not unexpected that this competency was not included in either groups' lists.

<b>Leadership educators should have:</b>	<b>Practitioners</b>	<b>Program Directors</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the history and current trends in leadership theories, models, and philosophies;</li> <li>• An understanding of the contextual nature of leadership;</li> <li>• Knowledge of organizational development, group dynamics, strategies for change, and principles of community;</li> <li>• Knowledge of how social identities and dimensions of diversity influence leadership;</li> <li>• The ability to work with a diverse range of students;</li> <li>• The ability to create, implement, and evaluate student learning as a result of leadership programs;</li> <li>• The ability to effectively organize learning opportunities that are consistent with students' stages of development;</li> <li>• The ability to use reflection in helping students understand leadership concepts;</li> <li>• The ability to develop and assess student learning outcomes</li> </ul>	X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X

Figure 5. Comparisons of Delphi group results to the “Standards for Student Leadership Programs” suggested competencies for leadership educators (as cited in Jenkins & Owen, 2016)

What was surprising though was that the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators did not include half of the list. These individuals are student

affairs content and context experts, whose primary job is to teach and train the next generation of student affairs practitioners and researchers, but they did not include many of the standards by which the profession is measured. The fact that CAS was not brought up by name in any of the rounds of data collection (see Tables 10 through 15), and then only half of the competencies were identified individually at the end of the study, begs the question: is CAS and its professional standards still relevant today?

The argument can be made that CAS is still relevant, at least to some, by reviewing the competencies identified by the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers. Unlike their counterparts, the Practitioners/Managers group listed eight of the nine competencies identified by CAS from the very beginning of the study. This result shows a disconnect between the two Delphi groups. If the Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators do not immediately think of the professional competencies promoted by CAS, then where and how did the practitioners become familiar enough with them that these professional competencies readily came to mind when asked the original open-ended question?

#### *Competencies Suggested by the Joint NASPA/ACPA Taskforce*

Eanes et al. (2015) identified ten general competency areas needed to be an effective and successful student affairs educator (Figure 3). Leadership was included in this list of competencies, but it was framed within the context of the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes one needs if they are to be successful as a positional leader, i.e., department director or higher (dean of students, assistant/associate vice president of student affairs/student life, vice president/vice chancellor of student affairs/student life),

rather than the context of what competencies are needed to help an individual succeed at teaching others, predominantly undergraduate students, to be effective leaders. Because the focus of this study was the competencies needed towards the teaching of leadership as opposed to leading and managing a functional area in student affairs via a titled leadership position, it is not surprising that “leadership” as a competency was not identified by either Delphi group. Similarly, study participants were asked to identify competencies needed for entry-level student affairs practitioners, those without responsibilities for the supervision of other full-time staff members; thus, it is also not surprising that organizational and human resource competencies were not identified by either group (see Figure 6).

<b>Student Affairs Educators should have competency in:</b>	<b>Practitioners</b>	<b>Program Directors</b>
• Personal and Ethical Foundations	X	X
• Values, Philosophy, and History		
• Assessment, Evaluation, and Research	X	X
• Law, Policy, and Governance		X
• Organizational and Human Resource		
• Leadership		
• Social Justice and Inclusion	X	X
• Student Learning and Development	X	X
• Technology		
• Advising and Supporting	X	

*Figure 6.* Comparison of Delphi group results to the suggested competencies for student affairs educators (taken from Eanes, et al., 2015)

What was unexpected was that values, philosophy, and history were not more prevalent in the final lists of required competencies for either Delphi group. By

definition, leadership is values-based and has a strong foundation in philosophy (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Northouse, 2016). The same can be said of student affairs as a profession, as supporting and promoting the learning and holistic personal development of students requires a specific philosophical mindset (Hunter & Murray, 2007; Javinar, 2000; Nuss, 2003). Therefore, it is reasonable to expect values and/or philosophy to emerge as a required competency for a student affairs leadership educator.

After closer review of all responses, knowledge of the NASPA/ACPA competencies in general and the leadership competency specifically were identified as a required area of competence in the first round of this study. The Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators mentioned both initially, while the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers only identified the NASPA/ACPA leadership competency initially. Yet both Delphi groups ranked these competencies as marginally important (see Tables 1 and 10), so they were not carried on to subsequent rounds of the study. As to the history of higher education, it was also mentioned by both Delphi panels in the initial round of this study. But a majority of the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers group rated it as only slightly or marginally important (see Table 1) so it was not advanced to subsequent rounds of the study. Conversely, the history of higher education was ranked as important by the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators and was carried through to the final round of the study. However, it was ranked as the 21st out of 22 required knowledge competencies (Table 16). Nevertheless, with two-thirds of this competency category not being present in the

data, and the low ranking history of higher education received by the expert panel, the decision was made to not include this competency area as one identified in this study.

One potential reason neither expert panel found more of the NASPA/ACPA list of competencies to be required for entry-level student affairs leadership educators could be that the list is still relatively new. The list was only published in 2015, and it takes time for information to disseminate through organizations and be applied in professional practice. Thus, individuals may still be gaining familiarity with them. This is evident in the fact that empirically-based studies examining the efficacy and application of these competencies are limited (O'Brien, 2018).

Another potential reason competency areas were or were not identified by the individual student affairs context groups is the nature of their work or job responsibilities. For example, it is typical for student affairs preparatory programs to include curriculum on higher education law, policy, and governance. As the individual ultimately responsible for the curriculum within these programs, the Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators would be aware of these courses and the importance of the content thereof. But dealing with university governance and law is well above the job responsibilities of most Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers. Accordingly, it is not surprising that this competency was identified by the Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators group but not identified by the Practitioners/Managers group.

Similar logic can be used to offer a potential explanation why advising and supporting was identified by the Practitioners/Managers group but not the Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators group. Advising and supporting student organizations



and individual students are part of the daily activities of most student affairs practitioners, especially entry-level practitioners. However, most student affairs preparatory program directors find themselves more removed from those activities and responsibilities.

At first glance, it was surprising that competence with technology was not included by either group, since technology is so pervasive on college campuses and people have become so reliant on it to complete their daily tasks. Then again for that reason, it is understandable why neither Delphi group felt the need to include technology in their respective lists of competencies unique to student affairs leadership educators. We live in a world reliant on technology. Thus, competence with technology is not unique to student affairs leadership educators. It is assumed that professionals who have completed an advanced degree have a high level of comfort and competence with technology. Therefore, perhaps neither Delphi group felt it was worth mentioning technology in their lists.

#### *Competencies Identified by the Latest Meta-analysis*

In terms of the third reference study, the latest meta-analysis of student affairs competencies conducted by Herdlein et al. in 2013, the results are much more mixed. On one hand, the required competencies identified by the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators aligned nicely with Herdlein et al.'s results. The competencies that aligned between both studies are indicated in bold, see Figure 7. On the other hand, the competencies identified by the Student Affairs Practitioners/

Managers comprised less than half of those identified in Herdlein et al.'s study (alignment in bold, see Figure 8).

<b>Desired Characteristics of Student Affairs Professionals</b>		
<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Personal Characteristics</b>
<b>Multicultural/Diversity Issues</b>	<b>Research/Assessment/Evaluation</b>	<b>Self-awareness</b>
<b>Student Development Theory</b>	<b>Communication</b>	Values
<b>Legal Issues</b>	<b>Administration &amp; Management</b>	<b>Flexibility</b>
<b>Research and Assessment</b>	Supervision	Positive Attitude
<b>Budget &amp; Finance</b>	Leadership	<b>Engaged in Critical Reflection</b>
<b>Ethics</b>	<b>Writing Effectiveness</b>	<b>Willingness to Collaborate</b>
<b>Campus Organization &amp; Structure</b>	Technology	<b>Maturity</b>
<b>Counseling Theories</b>	<b>Problem Solving</b>	Leadership Style
<b>Higher Education History</b>	Personnel Management	
<b>Strategic Planning</b>	<b>Collaboration</b>	
<b>Group Dynamics</b>	Practicing Diversity	
<b>Departmental Positions in Student Affairs</b>	<b>Conflict/Crisis Management</b>	
<b>Management Theory</b>	Advising Students	
<b>Social Justice</b>	Promote Student Learning	
	Application – Theory to Practice	
	Implementing Assessment	
	Teaching and Training	

Figure 7. Alignment of competencies identified by student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators and the desired characteristics of student affairs professionals, emphasis added (adapted from Herdlein et al., 2013).

Although the list of competencies generated by the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators aligned more closely with Herdlein et al.'s (2013) findings than the Practitioners/Managers' list, there were several competencies missed by both groups, namely: budgets, strategic planning, values, technology, and leadership

styles. The arguments mentioned previously for why it was surprising that values were not included in the final competency lists and why it was not surprising that technology was not included are still valid; therefore, those competencies will not be addressed again. Rather, competencies unique to the Herdlein et al. (2013) study, budgets, strategic planning, supervision and personnel issues, and leadership style, will be addressed.

<b>Desired Characteristics of Student Affairs Professionals</b>		
<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Personal Characteristics</b>
<b>Multicultural/Diversity Issues</b>	Research/Assessment/ <b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Self-awareness</b>
<b>Student Development Theory</b>	<b>Communication</b>	Values
Legal Issues	<b>Administration &amp; Management</b>	Flexibility
Research and Assessment	<b>Supervision</b>	<b>Positive Attitude</b>
Budget & Finance	<b>Leadership</b>	<b>Engaged in Critical Reflection</b>
Ethics	<b>Writing Effectiveness</b>	<b>Willingness to Collaborate</b>
Campus Organization & Structure	Technology	Maturity
<b>Counseling Theories</b>	<b>Problem Solving</b>	Leadership Style
Higher Education History	Personnel Management	
Strategic Planning	<b>Collaboration</b>	
<b>Group Dynamics</b>	Practicing Diversity	
Departmental Positions in Student Affairs	<b>Conflict/Crisis Management</b>	
Management Theory	<b>Advising Students</b>	
<b>Social Justice</b>	Promote Student Learning	
	Application – Theory to Practice	
	Implementing Assessment	
	Teaching and Training	

*Figure 8.* Alignment of competencies identified by student affairs practitioners/managers and the desired characteristics of student affairs professionals, emphasis added (adapted from Herdlein et al., 2013).

Out of the three referenced studies, Herdlein et al. (2013), was the broadest in scope, as its purpose was to determine if a single set of necessary competencies for student affairs practice could be determined from a review of the published literature. Because the population was student affairs practitioners in general and not a specific functional area or administrative level, the results have the most generalizable applicability. Therefore, it is appropriate that this study is the only one to include budget and finance as an area of professional competence.

In recent years, the call for increased fiscal accountability and transparency within higher education has gotten louder as state and federal financial support for higher education has waned (Coffey, 2010; Dickerson et al., 2011; Schuh, 2003). In response, many divisions of student affairs/student life have had to downsize and centralize their budget and finance personnel (Schuh, 2003). Consequently, it is not surprising that neither Delphi group identified budget and finance as a required competence for entry-level student affairs leadership educators.

One potential reason why competence in budgets and finance was not identified by either Delphi group could be that being fiscally responsible is too generic of a competence. Participants were asked to focus their attention on the competencies needed by leadership educators rather than those needed generally for professional practice. But student programmatic efforts have budgets tied to them, and if student affairs practitioners expect their students to be fiscally responsible, they should be modeling that behavior for their students to see. Therefore, it is reasonable to have budgets and finance be a required competence of entry-level student affairs leadership

educators (Schuh, 2003). Yet, previous research has shown consistently that entry-level student affairs practitioners, regardless of functional area, do not know enough when it comes to budgets and need more training in terms of budgeting (Coffey, 2010; Dickerson et al., 2011; Herdlein et al., 2010).

It was not unexpected that strategic planning was not included in any of the data. Strategic planning is typically seen as a skill required of those in more advanced positions within an organization rather than entry-level positions. Although leaders need vision and a strategic mindset and leadership educators need to be able to help their students develop and hone these qualities, it is understandable why neither Delphi group addressed this competency. Additionally, previous research has shown that student affairs practitioners in general lack this competence (Herdlein et al., 2010). So, it may be that the participants do not possess this competence, and thus it did not occur to them to include it in their lists.

The competencies of supervision and personnel issues posed an interesting dilemma, because the population for this study specifically had the constraint of not supervising *professional staff* placed upon them. Thus, the participants were asked to frame their responses for those who do not supervise other full-time staff and therefore do not have to deal directly with personnel issues. Therefore, it was not unexpected that these competences were not included in the lists of either Delphi group. Yet, many entry-level student affairs practitioners supervise graduate assistants, interns or practica students and/or supervise or advise undergraduate students. Hence, many entry-level

student affairs leadership educators have need for a level of competence in supervision and personnel issues, so it was unexpected that supervision was not included.

It was unexpected that leadership style was not included in the final list of competencies. The purpose of this study was to examine the competencies needed for student affairs leadership educators; and understanding one's leadership style is important to know before endeavoring to lead or develop others into effective leaders themselves (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Northouse, 2016). Then again, leadership styles may not have been included simply because student affairs practitioners and preparatory program directors may not be in the habit of articulating their leadership styles to others or have the depth of knowledge in leadership theories, models, perspectives, or approaches to articulate what their leadership style is. As a result, it may not have occurred to either group to include it on their lists.

### *Research Question Three*

How and where should entry-level student affairs practitioners gain competence as a leadership educator?

If the goal is to prepare competent student affairs leadership educators who are ready and able to develop the next generation of effective leaders, it is not enough merely to understand what the necessary leadership educator competencies are. It is also important to understand the ideal places and spaces where pre-service student affairs practitioners should learn and practice these competencies. Identifying these places and spaces helps clarify the individual roles and responsibilities student affairs faculty and

assistantship supervisors have in the development of the next generation of student affairs leadership educators.

### **Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies**

There was considerable overlap between the lists of both expert groups, which speaks to the stability of the data. Each of the six ways to learn the required leadership educator competencies identified by the Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers was also identified by the Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators; with the Program Directors identifying two additional places to learn these competencies. Apart from the graduate assistantship, identified as the most important place to learn by both panels, the order of the other places in which to learn these competencies differed between the two Delphi groups. Ranking the graduate assistantship as the most important place to learn leadership educator competencies was not unexpected as requiring a graduate assistantship was a prerequisite for the preparatory program to be considered for inclusion in the study. However, since there are student affairs preparatory programs that do not require a graduate assistantship as part of their program, the inference space for this finding is limited.

Although there were considerable similarities between the generated lists from both Delphi groups, there were some subtle differences. A required or core course in leadership was identified as necessary by both Delphi groups, yet the Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators also included an elective leadership course as a necessary, but less important, place to learn these competencies.

At first glance having one Delphi group identify both a core and an elective course in leadership studies as an important way to learn the necessary leadership educator competencies seems problematic, but it is not. Rather, it shows the agreement within the Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators and the value they place in having a leadership studies course be part of the student affairs preparatory program curriculum. In essence, they are saying it is good to offer an elective course in leadership studies within the preparatory student affairs program course catalog, but it is better, or more important, to have the leadership studies course be a required course. This finding is important to note because Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators context experts are saying one thing—a leadership studies course should be a required course in the preparatory programs—but doing the opposite, as very few programs incorporate a leadership studies course into the elective curriculum let alone the core curriculum.

Similarly, being mentored was identified as an important way to learn the necessary leadership educator competencies by both Delphi groups. But the student affairs practitioners/managers perceived mentoring relationships of greater importance than did the program directors/coordinators. This elevated importance was demonstrated in part by the higher ranking, but it was also demonstrated as the practitioners/managers were more specific and split mentoring into two items: having been mentored previously (more important) and being mentored by senior leadership educator (less important). Thus, we see that the student affairs practitioners/managers believe it was more



important to choose to be in a mentoring relationship than it was to be mentored by someone with a specific title or accumulated years of experience.

Still, one place stood out on both lists; that the necessary leadership competencies should be learned on the job post master's degree. All other items on both lists were tied directly to various aspects of an academic student affairs preparatory program. This item supports previous research that one of the best ways to learn leadership is through first-hand experience (Brungardt, 1996; Buschlen & Guthrie, 2014; Conger 1992; Hall, 2014). It appears though, that both Delphi groups took this thought one step further to declare that one of the best ways to learn the competencies needed to be a leadership educator is by working as a leadership educator. Thus, individuals are progressing through the experiential learning cycle (Kolb, 2015) as they work "to strengthen the critical linkages among education, work, and personal development" (pp. 3-4).

While there is much value in learning through first-hand experience, previous research has shown that the best place to develop competencies related to one's profession is during their academic preparatory program, not on the job (Kuk & Banning, 2009; Nelson, 2010). Moreover, previous research has also shown that entry-level student affairs practitioners lack many of the general, professional competencies needed to be successful in their first job (Nelson, 2010; Roberts, 2003). If that is the case, is it too much to expect these new professionals to learn and develop the specialized competencies of leadership education in addition to the more general, professional competencies they lack? By placing these expectations on early-career

practitioners, are their professors and supervisors setting them up for failure or at least burnout? Could these unrealistic expectations be one of the causes for the high attrition rate of early-career student affairs practitioners?

### **Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies**

Conversely, in relation to places where entry-level student affairs practitioners should practice the aforementioned leadership educator competencies, there was not a great degree of overlap between the two panels. Only four items, (graduate assistantship, on the job, graduate internship and/or practica, and advising a student organization) were identified by both Delphi panels. Three of those four common items (graduate assistantship, on the job, and graduate internships and/or practica) occupied the top three places on both lists; the places identified as most important to practice these leadership educator competencies, once again signifying the stability of the data. As was the case with where to learn these competencies, the graduate assistantship was identified as the most important place to practice the leadership educator competencies. The order of items two and three, on-the-job and graduate internships/practica, were reversed between the two groups.

Because a student affairs graduate assistantship, internship, or practicum mirrors the work of full-time student affairs staff members, it was not unexpected that these items were identified as some of the most important spaces or places to practice leadership educator competencies. But, proficiency comes through extensive practice and trial and error; therefore, waiting to practice the necessary competencies until one is hired in that first full-time job may not be wise, as the margin for error and time for trial

and error shrinks with full-time staff member status. The fourth common item, graduate advisor of student organization, can be considered in a similar manner to a graduate assistantship, thus it too was not an unexpected finding.

It is of interest that only the student affairs practitioners/managers identified an academic setting as a necessary place to practice the leadership educator competencies. This group identified two items: a formal class in leadership within the master's program (less important) and group work within the classroom (more important). Considering that the student affairs preparatory program directors/coordinators consider leadership education to be a functional area within a division of student affairs/student life and define leadership educators as those who have direct contact with undergraduate students through mentoring relationships, it is reasonable that they do not consider an academic classroom an appropriate venue in which to practice these competencies. All of the remaining places or spaces to practice the necessary leadership educator competencies identified by both Delphi groups revolved around 'learning by doing' in non-academic settings, which denotes the applied nature of leadership and the benefit of experiential learning opportunities.

### **Recommendations**

This study was conducted to identify the necessary leadership educator competencies of entry-level student affairs practitioners and to determine the best places to learn and practice the identified competencies. Assessing professional competencies is important as it helps advance that profession forward. As Lovell and Kosten (2000)

noted, “any profession with an extensive history ought to be able to identify traits, qualities, skills, and knowledge bases necessary for success” (p. 553). The analysis of the data led to several recommendations, which may have implications for the preparation and further study of student affairs leadership educators.

**1. A course in leadership should be included in the curriculum of student affairs preparatory programs.**

The primary objective of student affairs preparatory programs is to educate and train new student affairs professionals. As one advances through said programs, they learn the competencies, i.e., the knowledge, skills, abilities, and dispositions, needed to be student affairs professionals. Therefore, as entry-level student affairs practitioners are considered to be leadership educators, they need to be provided opportunities to explore leadership as an academic field of study, learn, and thereby practice the associated competencies prior to their first full-time positions in student affairs.

Integrating a leadership course into the program curriculum provides the space for pre-service student affairs professionals to explore leadership as an academic field of study prior to their first full-time position. If the goal is to introduce leadership competencies in a systematic and consistent manner, then a leadership studies course should be part of the core curriculum. However, if a required course is not feasible, one option is to offer an elective course(s) in leadership studies. These courses do not have to be taught by student affairs faculty members. Instead, these elective courses can be offered in partnership with another department on campus where the academic exploration of leadership is taught.

A second option is to incorporate leadership development modules into the existing core curriculum. Each module could focus on a specific leadership educator competency and could build upon each other as the student progresses through the preparatory program. An examination of the core curriculum would be required to determine where and how the academic study of leadership could be incorporated into existing or reconfigured courses. Focusing on the methods of teaching leadership within a student affairs preparatory program was beyond the scope of this study; therefore, this recommendation extends only to including a leadership course to the curriculum. A methods of teaching course focused on teaching leadership to others is not proposed at this time.

**2. Proficiency as a leadership educator should be added as a learning outcome for all graduate assistantships within a division of student affairs/student life.**

The graduate assistantship was ranked by both context-expert groups as the most important place pre-service student affairs professionals can learn, practice, and ultimately begin to develop proficiency as a leadership educator. Because the graduate assistantship experience is designed for pre-service student affairs practitioners to gain practical experience within a functional area of student affairs, it is appropriate for the graduate assistantship experience to be identified as one of the best opportunities for pre-service student affairs professionals to put theory to practice. Yet, student affairs preparatory program directors have very little say in what happens during the graduate assistantship experience. Traditionally, graduate assistantship supervisors, either

individually or in functional areas, provide their own training, set expectations, identify learning outcomes, determine developmental areas, and define acceptable practice for their specific graduate assistants.

If everyone is relying on the graduate assistantship experience to be *the place* where students learn and practice how to be leadership educators, then leadership educator proficiency needs to be included as a focused and intentional learning outcome of the assistantship experience. Additionally, there needs to be increased consistency between graduate assistantships across a division of student affairs/student life as it relates to student affairs leadership educator training and development. Common expectations should be discussed and set, and the assistantship supervisors need to be given the resources to bring themselves up to speed on leadership education. Only then can the supervisors be expected to be effective as they teach, train, and develop their graduate assistants to be effective leadership educators themselves.

**3. Student affairs practitioners and student affairs faculty members should regularly meet to discuss shifts and trends in the competencies needed to be a successful student affairs professional.**

This study confirmed previous research that student affairs practitioners and faculty members do not always agree on what professional competencies are most important or needed to be a successful student affairs professional. While their philosophical differences are warranted, this lack of agreement or appearance of a united front contributes to the on-going gap between theory and practice. Theory influences practice and practice can offer valuable insight into how theory is presented in courses.

In efforts to help bridge this gap, regular, consistent, intentional conversations between student affairs practitioners and preparatory program faculty members are recommended. By sitting in council together in partnership, sharing best practices, discussing trends in current student development and learning research, designing meaningful assessment and evaluation practices, and creating action items for collaboration and continuous learning, both graduate assistantship supervisors and student affairs faculty members can benefit from the shared wisdom and experience in the room.

**4. When working with pre-service student affairs professionals, do not assume leadership educator preparation is someone else's responsibility.**

This study confirmed that both student affairs practitioners and faculty members find value in and see the need for leadership educator preparation while participating in a preparatory student affairs program. However, both groups appeared to shift responsibility for this preparation to the other group; practitioners felt the education and practice should happen in the academic classroom while the preparatory program directors responded that the development should come through supervised experiential opportunities like graduate assistantships, internships, and practica.

While student affairs leadership programming is increasingly identified as a functional area within a division of student affairs/student life on many campuses, no one has cornered the market on leadership education. Thus, student affairs practitioners and faculty members each have a vital role to play in the education, training, and development of the next generation of leadership educators. Rather than working in

competition with each other, student affairs practitioners and faculty members need to work collaboratively (see Recommendation 3) to reinforce and expand upon leadership educator competencies learned experientially or academically. As Hall (2014) reported, graduate school needs to be seen as the start of a professional development journey and not the journey in its entirety.

#### **5. More research is needed.**

While this study looked at the leadership educator competencies necessary for entry-level student affairs practitioners, expanding the study to include student affairs practitioners at multiple levels of their careers could be insightful. Research has shown that organizational position or level influences the proficiency and relevance of the professional competencies in general (Herdlein et al., 2013). It could be useful to see if this trend holds for leadership educator competencies, as the result could inform professional development programming content.

A more in-depth examination of the leadership educator competencies identified in this study is also needed. This deeper study should seek to confirm and/or refine the lists of leadership educator competencies identified in this study. The goal should be to combine the context-expert specific lists of competencies into one list of essential competencies for student affairs leadership educators. From there, the goal would be to create an assessment with an associated proficiency rubric that could be used by student affairs leadership educators at any professional level to determine their level of proficiency in each competency area. This assessment could be used as part of the



formal annual performance review for pre-service or current student affairs professionals or to inform a personal development plan.

An appropriate next step in this line of inquiry is to examine how leadership education is currently addressed within the curricula of student affairs preparatory programs nation-wide. With a leading recommendation being the inclusion of a leadership studies course into the student affairs preparatory program curriculum, it is prudent to examine the status of current leadership development initiatives within these programs. This result could prove useful in refining programmatic options regarding the inclusion of leadership courses.

### **Conclusions**

In closing, multiple findings, items for discussion, and recommendations were made based on the results of this study. Most of these recommendations deal with changes to student affairs preparatory program curriculum and the way student affairs practitioners, specifically graduate assistantship supervisors, and student affairs faculty members work collaboratively to educate, train, and develop the next generation of student affairs leadership educators. The gap between leadership educator theory and practice, between student affairs practitioners and faculty members remains; now we need to find meaningful ways to bridge it.

While this section brings this study to a close, the examination of the preparation of student affairs leadership educators is just beginning. The emphasis of this study was the leadership educator competencies required of entry-level student affairs practitioners

and where these competencies should be learned and practiced. The vision moving forward is that this study is used to help develop highly proficient student affairs leadership educators who will in turn educate society's next generation of effective leaders.

## REFERENCES

- Abrams, D. & Hogg, M. A. (1990). An introduction to the social identity approach. *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances*, 1-9.
- Agresti, A., & Finlay, B. (2009). *Statistical methods for the social sciences* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Allen, S. J., & Hartman, N. S. (2009). Sources of learning in student leadership development programming. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(3), 6-16. doi:10.1002/jls.20119
- Andenoro, A. C., Allen, S. J., Haber-Curran, P., Jenkins, D. M., Sowcik, M., Dugan, J. P., & Osteen, L. (2013). *National leadership education research agenda 2013-2018: Providing strategic direction for the field of leadership education*. Retrieved from Association of Leadership Educators website <http://leadershipeducators.org/ResearchAgenda>.
- Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Blake, J. H. (2007). The crucial role of student affairs professionals in the learning process. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 117, 65-72. doi:10.1002/ss.234
- Brungardt, C. (1996). The making of leaders: A review of the research in leadership development and education. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(3), 81-95. doi:10.1177/107179199700300309
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. (4th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford Press.
- Buriak, P., & Shinn, G. C. (1989). Mission, initiatives, and obstacles to research in agricultural education: A national Delphi using external decision-makers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 30(4), 14-23. doi:10.5032/jae.1989.04014
- Burkard, A. W., Cole, D. C., Ott, M., & Stoflet, T. (2005). Entry-level competencies of new student affairs professionals: A Delphi study. *NASPA Journal*, 42(3), 283-309.
- Burns, J. S. (1995). Leadership studies: A new partnership between academic departments and student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 32(4), 242-250.

- Buschlen, E., & Guthrie, K. L. (2014). Seamless leadership learning in curricular and cocurricular facets of university life: A pragmatic approach to praxis. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(4), 58-6. doi:10.1002/jls.21311
- Coffey, C. M. (2010). *A study of competencies perceived to be important by professionals in entry-level positions within college student affairs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL.
- Conger, J. A. (1992). *Learning to lead: The art of transforming managers into leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). (2017a). *History*. Retrieved from <http://www.cas.edu/history>
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) (2017b). *Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.cas.edu/standards>
- Crisp, J. Pelleteir, D., Duffield, C., Adams, A., & Nagy, S. (1997). The Delphi method? *Nursing Research*, 46, 116-118.
- Cross, K. (1998). Why learning communities? Why now? *About Campus*, 3(3), 4–11.
- Dalkey, N. C. (1969a). An experimental study of group opinion: The Delphi method. *Futures*, 1(5), 408-426.
- Dalkey, N. C. (1969b). *The Delphi method: An experimental study of group opinion*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.
- Davis, T. M., & Murrell P. H. (1993). A structural model of perceived academic, personal, and vocational gains related to college student responsibility. *Research in Higher Education*, 34(3), 267-289.
- Day, D. V. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581-613.
- Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H., & Gustafson, D. H. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foreman and Company.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Touchstone.

- Dickerson, A. M., Hoffman, J. L., Anan, B. P., Brown, K. F., Vong, L. K., Bresciani, M. . . . , & Oyler, J. (2011). A comparison of senior student affairs officer and student affairs preparatory program faculty expectations of entry-level professionals' competencies. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48(4), 463-479. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.6270
- Dugan, J. P., & Osteen, L. (2016). Leadership. In J. H. Schuh, S. R. Jones, & V. Torres (Eds). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (6th ed.) (pp. 408-422). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dungy, G. J. (2003). Organizations and functions of student affairs. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates (Eds). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed.). (pp. 339-357). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Eanes, B. J., Perrillo, P. A., Fechter, T., Gordon, S. A., Harper, S., Havice, P., Hoffman, J. L. . . . Willoughby, C. (2015). Professional competency areas for student affairs educators. Retrieved from [https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/ACPA\\_NASPA\\_Professional\\_Competencies\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/ACPA_NASPA_Professional_Competencies_FINAL.pdf)
- Ellerston, S., & Thoennes, K. V. (2007). Reframing teaching and learning: Lessons from learning communities for student affairs. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 117, 35-46. doi:10.1002/ss.231
- Fincher, J., & Shalka, T. R. (2009). Co-curricular leadership education: Considering critical questions. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 8(1), 228-237.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Franklin, K. K., & Hart, J. K. (2007). Idea generation and exploration: Benefits and limitations of the policy Delphi research method. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31, 237-246. doi:10.1007/s10755-006-9022-8
- Guthrie, K., & Jenkins, D. M. (2018). *The role of leadership educators: Transforming learning*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Haber, P. (2012). Perceptions of leadership: An examination of college students' understandings of the concept of leadership. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 11(2), 26-51.
- Hall, M. R. (2014). Job one 2.0: The next generation. In P. M. Magolda, & J. E. Carnaghi. (2014). *Job one 2.0: Understanding the next generation of student affairs professionals* (2nd ed.). (pp. 1-10). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- Harris, M., & Cullen, R. (2007). Learner-centered leadership: An agenda for action. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*, 21-28. doi:10.1007/s10755-007-9059-3
- Hartman, N. S., Allen, S. J., & Miguel, R. F. (2015). An exploration of teaching methods used to develop leaders: Leadership educator's perspectives. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 36*(5), 454-472, doi:10.1108/LODJ-07-2013-0097
- Herdlein, R. (2004). Survey of chief student affairs officers regarding relevance of graduate preparation of new professionals. *NASPA Journal, 42*(1), 51-71.
- Herdlein, R., Kline, K., Boquard, B., & Haddad, V. (2010). A survey of faculty perceptions of learning outcomes in master's level programs in higher education and student affairs. *College Student Affairs Journal, 29*(1), 33-45.
- Herdlein, R., Riefler, L., & Mrowka, K. (2013). An integrative literature review of student affairs competencies: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 50*(3), 250-269. doi:10.1515/jsarp-2013-0019
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*(3), 184-200.
- Huber, N. S. (2002). Approaching leadership education in the new millennium. *Journal of Leadership Education, 1*(1), 25-34.
- Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2004). *Integrative learning: Mapping the terrain*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Huber, M. T., Hutchings, P., Gale, R., Miller, R., & Breen, M. (2007). Leading initiative for integrative learning. *Liberal Education, 46*-51.
- Hunter, M. S., & Murray, K. A. (2007). New frontiers for student affairs professionals: Teaching and the first-year experience. *New Directions for Student Leadership, 117*, 25-34. doi:10.1002/ss.230
- Hyman, R. E. (1985, April). *Do graduate preparation programs address competencies important to student affairs practice?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Portland, OR.
- Hyman, R. E. (1988). Graduate preparation for professional practice: A difference of perceptions. *NASPA Journal, 26*(2), 143-150.

- International Leadership Association (ILA). (2009). *Guiding questions: Guidelines for leadership education programs*. Retrieved from <http://www.ila-net.org/Communities/LC/GuidingQuestionsFinal.pdf>.
- Javinar, J. M. (2000). Student life and development. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 111, 85-93.
- Jenkins, D. M. (2012). Exploring signature pedagogies in undergraduate leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 11(1), 1-27.
- Jenkins, D. M., & Owen, J. E. (2016). Who teaches leadership? A comparative analysis of faculty and student affairs leadership educators and implications for leadership learning. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 15(2), 98-113, doi:1012806/V15/I2/R1
- Jones, E. A., & Voorhees, R. A. (2002). *Defining and assessing learning: Exploring competency-based initiatives* (NCES 2002-159). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Keating, K., Rosch, D., & Burgoon, L. (2014). Development readiness for leadership: the Differential effects of leadership courses on creating “ready, willing, and able” learners. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13(3), 1-16. doi:1012806/V13/I3/R1
- Kezar, A. J., Carducci, R. & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). Rethinking the ‘L’ word in higher education: The revolution in research and leadership. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 31(6). doi:10.1002/aehe.3106
- King, P. M. (2003). Student learning in higher education. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates (Eds.). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed.). (pp. 234-268). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Komives, S. R., Dugan, J. P., Owen, J. E. Slack, C., & Wagner, W. (2011). *The handbook for student leadership development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S. D., Owen, J. E., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2006). A leadership identity development model: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(4). doi:10.1353/csd.2006.0048
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuk, L., & Banning, J. (2009). Student affairs preparation programs: A competency based approach to assessment and outcomes. *College Student Journal*, 43(2), 492-502.
- Kuk, L., Cobb, B., & Forrest, C. (2007). Perceptions of competencies of entry-level practitioners in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 44(4), 664-691. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.1863
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Lovell, C. D., & Kosten, L. A. (2000). Skills, knowledge, and personal traits necessary for success as a student affairs administrator: A meta-analysis of thirty years of research. *NASPA Journal*, 37(4), 553-572.
- McEwen, M. K. (2003). New perspectives on identity development. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates (Eds). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed.). (pp. 203-233). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, J. M. (2007). Student affairs programs. In D. Wright, & M. T. Miller (Eds.). *Training higher education policy makers and leaders* (pp. 45-51). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Moore, E. L., & Marsh, R. S. (2007). College teaching for Student Affairs professionals. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 117, 3-11. doi:10.1002/ss.228
- Morgan, A. C., King, D. L., Rudd, R. D., & Kaufman, E. K. (2013). Elements of an undergraduate agricultural leadership program: A Delphi study. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 12(1), 140-154.
- Nelson, K. A. (2010). *Leadership development in student affairs graduate preparatory programs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
- Newton, F. B. & Richardson, R. L. (1976). Expected entry-level competencies of student personnel workers. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 17(5), 426-430.



- Northouse, P. (2016). *Leadership theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nuss, E. M. (2003). The development of student affairs. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates (Eds). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed.). (pp. 65-88). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Brien, J. J. (2018). Exploring intersections among the ACPA/NASPA professional competencies. *Journal of College Student Development*, 59(3), 274-290. doi:10.1353/csd.2018.0027
- Okoli, C., & Pawlowski, S. (2004). The Delphi method as a research tool: An example, design consideration and application. *Information & Management*, 42, 15-29. doi:10.1016/j.im.2003.11.002
- Ostroth, D. D. (1981). Competencies for entry-level professionals: What do employers look for in hiring new staff? *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22(1), 5-11.
- Owen, J. E. (2015a). Transforming leadership development for significant learning. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 145, 7-17. doi:10.1002/yd.20120
- Parks, S. D. (2005). *Leadership can be taught: A bold approach for a complex world*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pascarella, E. T. (2006). How college affects student: Ten directions for future research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(5), 508-520. doi:10.1353/csd.2006.0060
- Priest, K. L., & Clegorne, N. A. (2015). Connecting to experience: High-impact practices for leadership development. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 145, 71-83. doi:10.1002/yd.20125
- Rayens, M. K., & Hahn, E. J. (2000). Building consensus using the policy Delphi method. *Policy, Politics, & Nursing Practice*, 1(4), 308-315.
- Renn, K. A., & Jessup-Anger, E. R. (2008). Preparing new professionals: Lessons for graduate preparation programs from the National Study of New Professionals in Student Affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(4), 319-335.
- 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, & R. R. Riggio (Eds). *The future of leadership development* (pp. 223-236). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Roberts, D. C. (2007). *Deeper learning in leadership: Helping college students find the potential within*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Roberts, D. M. (2003). *Skill development among student affairs professionals in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators region III* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Rocconi, L. M. (2011). The impact of learning communities on first year students' growth and development in college. *Research in Higher Education*, 52(2), 178-193.
- Rogers, J. L. (1991). Leadership education in college student personnel preparation programs: An analysis of faculty perspectives. *NASPA Journal*, 29(1), 37-48.
- Rohrbaugh, J. (1979). Improving the quality of group judgement: Social judgement analysis and the Delphi technique. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 24, 73-92.
- Rosch, D. M., Collier, D., & Thompson, S. E. (2015). An exploration of students' motivation to lead: An analysis by race, gender, and student leadership behaviors. *Journal of College Student Development*, 56(3), 286-291.
- Rosch, D. M., Spencer, G. L., & Hoag, B. L. (2017). A comprehensive multi-level model for campus-based leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 16(4), 124-134. doi:1012806/V16/I4/A2
- Rost, J. C., & Barker, R. A. (2000). Leadership education in colleges: Toward a 21st century paradigm. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(1), 3-12.
- Schmidt, R. C. (1997). Managing Delphi surveys using nonparametric statistical techniques. *Decision Sciences*, 28(3), 763-774.
- Schuh, J. H. (2003). Strategic planning and finance. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates (Eds). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed.). (pp. 358-378). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shertzer, J., Wall, V., Frandsen, A., Guo, Y., Whalen, D. F., & Shelley II, M. C. (2005). Four dimensions of student leadership: What predicts students' attitudes toward leadership development? *The College Student Affairs Journal*, 25(1), 85-108.
- Spencer, L. M., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). *Competence at work: Models for superior performance*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Sowcik, M., Lindsey, J. L., & Rosch, D. M. (2012). A collective effort to understand formalized program review. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(3), 67-72.

- Thompson, M. D. (2013). Student leadership development and orientation: Contributing resources within the liberal arts. *American Journal of Education Research*, 1(1), 1-6.
- Waldman, D. A., Galvin, B. M., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2012). The development of motivation to lead and leader role identity. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(2), 156-168.
- Waple, J. N. (2006). An assessment of skills and competencies necessary for entry-level student affairs work. *NASPA Journal*, 43(1), 1-18.
- Woodard, Jr., D. B., Love, P., & Komives, S. R. (2000). Learning and development. *New Directions for Student Services*, 92, 49-60. doi:10.1002/ss.924
- Wright, D. (2007). Progress in the development of higher education as a specialized field of study. In D. Wright and M. T. Miller (Eds). *Training higher education policy makers and leaders: A graduate program perspective* (pp. 19-34). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

**APPENDIX A**  
**ROUND 1 DATA**

## Round 1: Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers

### Leadership Education Knowledge of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrument Item (if changed)</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
Basic understanding of leadership theories	Progression of leadership theory	1
	Leadership theories themselves	1, 2, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13
	Knowledge of Transformational Leadership	6
	Leadership Identity Development	5, 7
	Knowledge of the SCM	6, 7
	Knowledge of the Leadership Challenge	6
	Willingness to explore leadership theories	3
	Research on leader development (MSL)	1
Knowledge of leadership identity theory	Understanding of identity development	2, 10
Knowledge of student development theory	Understanding of basic theories used in student affairs that can interrelate with the leadership development of a student	2
	Knowledge of student development theory	5, 10, 13
	Knowledge of leadership instruments/assessments	3
Knowledge of experiential learning	Experiential learning	5
	Knowledge of organizational management	6
Knowledge of the theory of team and group dynamics	Theory of team and group dynamics	7
Knowledge of change agency and change processes	Change agency	7
	Change process	7
Knowledge of community building	Community building	7
Knowledge of diversity and inclusion	Diversity and inclusion	7
	Understanding of self	7
Knowledge of self-understanding and understanding of others	Understanding of others	7
	Familiarity of the Leadership Competency outlined in the ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies	NASPA/ACPA competencies

	Understanding constructs of leadership and leader	8
	Understanding of intentional program development (including developing learning outcomes and matching pedagogy with learning outcomes, etc.)	8
	Understand the leadership education desired at their particular institution (ascertain the culture, artifacts, indicators of educational aims, etc.)	9
There is not one single set of core knowledge needed to be a leadership educator	There is not one core set of leadership education knowledge	9
	Understanding of where their own learning occurred	11
	Core knowledge of ways to practice leadership	12
	Knowledge of the history of higher education	13
Knowledge of trends in student issues	Trends in student issues	13
Knowledge of campus based information (org chars, reporting procedures, risk-management, office protocols, etc.)	Campus based information (org charts, reporting procedures, risk-management, office protocols, etc.)	13
	Knowledge of the social sector	6
	Knowledge of leadership competencies highlighted in Seemiller and Murray's work	14

Leadership Educator Skills of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrument Item (if changed)</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
Life-long learner	Learner	1
	Organized	1
Project and event planning	Can plan	2
	Project and event planning	4
	Event planning experience	6
	Project management	13
Counseling/listening/advising skills	Counselling	2
	Listening	2
	Advising skills in order to have a conversation	2
	Advising	13
	Coaching skills	3, 11
	Teaching skills/strategies	5
General leadership skills	Leadership skills	4
	Problem solving skills	4, 5, 13
Awareness of others	Self-awareness of personalities and the personalities of others	4, 12
	Self-awareness	12
Effective presentation and facilitation skills	Facilitation	5, 7, 13
	Presentation; strong presentation skills	5, 6
	Public speaking	13
	Curriculum development	5, 13
	Creative thinking	1, 5, 6
	Critical thinking	5
Effective communication skills (oral and written)	Communication, written and oral skills	5, 7, 12
	Mentoring	5
	Reflection	5
	Relationship building	5
Skills to lead multi-generational teams or groups	Leading teams and groups	7
	Generational leadership	7
	Time management	7
	Meeting management	7
	There is not one core set of leadership education skills	9
	Objectively observe and summarize situations in need of intervention or organizational process in need of review	10

	Communicating their perspective of a situation and offering insight to action	11
Effective supervision skills	Practical strategic planning skills	11
	Supervision skills	13
	Assessment practices	13
	Administrative management (timely communication, record keeping, organization, etc.)	13
	Professionalism (follow-through, personal responsibility, appropriate behavior, positive attitude, not gossiping, etc.)	13
Effective conflict negotiation	Conflict negotiation	13
Cultural Competencies	Appreciation of diversity	13
Skills in student advocacy	Student advocacy	13

Leadership Educator Abilities/Attributes of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrument Item</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
Openness towards and inclusivity of all identities	Openness to all identities	1
	Inclusive to all identities	1
Loosely bound to student performance – you can’t force students to be better leaders, they have to do the work	Loosely bound – you can’t force students to be better leaders. Even if you teach and they understand, they still have to do it	1
	Experience leading a group of some sort to have direct experience	2
Direct experience leading a group	Willingness to give constructive feedback to student leaders	3, 10
	Ability to work on a team	4
Ability to work on a team	Collaboration	13
	Ability to communicate across differences	4
Ability to communicate across differences	Cultural competence	4
	Being a continuous learner	5, 6
Creative and innovative spirit	Continuous learning	5, 6
	Innovative spirit	6
	Creativity	5, 6
	Positive attitude	7



	Patience	7	
Desire to teach students	Desire to teach	1, 7	
	Desire to learn	7	
Ability to relate to novice leaders	Focus on youth development	7	
	Understanding of novices in leadership	7	
	Ability to translate desire leadership education into learning outcomes for learning that could occur outside the classroom	1, 9	
Ability to create strategies mapped to learning outcomes	Ability to create strategies mapped to learning outcomes	9	
	Make relationships across institutional barriers to advance leadership education on campus	1	
	There is not one core set of leadership education abilities or attributes	9	
	Ability to challenge students appropriately	10	
	Ability to help students identify ways in which they can practice and find opportunities that will help them engage in challenge areas	10	
	Ability to carry out a devised plan beyond a single event or program	11	
	Ability to facilitate consensus	11	
	Ability to develop a written long-term plan	11	
	Ability to communicate steps in a long-term plan to others	11	
	Student empowerment and delegation	13	
	Ability to have difficult conversations	13	
	Ability to be an ethical decision-maker	Ethical decision-making	13
		Hold people accountable	13
	Initiative	13	
Ability to generate ideas/be creative	Idea generation/creativity	13	
Ability to be a critical thinker	Critical Thinking	13	
	Ability to work independently	13	
Ability to set goals	Goal-setting	14	

Ability to focus on positive change	Positive change	12
Ability to help students and others dig deeper	Help students and others dig deeper	12
Event planning experience	Project and event planning	4

Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrument Item</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
Formal class in their master's program	Class on leadership	1, 2, 7, 9
	Coursework specific to leadership development in their graduate program	3, 5
Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning, not just the leadership office	Assistantship – any student affairs unit that integrates leadership learning in their work and not just the leadership office	1, 5, 11
	Within their graduate assistantship	2, 5
Participating in the Multi-institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) research	MSL research	1
Participation in a professional leadership conference (ILA, or Leadership Educators Institute/NCLP)	ILA or other conferences	1
	Leadership Educators Institute NCLP	1
As graduate advisor to a student organization	Hands-on experience of actually advising student organizations	3, 7
	Undergraduate classes	2, 3
Their undergraduate extracurricular activities, like student organizations	Extracurricular activities as an undergraduate	2, 3
	Participating in leadership programs as undergraduates	Participating in undergraduate leadership programs
Workshops or trainings (internal to campus)	Group work in the classroom	4
	Workshops	4
	Training	4
Internship and/or practicum	Internships	5, 9
	Practicum experiences	5, 7, 9
	Involvement with committees on campus	5

Involvement on campus committees in the field	Involvement with committees in the professional field	5
	Involvement with professional associations	5
Professional development training (external to campus)	Professional development training	5
A required course in their master's coursework	Required course in graduate prep program	8
On the job (i.e. their first job post master's program)	As new professionals	9
Mentoring relationships, either during their undergraduate or graduate programs	Mentoring opportunities in undergrad and grad school	9, 10
Reading journals or books seminal to the discipline	Reading books or articles	12
	Prior employment	14
	Team participation	4
	Volunteering and community service	4
	Being mentored by senior leadership educator	13
	Presenting at professional conferences	13

Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrument Item</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
Formal class in their master's program	Class on leadership Coursework specific to leadership development in their graduate program	1, 2, 7, 9 3, 5
Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning, not just the leadership office	Assistantship – any student affairs unit that integrates leadership learning in their work and not just the leadership office	1, 5, 11
graduate assistants	Within their graduate assistantship	2, 5
Attending professional leadership conference (ILA, or Leadership Educators Institute/NCLP)	ILA or other conferences Leadership Educators Institute NCLP	1 1

As graduate advisor to a student organization	Hands-on experience of actually advising student organizations	3, 7
	Undergraduate classes	2, 3
Their undergraduate extracurricular activities, like student organizations	Extracurricular activities as an undergraduate	2, 3
Participating in leadership programs as undergraduates	Participating in undergraduate leadership programs	6
	Group work in the classroom	4
Workshops or trainings (internal to campus)	Workshops	4
	Training	4
Internship and/or practicum	Internships	5, 9
	Practicum experiences	5, 7, 9
Involvement on campus	Involvement with committees on campus	5
committees in the field	Involvement with committees in the professional field	5
	Involvement with professional associations	5
Professional development training (external to campus)	Professional development training	5
A required course in their master's coursework	Required course in graduate prep program	8
On the job (i.e. their first job post master's program)	As new professionals	9
Mentoring relationships, either during their undergraduate or graduate programs	Mentoring opportunities in undergrad and grad school	9, 10
	Prior employment	14
	Team participation	4
	Volunteering and community service	4
	Presenting at professional conferences	13
	Identify something they are passionate about that is greater than themselves or their ability to control	12

**Round 1: Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators**

Leadership Education Knowledge of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrumentation Item</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
Basic understanding of leadership theory	Basic understanding of leadership theory	A, B, G, H, M
	An understanding of at least understand the SCM	M
	Knowledge of the evolution of leadership theory	M
	Theoretical understanding of college environments and organization	A
	Theoretical underpinning of student development theory	A, N
	Understanding social justice theories	G
	Practical and conceptual understanding of the college experience and different pathways thereof	Practical and conceptual understanding of the college experience and the different pathways to get there
Understanding of enrollment trends		A
Understanding of diverse subpopulations within specific institution		A
Understanding of diverse subpopulations within higher education at large		A
Deep understanding of diversity, inclusion, privilege, oppression, and power dynamics		F
Understanding of how identity play into the college experience for diverse subpopulations		A
An understanding of the political campus environment and how to navigate it		A
Deep understanding of the inner workings of a particular functional area (i.e. where they will work for that first job)	Deep understanding of a functional area	A

	Deep understanding of many functional areas	A
Understanding of group dynamics (i.e. group and team development)	Understanding of group dynamics	A
	Understanding of group and team development	B
	Understanding of the important role of context in leadership education	B
Knowledge of self (personal strengths, limitations, goals, learning style)	Sense of self	D, K, Q
	Personal strengths and limitations	D
	Knowledge of ethical standards	G
	Knowledge of NASPA/ACPA competencies in general	I
	Knowledge of NASPA/ACPA competency for leadership	Q
	Knowledge that leadership does not require a position/title	P
	Understand that development is an avenue to impact positive change	P
Understanding of the history of US higher education	History of US higher education	N
Understanding of the emergence and growth of student affairs as a profession	Emergence and growth of student affairs as a profession	N
Knowledge of program evaluation and assessment	Program evaluation and assessment	N
Knowledge of research about college students	Research about college students	N
Knowledge of higher education governance	Higher education governance	N
Knowledge of the fundamentals of higher education law	Fundamentals of higher education law	N
	Knowledge of how to infuse practice with theory	N
	Understanding of one's role within the institution	N
	Knowing when to refer a student to other campus resources	N

Leadership Education Skills of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrumentation Item</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
Basic research/assessment skills	Basic understanding of research methods	A
	Assessment	O
	Critical thinking	A
	Problem solving	A
Skill to effectively self-reflect	Reflection	A, J, N
Skill to establish a strong vision for the group	Strong vision	A
	How to establish a vision for a group	A
	Listening skills	A, L, M, N
Crisis/emergency management skills	Handles crises and emergencies with ease	A
	Skills to create and sustain healthy environments	B
Effective communication skills	Communication (verbal, digital, written, nonverbal)	B, C, D, G, H, L, O, N
	Counselling skills	B
	Interpersonal skills	B, I
	Effectively working with teams	B, L, O
	Delegation	B, O
	Running effective meetings	B
	Enhancing group morale	B
	Organizational skills	C, H
	Group facilitation skills	H
	Conflict resolution/management skills	Conflict management
Effective dialogue skills	Supervision skills	I
	Dialogue	J
Effectively working with diverse individuals	Effectively working with diverse individuals	L
	Communicating with diverse stakeholders	A, G
Advising skills (in terms of student groups)	Advise student groups	M
	Skill to learn culture of the office	M
	Resilience	O
	Restorative practices	Q
Event/program planning	Planning	N

Excellent time management skills	Time management	N
Building programs to meet desired outcomes	Programming to accomplish desired outcomes	N
	Entrepreneurial thinking with an eye towards innovation	A
	Public speaking skills	H

Leadership Education Abilities/Attributes of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrumentation Item</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
	Ability to communicate with diverse stakeholders	A
	Insight into the ways real college experience might differ from the theoretical	A
	Sensitivity to the needs and experiences of individuals and diverse subpopulations	A
	Ability to communicate conceptual ideas through a practical lens	A
	Hard working	A
	Capacity to persuade, argue, or debate	A
	Capacity to negotiate	A
	Ability to build effective teams	A
Capacity to mediate and bring groups to consensus	Capacity to bring groups to consensus	A
	Ability to mediate groups	A
	Flexibility/adaptability	A, G
Strong personal vision	Strong vision	A
	Ability to have vision/see the “big picture”	E
	Ability to learn from mistakes	A
	Ability to foresee possible outcomes of decision/actions	A
	Can articulate the importance of college for students	A



	Can articulate the importance of student affairs and its impact on student success, engagement, learning, and development	A
	Can articulate the impact leadership experiences and skills may have on students	A
Willing to learn/grow	Willing to learn	A, B
	Willing to grow/ develop skills	A, D, O
	Willing to mentor and be mentored	A
	Willing to challenge and question others	A
	Willing to be challenged and questioned	A
Multicultural competence	Cultural competence/cultural awareness	B, C, H, J, L, O
	Political acumen/political savvy	B
	Charismatic (but not necessarily extroverted)	A
Empathic	Authenticity	B
	Empathy	E, O
	Ability to ask clarifying questions	E, J
	Enjoys working with students	G
	Committed to equity and inclusion	G
	Self-confidence	J, M
	Ability to analyze situations	K
	Ability to develop alternative pathways in order to advise students	
	Patience to observe failure	K
	Persistence to help students internalize and recognize mistakes, good decisions, missed opportunities, and to celebrate achievements	K
	Trustworthiness	O
	Calculated risk-taking	O
Developed sense of responsibility	Motivation/being a self-starter	O
	Responsibility	O
	Being able to “envision, plan, and affect change in organizations”	P
	Ability to respond to broad-based constituencies and issues	P

Ability to help others do the same as active members of a community	P
Conscious choice-making	Q
Compassion	Q
Ability to understand and support institutional policy	N
Ability to understand one's own needs	N
Respect for students	N
Capacity to support those with whom personal values and beliefs may differ	N
Desire to contribute to a better world	N
Ability to think outside of the box	A
Ability to build community	I
Ability to develop others	I
Patience	J
Ability to develop leadership capacity in diverse students in or out of the classroom	M

Where to Learn Leadership Educator Competencies of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrument Item</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
	Master's classroom	A, B, C, D, F, H, J, L, P, Q, N
	Employment (non-graduate assistantship)	A
	Graduate assistantship	A, B, D, E, F, G, H, K, P, N
Graduate practicum(a)	Practica	A, B, E, G, H, I, P
	Internships	A, B, D, E, F, G, H, J, P

Professional development opportunities off campus (professional associations)	A, B, L
Professional development opportunities on campus (workshops or training)	A, B, L
In side conversations before, after, or during meetings	F
In daily interactions (social media, at the grocery store, etc.)	F
Mater's classroom (elective course)	H
Being mentored	I, K, Q
Mentoring others	I
Engaging teaching methods (team projects, case studies, role plays, etc.)	I, O
Reading current leadership journals/books	M
Teach a leadership course	M
Facilitate leadership trainings or workshops	M
Co-author journal articles	M
Participation in a student organization (member)	O, P
Participation in a student organization (student leader)	O
On the job training	K

Where to Practice Leadership Educator Competencies of a Student Affairs Leadership Educator

<b>Instrument Item</b>	<b>Raw Data</b>	<b>Participant Identifier</b>
Engaging in professional communities		A, L
Involvement in campus activities beyond class and graduate assistantship		A
Volunteering in the local community		A
Actively working to enhance the off-campus community		A
Advising student groups		A
Training student leaders		A
Creating and/or facilitating a campus event or program		A

Representing an office on a campus committee	A
Helping students understand and engage in challenges to defend their beliefs/core values	A
Graduate assistantships	B, D, E, F, G, H, P, N
Graduate internship(s) or practicum(a)	B, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, P
Through interpersonal interactions (social media, in the grocery store, hallway conversations, etc.)	F
Mentoring others	I
On the job	K
Presenting at professional conferences	M
Taking student leaders to professional conferences	M

**APPENDIX B**  
**ROUND 2 SURVEYS**

## Round 2 - Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers

### Start of Block: Leadership Education Knowledge

#### Leadership Education Competencies Needed for Entry-level Student Affairs Practitioners

In this round, please rate the responses provided from the previous round. You will have 14 calendar days to complete this round. Any information provided in this survey will remain confidential.

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the **leadership education knowledge** *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners. If you believe required knowledge was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

Progression of leadership theory.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Research on leader development.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

A willingness to explore leadership theories.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge about leadership instruments/assessments.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

Basic understanding of leadership theories.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of leadership identity development.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of experiential learning.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of organizational management.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of the social sector.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of the theory of team and group dynamics.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of change agency and change processes.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of community building.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

Knowledge of diversity and inclusion.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of student development theory.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of self understanding and understanding of others.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Familiarity with the Leadership Competency outlined in the ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of the constructs of leader and leadership.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of intentional program development (including developing learning outcomes and matching pedagogy with learning outcomes, etc.).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understand the leadership education desired at their particular institution (ascertain the culture, artifacts, indicators of educational aims, etc.).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important



There is not one single set of core knowledge needed to be a leadership educator.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of where their own learning occurred.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of the history of higher education.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of trends in student issues.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of campus-based information (org charts, reporting procedures, risk management, office protocols, etc.).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of leadership competencies highlighted in Seemiller and Murray's work.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Core knowledge of ways to practice leadership.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Other **leadership education knowledge** required by entry-level student affairs practitioners

---

---

**End of Block: Leadership Education Knowledge**

---

**Start of Block: Leadership Education Skills**

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the leadership education skills *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners. If you believe a required skill was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

Life-long learner.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Project and event planning skills.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Well organized.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Counseling/listening/advising skills.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

Coaching skills.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Problem solving skills.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

General leadership skills.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Cultural competencies.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Self-awareness.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Awareness of others.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Effective presentation and facilitation skills.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Curriculum development.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

**Creative thinking skills.**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Critical thinking skills.**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Effective teaching skills/strategies.**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Time management skills.**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Effective communication skills (oral and written).**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Mentoring skills.**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Reflection skills.**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Relationship building.**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Skills to lead multi-generational teams or groups.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Meeting management skills.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

There is not one set of core leadership education skills.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Objectively observe and summarize situations in need of intervention or organizational process in need of review.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Communicating their perspective of a situation and offering insight to action.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Practical strategic planning skills.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Effective supervision skills.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Assessment practices.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Administrative management (timely communication, record keeping, organization, etc.).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Professionalism (follow-through, personal responsibility, appropriate behavior, positive attitude, not gossiping, etc.).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Effective conflict negotiation.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Skills in student advocacy.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Other **leadership education skills** required by entry-level student affairs practitioners

---

End of Block: Leadership Education Skills

---

Start of Block: Leadership Education Abilities/Attributes

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the leadership education abilities/attributes *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners. If you believe a required ability or attribute was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

Openness towards and inclusivity of all identities.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Loosely bound to student performance - you can't force students to be better leaders, they have to do the work.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Direct experience leading a group.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Willingness to promote constructive feedback to students.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to communicate across differences.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to work on a team.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Being a continuous learner.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Creative and innovative spirit.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Event planning experience.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Positive attitude.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Patience.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Desire to teach students.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Desire to learn.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Focus on youth development.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important



Ability to relate to novice leaders.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to translate desired leadership education into learning outcomes for learning that could occur outside the classroom.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to create strategies mapped to learning outcomes.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

There is not one set of core leadership education abilities or attributes.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to challenge students appropriately.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to help students and others dig deep.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to help students identify ways in which they can practice and find opportunities that will help them engage in challenge areas.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Ability to carry out a devised plan beyond a single event or program.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to facilitate consensus.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to develop a written long-term plan.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to communicate steps in a long-term plan to others.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Student empowerment and delegation.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to hold people accountable.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to have difficult conversations.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Ability to work independently.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to be an ethical decision-maker.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to be a critical thinker.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Initiative.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to generate ideas/be creative.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to focus on positive change.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to set goals.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Other leadership education abilities or attributes required by entry-level student affairs practitioners

---

---

Start of Block: Where to learn competencies

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of where entry-level Student Affairs practitioners **should learn** these competencies. If you believe an educational venue was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

Formal class in their master's program.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning, not just the leadership office graduate assistants.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Participating in the Multi-institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) research.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Participation in a professional leadership conference (ILA or Leadership Educators Institute/NCLP).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Their undergraduate classes.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Their undergraduate extra curricular activities, like student organizations.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

As graduate advisor to a student organization.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Prior employment.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Workshops or trainings (internal to campus).

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Team participation.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Group work in the classroom.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Volunteering and community service.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Internship and/or practicum.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Involvement on campus committees in the field.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

Involvement with professional associations.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Professional development training (external to campus).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Participating in leadership programs as undergraduates.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

A required course in their master's coursework.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

On the job (i.e. their first job post master's program).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Mentoring relationships, either during their undergraduate or graduate programs.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Presenting at professional conferences.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Reading journals or books seminal to the discipline.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Being mentored by senior leadership educators.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Other venues to **learn** leadership education competencies required by entry-level student affairs practitioners.

---

---

**End of Block: Where to learn competencies**

---

**Start of Block: Where to practice competencies**

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of where entry-level Student Affairs practitioners **should practice** these competencies. If you believe a practice venue was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

Formal class in their master's program.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning, not just the leadership office graduate assistants.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Presenting at professional conferences.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Attending professional leadership conference (ILA or Leadership Educators Institute/NCLP).

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Their undergraduate classes.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Their undergraduate extra curricular activities, like student organizations.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

As graduate advisor to a student organization.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Prior employment.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Workshops or trainings (internal to campus).

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Team participation.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important



Group work in the classroom.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Volunteering and community service.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Internship and/or practicum.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Involvement on campus committees in the field.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Involvement with professional associations.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Professional development training (external to campus).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Participating in leadership programs as undergraduates.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

A required course in their master's coursework.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

On the job (i.e. their first job post master's program).

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Mentoring relationships, either during their undergraduate or graduate programs.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Identify something they are passionate about that is greater than themselves or their ability to control.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Other venues to **practice** leadership education competencies required by entry-level student affairs practitioners.

---

End of Block: Where to practice competencies

## Round 2 - Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators

### Start of Block: Leadership Education Knowledge

#### Leadership Education Competencies Needed for Entry-level Student Affairs Practitioners

In this round, please rate the responses provided from the previous round. You will have 14 calendar days to complete this round. Any information provided in this survey will remain confidential.

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the **leadership education knowledge *required*** for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners. If you believe required knowledge was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

#### Basic understanding of leadership theory

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

#### Theoretical understanding of college environments and organizations

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

#### Theoretical underpinnings of student development theory

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

#### Practical and conceptual understanding of the college experience and different pathways thereof

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

Understanding of enrollment trends

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of diverse student subpopulations within specific institution

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of diverse student subpopulations throughout higher education at large

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

An understanding of how identity plans into the experience of college for diverse subpopulations

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

An understanding of the political campus environment and how to navigate that environment

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Deep understanding of the inner workings of a particular functional area (i.e. where they will work for that first job)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Deep understanding of multiple functional areas

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Understanding of group dynamics (i.e. group and team development)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of the important role of context in leadership development and education

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Deep understanding of diversity, inclusion, privilege, oppression, and power dynamics

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of self (personal strengths, limitations, goals, learning style)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of social justice theories

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of ethical standards

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of ACPA/NASPA professional competency in leadership

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of ACPA/NASPA professional competencies in general

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

An understanding of at least the Social Change Model

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of one's role within the institution

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of the history of US higher education

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of the emergence and growth of student affairs as a profession

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of program evaluation and assessment

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of research about college students

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of higher education governance

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of the fundamentals of higher education law

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Knowledge of how to infuse practice with knowledge

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowing when to refer a student to other campus resources

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge that leadership does not require a position/title

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding of development as an avenue to impact positive change

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Understanding team motivation

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Knowledge of evolution of leadership theory

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Other **leadership education knowledge** required by entry-level student affairs practitioners

---

---

End of Block: Leadership Education Knowledge

---

Start of Block: Leadership Education Skills

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the leadership education skills *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners. If you believe a required skill was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

Basic research/assessment skills

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Critical thinking skills

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Problem solving skills

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Entrepreneurial thinking with an eye towards innovation

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Skill to establish a strong vision for a group

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Listening skills

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Crisis/emergency management skills



Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Effective communication skills (oral and written)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Counseling skills (including reflective counseling skills)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Skills to create and sustain healthy environments

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Interpersonal skills

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Effectively working with teams

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Delegation

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Running an effective meeting

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Enhancing group morale

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Conflict resolution/management skills

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Organizational skills

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Public speaking skills

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Group facilitation skills

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Supervision skills

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Effective dialogue skills

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Skill to effectively self-reflect

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Effectively working with diverse individuals

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Advising skills (in terms of student groups)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Skill to learn the culture of the office

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Event/program planning

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Excellent time management skills

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Building programs to meet desired outcomes

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Resilience

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Restorative practices

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Other **leadership education skills** required by entry-level student affairs practitioners

---

---

**End of Block: Leadership Education Skills**

---

**Start of Block: Leadership Education Abilities/Attributes**

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the leadership education abilities/attributes *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners. If you believe a required ability or attribute was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

Ability to build effective teams

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Ability to effectively communication to multiple stakeholders

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Insight into the ways actual college experiences might deviate from the theoretical

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Sensitivity to the needs and experiences of individuals and diverse subpopulations

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Charismatic (but not necessarily extroverted)

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Ability to think outside the box

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Ability to communicate conceptual ideas through practical lens**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Hard working**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Capacity to persuade, argue, and debate**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Capacity to negotiate**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Capacity to mediate and bring groups to consensus**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Flexibility or adaptability**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Strong personal vision**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Ability to foresee possible outcomes of decisions/actions

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to learn from mistakes

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Can articulate the importance of college for students

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Can articulate the importance of student affairs and its impact on student success, engagement, learning and development

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Can articulate the impact that leadership experiences and skills may have on students

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Willing to learn/grow

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Willing to mentor and be mentored

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Willing to challenge and question others

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Willing to be challenged and questioned

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Multicultural competence

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Political acumen/political savvy

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Authenticity

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Empathetic

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to have vision/see the "big picture"

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to ask clarifying questions

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Enjoys working with students

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Committed to equity and inclusion

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to build community

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to develop others

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Patience

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Self-confidence

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to analyze situations

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to develop alternative pathways in order to advise students

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important



Patience to observe "failure"

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Persistence to help students recognize and internalize mistakes, good decisions, missed opportunities, and to celebrate achievements

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to develop leadership capacity in diverse students in or out of the classroom

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to understand and support institutional policy

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Ability to understand one's own needs

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Respect for all students

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Capacity to support those with whom personal values and beliefs may differ

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Desire to contribute to a better world

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Developed sense of responsibility

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Motivation/being a self-starter

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Trustworthiness

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Calculated risk-taking

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Conscious choice-making

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Compassion

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Being able to "envision, plan, and affect change in an organization"

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Ability to respond to broad-based constituencies and issues

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Ability to help others become active citizens in their community

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Other leadership education abilities or attributes required by entry-level student affairs practitioners \_\_\_\_\_

---

**End of Block: Leadership Education Abilities/Attributes**

---

**Start of Block: Where to learn competencies**

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of where entry-level Student Affairs practitioners **should learn** these competencies. If you believe an educational venue was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

Master's classroom (core course)

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Employment (non-graduate assistantship)

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Graduate assistantship

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

Graduate practicum (a)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Internships

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Professional development opportunities off campus (professional associations)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Professional development opportunities on campus (workshops or trainings)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

In side conversations before, after, or during meetings

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

In daily interactions (social media, at the grocery store, etc.)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Master's classroom (elective course)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Being mentored

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Mentoring others

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Engaging teaching methods (team projects, case studies, role plays, etc.)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Reading current leadership journals/books

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Teach a leadership course

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Facilitate leadership trainings or workshops

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Co-author journal articles

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Participation in a student organization (member)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Participation in a student organization (student leader)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

On the job training

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Other venues to **learn** leadership education competencies required by entry-level student affairs practitioners. \_\_\_\_\_

---

End of Block: Where to learn competencies

---

Start of Block: Where to practice competencies

In this section, select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of where entry-level Student Affairs practitioners **should practice** these competencies. If you believe a practice venue was not included in the list, please include it in the other question.

Engaging in professional communities

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Involvement in campus activities beyond class and graduate assistantship

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Volunteering in the local community

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Actively working to enhance the off-campus community

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Advising student groups

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Training student leaders

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Creating and/or facilitating a campus event or program

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Representing an office on a campus committee

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Helping students understand and engage in challenges to defend their beliefs/core values

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Graduate assistantships

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Graduate internship(s) or practicum (a)

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important

Through interpersonal interactions (social media, in the grocery store, hallway conversations, etc.)

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Mentoring others

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

On the job

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Presenting at professional conferences

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Taking student leaders to professional conferences

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Other venues to **practice** leadership education competencies required by entry-level student affairs practitioners. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

End of Block: Where to practice competencies  
\_\_\_\_\_



**APPENDIX C**  
**ROUND 3 SURVEYS**

## Round 3 – Student Affairs Practitioners/Managers

### Start of Block: Leadership Education Knowledge

#### Leadership Education Competencies Needed for Entry-level Student Affairs Practitioners

In this round, you have the opportunity to review the responses provided by the panel in the previous round. You also have the opportunity to adjust your score, if you so choose. You will have **until April 16th** to complete this round. Any information provided in this survey will remain confidential.

This section details the statements of **leadership education knowledge** *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

A willingness to explore leadership theories.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 42.9% (6)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge about leadership instruments/assessments.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Basic understanding of leadership theories.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of leadership identity development.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
My Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of experiential learning.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 21.4% (3)

Extremely Important: 64.3% (9)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
My Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of the theory of team and group dynamics.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of change agency and change processes.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of community building.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of diversity and inclusion.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 14.3% (2)

Extremely Important: 78.6% (11)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of student development theory.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of self-understanding and understanding of others.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 57.1% (8)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of the constructs of leader and leadership.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of intentional program development (including developing learning outcomes and matching pedagogy with learning outcomes, etc.).

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 71.4% (10)

Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of the leadership education desired at their particular institution (ascertain the culture, artifacts, indicators of educational aims, etc.).

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

There is not one single set of core knowledge needed to be a leadership educator.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of where their own learning occurred.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of trends in student issues.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 64.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of campus-based information (org. charts, reporting procedures, risk management, office protocols, etc.).

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Core knowledge of ways to practice leadership.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 71.4% (10)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



The following are additional knowledge items that emerged from Round 2. Please select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the leadership education knowledge *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.

Knowledge of when to be a follower

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of social justice

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of how students learn leadership

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

Knowledge of instructional strategies for leadership education, which expands curricular and co-curricular programs

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

**End of Block: Leadership Education Knowledge**

---

**Start of Block: Leadership Education Skills**

This section details the statements of leadership education skills *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

Life-long learner.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

	Important: 57.1% (8) Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)			
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Project and event planning skills.

	Panel Scores: Frequency (count) Important: 42.9% (6) Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)			
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Well organized.

	Panel Scores: Frequency (count) Important: 35.7% (5) Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)			
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Counseling/listening/advising skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 85.7% (12)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Coaching skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 64.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Problem solving skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 35.7% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

General leadership skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Cultural competencies.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Self-awareness.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 64.3% (9)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Awareness of others.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 64.3% (9)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effective presentation and facilitation skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Curriculum development.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Creative thinking skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 64.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Critical thinking skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effective teaching skills/strategies.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 24.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Time management skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effective communication skills (oral and written).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 57.1% (8)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Mentoring skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Reflection skills.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 35.7% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Relationship building.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 64.3% (9)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Communicating their perspective of a situation and offering insight to action.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Assessment practices.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 64.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Administrative management (timely communication, record keeping, organization, etc.).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Professionalism (follow through, personal responsibility, appropriate behavior, positive attitude, not gossiping, etc.).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 21.4% (3)

Extremely Important: 64.3% (9)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effective conflict negotiation.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Skills in student advocacy.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following is an additional item that emerged from Round 2. Please select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the leadership education skills required for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.

Skill to understand policies and procedures.

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

                                                                                      

**End of Block: Leadership Education Skills**

**Start of Block: Leadership Education Abilities/Attributes**

This section details the statements of leadership education abilities/attributes required for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

Openness towards and inclusivity of all identities.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 7.1% (1)

Extremely Important: 92.9% (13)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Loosely bound to student performances - you can't force students to be better leaders, they have to do the work.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Willingness to promote constructive feedback to students.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 71.4% (10)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to communicate across differences.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 21.4% (3)

Extremely Important: 78.6% (11)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to work on a team.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 64.3% (9)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Being a continuous learner.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Creative and innovative spirit.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 0.0% (0)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Positive attitude.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 35.7% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Patience

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
Important: 42.9% (6)  
Extremely Important: 35.7% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Desire to teach students.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
Important: 50.0% (7)  
Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Desire to learn.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
Important: 28.6% (4)  
Extremely Important: 57.1% (8)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to translate desired leadership education into learning outcomes for learning that could occur outside the classroom.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 42.9% (6)  
 Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to create strategies mapped to learning outcomes.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 42.9% (6)  
 Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to challenge students appropriately.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 57.1% (8)  
 Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to help students and others dig deep.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 64.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to help students identify ways in which they can practice and find opportunities that will help them engage in challenge areas.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to carry out a devised plan beyond a single event or program.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 35.7% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Student empowerment and delegation.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 64.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to hold people accountable.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 35.7% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to have difficult conversations.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to work independently.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to be an ethical decision-maker.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 14.3% (2)

Extremely Important: 71.4% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to be a critical thinker.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 21.4% (3)

Extremely Important: 64.3% (9)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Initiative.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
Important: 42.9% (6)  
Extremely Important: 35.7% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to focus on positive change.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
Important: 50.0% (7)  
Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to set goals.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
Important: 42.9% (6)  
Extremely Important: 42.9% (6)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Leadership Education Abilities/Attributes

---

Start of Block: Where to learn competencies

This section details the statements of where these competencies **should be learned** by entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

Formal class in master's program.

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Panel Scores: Frequency (count) Important: 57.1% (8) Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)				
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning, not just the leadership office graduate assistants.

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Panel Scores: Frequency (count) Important: 50.0% (7) Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)				
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Undergraduate extra-curricular activities, like student organizations.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

As a graduate advisor to a student organization.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 64.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Workshops or trainings (internal to campus).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Team participation.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 64.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Internship or practicum.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 21.4% (3)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Involvement on campus committees in the field.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Involvement with professional associations.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Professional development trainings (external to campus)

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A **required** course in master's coursework.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

On the job (i.e. their first job post master's program).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 42.9% (6)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Mentoring relationships, either during their undergraduate or graduate programs.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Being mentored by senior leadership educators.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 42.9% (6)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following are additional items that emerged from Round 2. Please select the level of importance you associate with each statement in terms of **where** these competencies **should be learned** by entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.



Part-time or full-time employment outside of an on-campus job.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Community engagement and volunteering.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Communities of Practice.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Seemiller and Priest's work on Leadership Educator Professional Identity Development Model.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

Book club/Working group on campus.

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**End of Block: Where to learn competencies**

---

**Start of Block: Where to practice competencies**

This section details the statements of where these competencies **should be practiced** by entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

Formal class in master's program.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Graduate assistantship in any office that integrates leadership learning, not just the leadership office graduate assistants.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 57.1% (8)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

As a graduate advisor to a student organization.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Team participation.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 64.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 14.3% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Group work in the classroom.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Volunteering and community service.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 28.6% (4)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Internship and/or practicum.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 42.9% (6)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Change (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Involvement on campus committees in the field.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (7)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Involvement with professional associations.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 35.7% (5)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Professional development trainings (external to campus)

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 42.9% (6)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A **required** course in master's coursework.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 57.1% (8)

Extremely Important: 7.1% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

On the job (i.e. in their first job post master's program)

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (7)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Mentoring relationships, either during their undergraduate or graduate programs.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 28.6% (4)

Extremely Important: 42.9% (6)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Identifying something they are passionate about that is greater than themselves or their ability to control.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 35.7% (5)

Extremely Important: 35.7% (5)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following is an additional item that emerged from Round 2. Please select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of **where** these competencies **should be practiced** by entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.

Communicating across differences

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

                                                                                      

End of Block: Where to practice competencies

---

# Round 3 – Student Affairs Preparatory Program Directors/Coordinators

## Start of Block: Leadership Education Knowledge

### Leadership Education Competencies Needed for Entry-level Student Affairs Practitioners

In this round, you have the opportunity to review the responses provided by the panel in the previous round. You also have the opportunity to adjust your score, if you so choose. You will have **until April 20th** to complete this round. Any information provided in this survey will remain confidential.

This section details the statements of **leadership education knowledge *required*** for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

Basic understanding of leadership theory.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Theoretical understanding of college environments and organizations.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 56.3% (9)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Theoretical underpinning of student development theory.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 25.0% (4)

Extremely Important: 75.0% (12)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Practical and conceptual understanding of the college experience and different pathways thereof.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
My Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Understanding of diverse student subpopulations within specific institution.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 25.0% (4)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
My Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of diverse student subpopulations throughout higher education at large.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of the political campus environment and how to navigate that environment.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of how identity plays into the experience of college for diverse subpopulations.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 25.0% (4)

Extremely Important: 68.8% (11)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Deep understanding of the inner workings of a particular functional area (i.e. where they will work for that first job).

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of group dynamics (i.e. group and team development).

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 37.5% (6)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of the important role of context in leadership development and education.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Deep understanding of diversity, inclusion, privilege, oppression, and power dynamics.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of one's role within the institution.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of the history of US higher education.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Understanding of the emergence and growth of student affairs as a profession.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of self (personal strengths, limitations, goals, learning style, etc.).

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of social justice theories.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 62.5% (10)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of ethical standards.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 31.5% (5)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of program evaluation and assessment.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of research about college students.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of higher education governance.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of the fundamentals of higher education law.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 6.3% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of how to infuse practice with knowledge.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 43.8% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge of when to refer a student to other campus resources.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 18.8% (3)

Extremely Important: 81.3% (13)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Knowledge that leadership does not require a position/title.

Panel Scores: Frequency (Count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following are additional knowledge items that emerged from Round 2. Please select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the leadership education knowledge *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.

**Knowledge of managing from the middle**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Knowledge of how to accept feedback and make behavioral modifications**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Knowledge of relational aspects of leader-follower interactions**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**Maintaining a personal definition of leadership**

Not at all important   Slightly important   Moderately important   Important   Extremely important  
           

**End of Block: Leadership Education Knowledge**

---

**Start of Block: Leadership Education Skills**

This section details the statements of leadership education skills *required* for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score



Basic research/assessment

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 62.5% (10)

Extremely Important: 6.3% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Critical thinking

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 25.0% (4)

Extremely Important: 75.0% (12)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Problem solving.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 18.8% (3)

Extremely Important: 82.3% (13)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Entrepreneurial thinking with an eye towards innovation

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 0.0% (0)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Skill to establish a strong vision for a group.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 6.3% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Listening.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 18.8% (3)

Extremely Important: 81.3% (13)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Crisis/emergency management.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effective communication (oral and written).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 12.5% (2)

Extremely Important: 81.3% (13)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Counseling (including reflective counseling skills)

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Create and sustain healthy environments.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 75.0% (12)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Interpersonal

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 25.0% (4)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effectively working with teams

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 43.8% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Delegation.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)				
Important: 50.0% (8)				
Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)				
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Running an effective meeting

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)				
Important: 43.8% (7)				
Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)				
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Enhancing group morale

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)				
Important: 50.0% (8)				
Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)				
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Conflict resolution/management

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Organized

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 37.5% (6)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Public speaking

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 68.8% (11)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Group facilitation

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Supervision

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effective dialogue

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effective self-reflection

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 43.8% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effectively work with diverse individuals

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 68.8% (11)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Advising of student groups

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Learning the culture of the office

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Event/program planning

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Excellent time management

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 18.8% (3)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (8)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Building programs to meet desire outcomes

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 62.5% (10)

Extremely Important: 12.5 (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Resilience

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 37.5% (6)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Restorative practices

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 score: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following is an additional item that emerged from Round 2. Please select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the leadership education skills required for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.

Creativity

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important  
                                                                                       

End of Block: Leadership Education Skills

---

Start of Block: Leadership Education Abilities/Attributes

This section details the statements of leadership education abilities/attributes required for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

Hard working.

	Panel Scores: Frequency (count)			
	Important: 56.3% (9)			
	Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)			
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Sensitivity to the needs and experiences of individuals and diverse subpopulations.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Flexibility or adaptability

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Willing to learn/grow

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 25.0% (4)

Extremely Important: 68.8% (11)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Willing to mentor and be mentored

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 56.3% (9)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Willing to challenge and question others

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Willing to be challenged and questioned.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 50.0% (8)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Multicultural competence.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 25.0% (4)

Extremely Important: 68.8% (11)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Authenticity

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 43.8% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Empathetic

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 25.0% (4)

Extremely Important: 37.5% (6)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Enjoys working with students

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 18.8% (3)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Committed to equity and inclusion

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Patience

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Self-confidence

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Persistence to help students recognize and internalize mistakes, good decision, missed opportunities, and to celebrate achievements

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 68.8% (11)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Respect for all students

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 68.8% (11)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Desire to contribute to better world

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Developed sense of responsibility

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Motivation/being a self-starter

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 37.5% (6)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Trustworthiness

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 25.0% (4)  
 Extremely Important: 68.8% (11)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Calculated risk-taking.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 50.0% (8)  
 Extremely Important: 00.0% (0)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Conscious choice-making.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 31.3% (5)  
 Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Compassion.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)				
Important: 50.0% (8)				
Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)				
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to build effective teams.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)				
Important: 37.5% (6)				
Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)				
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to effectively communicate to multiple stakeholders.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)				
Important: 37.5% (6)				
Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)				
	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Insight into the ways actual college experiences might deviate from theoretical experiences.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 50.0% (8)  
 Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to think outside the box.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 37.5% (6)  
 Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to communicate conceptual ideas through practical lens.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 37.5% (6)  
 Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to foresee possible outcomes of decision/actions

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to learn from mistakes.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 12.5% (2)

Extremely Important: 81.3% (13)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to see the "big picture"/vision

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 6.3% (1)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to ask clarifying questions.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to build community.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to develop others

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to analyze situations

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 62.5% (10)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to develop alternative pathways when advising students

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to develop leadership capacity in diverse students in or out of the classroom

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 68.8% (11)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to understand and support institutional policy

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to understand one's own needs

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 37.5% (6)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to respond to broad-based constituencies and issues

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Capacity to mediate and bring groups to consensus

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Can articulate the importance of college for students

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Can articulate the importance of student affairs and its impact on student success, engagement, learning, and development.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 43.8% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Can articulate the impact that leadership experiences and skills may have on students.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Capacity to support those with whom personal values and beliefs may differ.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 43.8% (7)

	Do not change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following is an additional item that emerged from Round 2. Please select the level of importance you associate with the statement in terms of the leadership education attributes/abilities required for entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.

Understanding of service-learning

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

                                                                                      

**End of Block: Leadership Education Abilities/Attributes**

---

**Start of Block: Where to learn competencies**

This section details the statements of where these competencies **should be learned** by entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

Master's classroom (core course).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 62.5% (10)

Extremely Important: 37.5% (6)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Employment (non-graduate assistantship)

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Graduate assistantship

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 62.5% (10)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Graduate practicum (a)

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Internships

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 31.3% (5)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Professional development opportunities off-campus (professional associations).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 6.3% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Professional development opportunities on-campus (workshops or trainings).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 6.3% (1)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Side conversations before, after, or during meetings.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 0.0% (0)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Master's classroom (elective course).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 81.3% (13)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: x	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Being mentored

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Engaging teaching methods (team projects, case studies, role plays, etc.)

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 43.8% (7)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Reading current leadership journals/books.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 43.8% (7)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

On the job training.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 68.8% (11)

Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following are additional items that emerged from Round 2. Please select the level of importance you associate with each statement in terms of **where** these competencies **should be learned** by entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.

Attending conferences

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

                                                                                      

**End of Block: Where to learn competencies**

---

**Start of Block: Where to practice competencies**

This section details the statements of where these competencies **should be practiced** by entry-level Student Affairs practitioners that a majority of panelists scored as important or extremely important in the previous round.

For each statement, you will be given the following information:

1. The frequency and count for the scores of Important and Extremely Important
2. Your score for each statement from Round 2
3. An opportunity to change your score

Engaging in professional communities.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 75.0% (12)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Involvement in campus activities beyond class and graduate assistantship.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 31.3% (5)

Extremely Important: 18.8% (3)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Advising student groups.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 56.3% (9)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Training student leaders.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Creating and/or facilitating a campus event or program.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 50.0% (8)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Representing an office on a campus committee.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)

Important: 37.5% (6)

Extremely Important: 12.5% (2)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Helping students understand and engage in challenges to defend their beliefs/core values.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 56.3% (9)  
 Extremely Important: 25.0% (4)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Change (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Graduate assistantship.

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 25.0% (4)  
 Extremely Important: 75.0% (12)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Graduate internship(s) or practicum (a).

Panel Scores: Frequency (count)  
 Important: 43.8% (7)  
 Extremely Important: 56.3% (9)

	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

On the job

	Panel Scores: Frequency (count)			
	Important: 43.8% (7)			
	Extremely Important: 50.0% (8)			
	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Presenting at professional conferences.

	Panel Scores: Frequency (count)			
	Important: 43.8% (7)			
	Extremely Important: 12.5% (5)			
	Do not Change (1)	Change to Moderately Important (2)	Change to Important (3)	Change to Extremely Important (4)
Your Round 2 response: xxx	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following are additional items that emerged from Round 2. Please select the level of importance you associate with each statement in terms of **where** these competencies **should be practiced** by entry-level Student Affairs practitioners.

Participation in webinars

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

                                                                                      

In the graduate classroom

Not at all important    Slightly important    Moderately important    Important    Extremely important

                                                                                      

End of Block: Where to practice competencies

**APPENDIX D**

**VITA**

*Allison L. Dunn*

1301 Mullins Loop S  
College Station, TX 77845

(281) 731-5954 (M)  
aldunn96@gamil.com

**EDUCATION**

**Texas A&M University**

Doctor of Philosophy in Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications 2018  
Graduate Certificate in Leadership Education  
Dissertation: *Leadership Competencies Needed for Early-career Student Affairs Professionals: A Delphi Study*

Master of Science in Sociology 2001  
Emphasis in Social Psychology & Race and Ethnic Studies  
Thesis: *How Intimacy Affects Resource Conceptualization*

**Brigham Young University**

Bachelor of Arts in Chemistry with a minor in Math 1996

**TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

**Texas A&M University**

Course Title	Semester Taught	Students
Foundations of ALEC	Fall 2017	87
Introduction to Leadership	Spring 2017, Summer 2018	50
Personal Leadership Education	Spring, Summer, Fall 2018	78
Survey of Leadership Theory	Summer 2016, Spring, Summer, Fall 2018	284
Applied Ethics in Leadership	Summer 2017	22
Special Topics: Seminar Leadership Studies Minors	Fall 2018	30

**RESEARCH EXPERIENCE**

**Journal Articles in Progress**

Costello, L., Rutherford, T., & **Dunn, A. L.** (accepted with revisions). Significant learning in an agricultural study away experience. *NACTA Journal*.

**Dunn, A. L.**, & Odom, S. F. (accepted with revisions). The motivation and intent towards leadership and entrepreneurship of undergraduate students enrolled in leadership majors or minors. *Journal of Leadership Education*.

**Dunn, A. L.**, & Moore, L. L. (Received IRB approval 2016). All about relationships: A phenomenological case study of peer-mentoring within a leadership living-learning community.

**Dunn, A. L.**, & Moore, L. L. (Received IRB approval 2016). Significant learning of peer-mentors within a leadership living-learning community: A phenomenological case study.

**Peer-Reviewed Journal Publications**

**Dunn, A. L.**, Odom, S. F., Moore, L. L., & Rotter, C., (2016). Leadership mindsets of first-year undergraduate students: An assessment of a leadership-themed living learning community. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 15(3), 151-169. doi 1012806/V15/I3/R6

**Dunn, A. L.**, Ho, S. P., Odom, S. F., & Purdue, E. (2016). Influence of formal academic leadership programs on undergraduates' leadership mindset: An assessment of a Corps of Cadets program. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 15(4), 57-74. doi:1012806/V15/I4/R5

Odom, S. F., McKee, V, **Dunn, A. L.** (2017). Measuring significant learning through a personal leadership transformation assignment in an undergraduate leadership course. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 16(3), 67-81. doi:1012806/V16/I3/R3