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The 2014-15 Staff Fellows cohort researched best practices in professional development, engaged with a broad range of university stakeholders in order to identify their needs, and collaborated with other staff members across campus throughout the process. The cohort conducted extensive internal and external research on the professional development needs of UPS (Unclassified Professional Staff) and USS (University Support Staff) and presented their results in the report *Learning for a Lifetime*:

“We recommend HRM pilot a leadership development program. The objective of this program will be to identify staff with leadership potential and further cultivate their leadership skills. Participants in this program will be candidates for positions in leadership based career paths.” (*Learning for a Lifetime*, p. 10)

This recommendation, supported unequivocally by their research, became the foundation for the work conducted by the 2015-2016 Staff Fellows cohort.

To further the work of the prior cohort, the 2015-2016 Staff Fellows conducted additional research specific to the leadership development needs at the University of Kansas as well as offerings at peer institutions. The internal research team hosted focus groups with KU UPS staff and USS staff and conducted individual stakeholder interviews in order to ascertain the values, priorities, and skills most important to staff at KU, which became the core of the plan. The themes imperative to leadership development that emerged from the research included: **Communication Skills**, **Ability to Inspire and Motivate**, **Integrity**, **Knowledge of Field and of Self**, and **Diversity**. The external research group surveyed leadership development programs at peer institutions through interviews with program coordinators in order to learn about their programs as well as the infrastructure and support needed. Buy-in from all levels of staff; a variety of delivery methods; a marker of completion of the material; and post-program follow-up were recurring trends that emerged from the external research. Thus, the external research report is organized around the themes of **Program Content**, **Program Structure and Delivery**, **Program Management**, **Constituency**, and **Recommendations**.
This research contributed to the creation of this report, *Leading Up the Hill: A Leadership Development Roadmap for Staff at the University of Kansas*, which provides all levels of UPS and USS staff a clear path to developing leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities to increase their leadership potential at KU and beyond. This report provides the contextual framework for the leadership development roadmap, which includes certificate programs for Developing Leaders, Project Leaders, Supervisors, and Administrators, along the following tracks:

**Leading Yourself**
Develop awareness of self, individual strengths, and personal integrity in the professional environment

**Leading Teams**
Develop a skill set to lead a team of employees to work together and achieve results through collaboration, trust, and accountability

**Leading KU**
Develop strategies that facilitate innovation, cross-functional collaboration, and connect day-to-day responsibilities with the long-term mission of the university
The Staff Fellows cohort recommends that KU Human Resources Management (HRM) take executive responsibility, with the assistance of an Advisory Board of UPS and USS staff across the university, for the implementation of the leadership development roadmap. Additional recommendations for developing, implementing, and supporting this work throughout the university are included in the report that follows.

By utilizing the framework and recommendations provided here, the University of Kansas will have the tools necessary to build a comprehensive, successful leadership development program.
Aligning Professional Development Opportunities with Leading Up the Hill

One of the greatest assets at the University of Kansas is its staff. *Bold Aspirations*, the multi-year strategic plan for the university, commits KU to recruiting, valuing, developing, and retaining an excellent and diverse faculty and staff through Goal 5: “Develop Excellence in People.” The goal states, in part, that “KU faculty members and staff should be encouraged to achieve high standards of performance based upon clearly established and applied criteria” and that by fulfilling this goal, the outcome will be a workforce accountable to the highest standards of performance with a culture that recognizes, rewards, and advances excellence.

To further these efforts, the 2014-2015 KU Staff Fellows cohort created a university-wide professional development program based on best practices of professional development. The results were published in the report *Learning for a Lifetime*, which provided an overview of current best practices in professional development and made several recommendations for creating additional professional development opportunities for KU UPS and USS staff. The summary included “Recommendation 2: Career Track.”

“Recommendation 2: Career Track” proposes that the university “Construct career tracks to which all professional development programs are aligned so that staff can identify opportunities and acquire knowledge and skills needed for advancement and future leadership roles within the university.” As the next step, the 2015-2016 KU Staff Fellows cohort has created this plan, *Leading Up the Hill*, for implementation of the leadership development roadmap.

“Leading is rarely easy. But if we are going to continue moving our university and our society forward, we need strong leaders among our students, faculty and staff — and we need Jayhawks who are willing to lead in a variety of different ways. That is why I am so proud to be at the University of Kansas and to be part of a community of scholars like you who don’t settle for just doing, but instead strive to lead.” (Chancellor’s Message, March 21, 2016)
The 2015-2016 Staff Fellows cohort conducted research using a two-tiered approach. One group focused on internal development needs and desires, and the other contacted peer universities and corporations with established external leadership development programs in order to learn from existing models. The following report details the methodologies and results of each study.

**Methodology**

The internal research team focused on the ways in which leadership development is currently conducted at KU and considered how that approach may be improved. Through a careful survey of the current climate surrounding leadership development at the university, the internal research team developed questions that would elicit and generate discussion from staff about how leadership is developed within their own professions at KU as well as how that same leadership development could be enhanced. These questions were developed to apply broadly, granting all participants the opportunity to respond, and thus giving a holistic perspective of leadership and leadership development at the university.

Participants were grouped based on their current positions at the university and invited to attend a focus group meeting to share feedback. The discussions were held for administrators, supervisors, administrative support and project/program team members, and facilities services staff [Appendix A]. Additionally, the team hosted a session during the 2016 KU Staff Leadership Summit. Each focus group consisted of approximately 15 – 20 stakeholders with each session lasting around one hour. Open-ended questions were asked in order to spur discussion around various topics regarding leadership [Appendix B]. To add to these findings, several KU senior administrators who are mentors to 2015-2016 KU Staff Fellows were asked the same questions.
Findings

This process generated substantial qualitative feedback on desired areas for leadership growth, from which five general themes emerged: Communication Skills; Abilities to Inspire and Motivate; Integrity; Knowledge of Field and Self; and Diversity.

Communication Skills

KU staff and senior administrators value the importance of strong communication skills, noting that they are essential to the development and advancement of a leader. The ability to listen and provide feedback was consistently cited as crucial to demonstrating the capacity to lead. When asked how staff might be considered leaders within their professions, one staff member added that “giving feedback with specific details and instructions for improvement” was desirable.

Communication style was also highlighted. Staff expressed the need for leaders to be calm, approachable, and professional. One staff member noted that he is able to identify the natural leaders within the university by their style of communication in urgent situations.
In almost all of the focus group sessions, participants noted the need for a leader to be able to develop and communicate a vision. While providing training to develop this skill may be difficult, it is necessary, especially in an ever-changing campus environment.

As an extension of this, successful leaders create environments in which their colleagues feel comfortable sharing ideas. Focus group participants cited the ability to engage people of any level as a necessity among leaders.

**Ability to Inspire and Motivate**

Participants expressed their desire for leaders who inspire and motivate their staff, observing that the most effective leaders ensure that their staff feel valued and well supported. In order to do this most effectively, leaders must understand the strengths of their individual staff members.

Further feedback indicated that this aspect of leadership is achieved through encouragement, empathy, and team-building. Therefore, training should focus on building strong teams, not only through hiring exceptional employees, but also by developing them throughout their careers.

Staff also cited the capacity to delegate effectively, focus on solutions, and set goals as components for motivating their employees. Among these, the ability to offer solutions to problems, especially focusing on doing so with a positive attitude, differentiates inspiring leaders from others. Thus, training centered on problem-solving would serve KU well.

**Integrity**

In addition to the desired abilities of a successful leader, participants identified characteristics of perceived leaders at the university. Specifically, they listed humility, authenticity, and open-mindedness. Further, employees shared anecdotes about great leaders and highlighted trust and respect as specific qualities that empower employees.

**Knowledge of Field and of Self**

Many focus group participants expressed a desire for leaders who are not only rich in knowledge of his/her field but also understand the broader environment to be able to think strategically about how his/her team works as part of the larger whole.

Further, according to the focus groups, a leader is most engaging when he/she possesses this knowledge in concert with demonstrated self-awareness. This trait was cited most
frequently by focus group participants, who shared examples of great leaders who know their own strengths, weaknesses, emotions, motivations, values, and goals. In addition, the senior leaders who serve as mentors to the Staff Fellows repeatedly cited the concept of self-awareness as a “stepping stone” in the development of staff as they transition to higher levels of leadership.

**Diversity**

Many focus group participants pointed to current events as evidence that actively exploring diversity issues is crucial. Without this knowledge and training, leaders at the university cannot successfully promote the well-being of the entire campus.

Focus group participants expressed a need for more diversity training, but it was challenging for them to elaborate on specifics. However, observed gaps exist in gender and generational equity as well as the ability to talk respectfully about differences between people.
Methodology

The external research team interviewed peer institutions [Appendix C], chosen for their robust and, in some cases, nationally recognized leadership development programs. The research also included the Army Management Staff College (AMSC), the entity responsible for leadership development of Army Civilian Staff. The goal of the external team was to learn about the leadership development offerings of these institutions and find common themes that could be applied to the leadership development roadmap.

The external team members identified 14 peer institutions to be interviewed. At that point, leadership development program managers within each institution were identified and contacted by email with information on the goals of the project and the list of questions. The external research team developed this list of questions that focused on five categories within existing leadership development programs: content; oversight and development; audience; delivery; and recommendations [Appendix D]. Interviews were conducted via telephone or by email.

Findings

Through the interview process, peer institutions shared information about their individual leadership development programs. The results are categorized into five areas: Program Content; Program Structure and Delivery; Program Management; Constituency, which includes incentives and retention; and Recommendations, which fall into two categories—Conceptual and Logistical.

Program Content

Most established leadership development programs begin with a pre-assessment to evaluate individual staff member strengths and opportunity for growth. This information guides enrollment in program offerings that are best-suited to the employee’s needs.

Some institutions employ human resources staff to develop customized programs for their constituencies. These highlight themes such as strategic thinking, peer coaching, diversity training, negotiation skills, and problem-solving. As a complement to this program, some institutions purchase programming from third party training
organizations. Examples include: Crucial Conversations, Appreciative Leadership, 360° Assessments, DiSC Assessments, Franklin Covey’s Great Leaders, and Skillsoft.

Generally, these programs include individual assessments that can be incorporated into customized course offerings.

**Program Structure and Delivery**

In developing the structures for their programs, many institutions conducted internal interviews with deans, directors, and chairs and hosted focus groups with university leaders. In some cases, human resources representatives positioned throughout the institutions were responsible for communicating the leadership development plans to their respective staff members. In some cases, they looked to peer institutions for inspiration and advice. The *Fully Prepared to Lead* program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison attributes some of its success to the fact that it was the result of a grassroots movement among faculty and staff who sought more opportunities to develop leadership skills.

Most existing programs feature certification programs in specific areas of leadership growth. Examples can be seen within the AMSC and the University of Virginia. Within those programs, there are classes taught as seminars, in a traditional classroom style, or in cohort groups. In addition, many institutions offer online modules for training and development. Through these certification programs, staff are often provided a list of core classes as well as optional electives that they may enroll in, based on their personal growth needs.

The certification programs often last between three weeks and one semester, depending on the frequency of meetings. In some cases, the courses meet for an entire day, once per week. In other cases, development programs are offered as individual coaching sessions, which feature a mentor-mentee model. The University of Florida has an interactive web component, which makes the program available to a larger audience and at flexible times. Some institutions employ a creative hybrid alternative to these models. One example of this is a regular meeting that begins by evaluating a written case-study and is followed by interactive role-playing. Other hybrid formats integrate web-based training *and* classroom learning.

**Program Management**

In most cases, leadership development is overseen centrally by human resources. Often, certificate-based programs are each managed by an employee who is certified to oversee the program enrollment and assessment along with curriculum development and
facilitation. It is notable that these individuals admit that the programs are constantly evolving, so the exposure to participants is helpful in determining the needs for the program itself. In other cases, human resources staff are divided among departments on campus and they advertise offerings and encourage enrollment.

The costs of the programs are, in some instances, incurred centrally by human resources. In some cases, this was accomplished by administration appropriating funds for development; in others, such as the *Fully Prepared to Lead* initiative at the University of Wisconsin, the program staff can offset the cost of training by providing other services at a cost, such as organizing conferences on campus or providing one-on-one counseling for departments. In other cases, departments pay tuition for their staff members to receive training, the most expensive component of which is typically 360° Assessments or another corporate assessment model.

**Constituency**

At roughly 60% of the institutions interviewed, all staff have access to some type of professional development. In cases where leadership training is currently reserved for managerial-level staff, many institutions are in the process of expanding program offerings to all staff. For example, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, student employees are now permitted to enroll in development programs. Also, the University
of Iowa’s UI LEAD and Executive Leadership Academy programs include specific tracks for both their faculty and staff.

The University of Virginia includes a medical center, much like KU, and they are in the process of centralizing their leadership development program so that it will incorporate staff at the main campus and at the medical center to make one wholly relevant system. Given the specialized nature of the work at the medical center, this is challenging.

**Incentives**

Overall, the largest incentives for leadership development training are exposure to high-level administrators; a deeper knowledge of the institution; networking across the institution; access to a network of alumni of the program; and training in specific areas of interest. Program coordinators noted that the certificate programs command a certain level of respect on campus, and administrators are impressed by staff members who have demonstrated the initiative to complete them. In only three cases did program coordinators report that there was monetary incentive for completing the programs.

**Retention**

The majority of the institutions interviewed reported that staff retention is not monitored. However, many of the interviewees shared that graduates of the leadership development programs are often promoted internally and estimated that about 5% seek opportunities for advancement at other institutions. The interviews revealed that people see the training opportunity as a reason to stay at a place that invests in their growth.

**Recommendations - Conceptual**

Most importantly, the leadership development plan must align with the overall mission and strategic plan of the institution. This is essential to growing the culture internally, and it is vital to gaining the support of administration. It serves to increase the fluency of institutional messaging on campus, and it ensures that the values and guiding principles of the program support the larger goals of the university.

Every institution interviewed stressed the importance of buy-in, not only from administration, but staff as well, citing that the success of the program is dependent on the full support of both the administrators who approve the program and the staff who participate. This feedback informed the design of the leadership development roadmap, which incorporates the values shared by KU staff and administration in order to illustrate a connection to the existing culture.
Several universities advised expressed the need to recognize that this is a shift in culture; therefore, it must happen slowly. Because the entire process is interactive, and program managers will receive feedback constantly, it is wise to build it thoughtfully, ensuring that there is a need and interest for every course and/or certificate offered. The model should feel as though it is being developed with the interests of the constituents at its core.

**Recommendations – Logistical**

External institutions also suggested involving stakeholders early in the process by communicating the benefits of a leadership development program. They recommended building a strong team to implement the plan, which will involve communication in two directions—to upper-level administrators and to the potential beneficiaries of the leadership development opportunities. In addition, they indicated the importance of continuing to engage the stakeholders as the plan is implemented.

Several institutions stressed the importance of low- or no-cost training. In order to gain support from department chairs and unit directors, the training for their staff cannot be cost-prohibitive. Costs should be identified early to ensure necessary resources have been allocated.

Peer institutions observed that it is best to introduce employees to a development model by conducting an individual assessment. Some methods for doing this include annual reviews, peer evaluations, assessment tools such as Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), Clifton StrengthsFinder (CSF), or 360° Assessments.

Interviews revealed the need to include time for follow-up, citing that feedback from the courses will help them evolve and will illustrate the changing needs and interests of staff. Often, this observation was shared by interviewees who felt it was an area for improvement within their own systems. Suggestions included using the final session for a survey or engaging attendees and their supervisors in a conversation several months after completing the training to determine whether it had had an effect on their work performance.

One major challenge faced by several institutions is determining how best to market the opportunity, which applies and thus, should appeal, to a very broad audience. They advised that this takes time as the program is established and staff who enroll share the news with their colleagues. In cases where the campus is divided geographically, this posed an even larger challenge, warranting more need for online offerings. The interviewees recommended highlighting the obvious benefits of the programs, such as giving employees with great potential a platform for development; offering training that is not technical and can be applied broadly; and networking capacity.
**Vision for the Leadership Development Roadmap**

The goal of this project is to provide the University of Kansas with a plan to improve leadership skills of its workforce.
The leadership development roadmap [Appendix E for expanded view] is intended to provide a framework for UPS and USS staff to be able to pursue certification at multiple leadership levels along different tracks. The leadership levels are Administrator, Supervisor, Project Leader, and Developing Leader.

At each level, there are three primary tracks: Leading Yourself, Leading Teams, and Leading KU.

- **Leading Yourself**
  - **Administrator Leadership Certificate**
    - Assess impact of personal strengths on the department/unit.
    - Understand how strengths affect relationships, performance, and business outcomes.
    - Coach and develop self-awareness in others.
  - **Supervisor Leadership Certificate**
    - Set personal priorities within a team context.
    - Identify key partnerships that are essential to individual growth and team performance.
  - **Project Leader Leadership Certificate**
    - Assess impact of personal strengths on the project.
    - Develop design thinking.
    - Lead teams with emotional intelligence.
    - Influence without authority.
  - **Developing Leader Leadership Certificate**
    - Assess strengths and impact in the workplace.
    - Develop self-awareness, self-regulation and empathy for others.
    - Manage and prioritize your responsibilities.
    - Create personal leadership and career goals.
    - Build relationships and networks across campus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Leading Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator Leadership Certificate | Influence organizational culture.  
Increase motivation and productivity.  
Communicate shared vision.  
Solicit meaningful feedback. |
| Supervisor Leadership Certificate | Increase commitment and engagement to improve team effectiveness.  
Build and strengthen relationships to build trust, improve performance, allow for effective delegation and constructive conflict resolution.  
Balance competing priorities. |
| Project Leader Leadership Certificate | Bring together diverse groups of people representing various, groups, functions, organizations and viewpoints.  
Meet the complex and often changing needs of the organization through creative problem-solving. |
| Developing Leader Leadership Certificate | Develop active listening and non-verbal communication skills.  
Present ideas and concepts effectively to various stakeholders and colleagues. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Leading KU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator Leadership Certificate | Create partnerships across the university, leading across the various levels of the organization.  
Set and realize the vision, direction, and goals for the university.  
Manage institutional change.  
Manage budgets. |
| Supervisor Leadership Certificate | Understand how your team fits within the university structure.  
Develop a shared vision and communicate that to your team and others. |
| Project Leader Leadership Certificate | Understand how your project(s) aligns with the mission of the university.  
Assess project impact. |
| Developing Leader Leadership Certificate | Understand how your role at the university contributes to the success of the institution.  
Develop critical thinking and problem-solving abilities. |
These levels and tracks reflect the results of the internal research, particularly the focus group data, which indicated that these are the specific leadership development needs at the university. The certificate structure is drawn from the external research. It should be noted that the University Core Competencies informed this document, which ensures its relevance to the university and that this investment in staff development will strengthen the work that serves the larger mission of the university. Theses competencies are reflected in the figures below.

In addition, diversity and cultural competency, as well as technology training, are necessary components to all work at the university. Thus, they are included at the foundational level of the leadership development roadmap.
Refining the Vision

The skills listed at the intersection of each level and track should be gained as a result of finishing the requirements of the certificate. They are not intended to be exhaustive, but rather, to provide a guide. Each intersection is supported by specific knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) that will enable each participant to improve. The following table is an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>ABILITIES</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Personal Strength Assessment</td>
<td>• Assess the impact of personal strengths</td>
<td>• Manage relationships and networks</td>
<td>Develop awareness of self, individual strengths, and personal integrity in the professional environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define emotional intelligence</td>
<td>• Assess and develop emotional intelligence</td>
<td>• Prioritize goals</td>
<td>Develop a skill set to lead a team of employees to work together and achieve results through collaboration, trust, and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define goals</td>
<td>• Set personal priorities and goals</td>
<td>• Coach other staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify key partnerships</td>
<td>• Facilitate a group process</td>
<td>• Build a climate of trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define organizational culture and its influences</td>
<td>• Present material to a specific audience</td>
<td>• Solve problems within the team context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify active listening and effective communication</td>
<td>• Constructively resolve conflict</td>
<td>• Develop a shared vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand the university structure, political climate, budget realities, and vision</td>
<td>• Assess impact of small and large scale projects</td>
<td>• Plan strategically for the future of your department/unit and the university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess impact of structure and climate on university culture</td>
<td>• Manage a budget</td>
<td>• Think critically about the impact of structure and climate on university culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The completion of a track or level within the proposed recommendation does not guarantee promotion. This proposed leadership roadmap is meant to be utilized in conjunction with the KU Compensation and Market Study as a tool for supervisors to use in discussion with their staff about goals and opportunities for growth.*
RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are a result of the findings from compiling and analyzing the research and creating the framework for the leadership development roadmap.

Implementing the Leadership Development Roadmap

Structure

The primary purpose of this stage of the leadership development roadmap is to serve as a framework for individual leadership development. Guided by the university core competencies, the leadership development roadmap offers three tracks for growth: Leading Yourself, Leading Teams, and Leading KU, as well as key KSAs to be acquired at each intersection. Using this framework, the Staff Fellows cohort recommends that HRM map specific trainings currently offered by the university onto the leadership development roadmap. This will allow HRM to identify which areas currently are robust with programming opportunities and which need to be further developed.
HRM should identify and include university programs or activities outside of its own offerings that would be appropriate at each intersection. This may encompass programs that are available through other offices across the university that will help participants meet learning outcomes. Including these programs will connect the leadership development roadmap to existing efforts, and, consequently, increase campus support of this effort.

The external research group learned that many institutions use a certificate model to provide employees with benchmarks to indicate completion or mastery and recommended this as an organizing structure around which KU staff members can build their individual training programs. The leadership development roadmap reflects this certificate model. Alternatively, employees should be able to complete coursework included on the map without pursuing a certificate, assuming that, if applicable, the course’s prerequisites have been met.

HRM will need to decide which trainings in each intersection are required for certificates and which are electives. In addition, each certificate program would benefit from a capstone experience during which employees can apply the knowledge they gained through their training.

**Enrollment**

Employees wishing to complete a certificate should indicate this to HRM, possibly through an online application/declaration form. This will allow HRM to track certificate participation and completion rates, follow enrollment trends, and make adjustments to curriculum requirements as necessary. In order to complete a certificate, employees will need to complete all required trainings associated with it (or show evidence of completing similar trainings at another institution). It is recommended that each certificate include electives so that employees have some control over what they learn.

Ideally, participants would first pursue a certificate at their current staffing level as defined in the roadmap (Administrator, Supervisor, Project Leader, or Developing Leader). However, with the understanding that many employees work beyond the level of their university title, and considering that many employees will have already completed coursework at their current levels, the following are recommended guidelines:
Staff who have completed a certificate at their current level should be allowed to pursue a certificate at the next level. Staff who have compelling reasons to start at a level above their current employment should have an option to request this. One possible way of handling this is to choose or create prerequisite courses that any employee must take (or show evidence of similar programming completed at another institution) in order to start the certificate at the next level. A designated HRM staff person and/or an advisory committee should be responsible for reviewing these cases and establishing if the designated requirements have been met or not.

Employees should work with their supervisors to identify leadership development goals, which will then be documented in the Performance Management System. Employees can record their progress toward goal completion in the system, and supervisors should use this information as part of employees’ annual reviews.

**Tracking**

The Learning Management System should be used to display training offerings and track and display progress toward and completion of activities and certificates.

**Management**

In addition to oversight by HRM staff, the leadership development roadmap would benefit from guidance from an advisory committee of diverse positions and backgrounds, appointed by HRM, to guide the implementation of this effort. For continuity, the committee should include former participants of Staff Fellows.

**Delivery of Training Content**

Trainings should be offered in a variety of formats in order to accommodate diverse learning styles and time limitations. Employees at all levels should have the opportunity to complete training in person, online, or in a blended format. Internal research results indicate employees’ interest in moving through certificate programs in cohorts. HRM should evaluate the degree to which it would be feasible to conduct multiple programs using this format.
Creating a Culture that Values Leadership Development

It is important that senior leadership collaborate with HRM to communicate the value of staff leadership development to the university. Senior leadership can continue to discuss leadership development expectations in leadership unit meetings, such as deans’ and directors’ meetings and department chair meetings. Department/unit leaders should incorporate employee leadership development opportunities into departmental and budgetary planning each year, and they should be willing to work with employees who wish to take advantage of these opportunities. A staff leadership development policy should be added to the policy library that addresses the value of leadership development, sets minimum standards of protected time and funding allotted to all staff for pursuing development opportunities, and gives HRM authority to mandate supervisory training.

Employees are expected to share information and knowledge gained from leadership development activities (e.g. presenting to their teams, applying skills in the workplace, and/or facilitating a workshop).

Through the implementation of the leadership development roadmap, university staff must understand that, though completing certificate programs will grow their skills as employees,
there is no guarantee of remuneration for skills gained. Supervisors are encouraged to recognize employees who complete certificates, in a manner deemed best within individual departments/units. Possible examples include changing or increasing job responsibilities to match new knowledge, skills, and abilities; increase in pay and/or job title; public recognition at department-/unit-wide meetings; a plaque or other tangible piece of recognition.

**Introducing the Roadmap to Campus**

HRM should partner with the Office of the Provost and Marketing Communications in the Office of Public Affairs to create a communication plan that introduces the concept of leadership development, its importance to individuals and the university as a whole, and the leadership development roadmap itself.

Communication should appear in the Talent Development Suite and in emails sent to the staff by HRM and the Office of the Provost. Preferably, HRM would visit individual department/unit staff meetings to present the leadership development roadmap and answer questions.
**Assessment**

HRM should develop tools to assess the effectiveness of not only individual training sessions, but also the certificate program and the roadmap as a whole. This could include employee reactions immediately after trainings; surveys or interviews with employees and their supervisors 90 or 180 days after completing a certificate; and/or tracking the number of employees who move into higher-level positions after completing certificates.

**Additional Development Opportunities**

University employees at each focus group mentioned two specific programs that they would like to see added to leadership development program:

- A formal mentoring program, through which individuals can serve as mentors and mentees.
- An ongoing opportunity for KU staff in similar positions around the university to network and discuss challenges and opportunities.

These programs would fall outside of the scope of *Leading Up the Hill*, but should be considered as a future step to take in developing strong leaders at KU.
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Jason Hornberger, Assistant Vice Provost of Shared Service Centers, Office of the Provost
Derek Kwan, Executive Director, Lied Center
Linda Luckey, Senior Executive Associate, Office of the Provost
Michael Roberts, Dean/Professor, Graduate Studies
Reggie Robinson, Director/Professor, School of Public Affairs and Administration
Mike Rounds, Associate Vice Provost, Human Resource Management
Nate Thomas, Vice Provost of Diversity and Equity
Jim Tracy, Vice Chancellor/Professor, Office of Research
### Appendix A: INTERNAL RESEARCH LIST OF FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS

#### Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Bankart</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Provost</td>
<td>International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Broadwell</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Curran</td>
<td>Chief Audit Executive</td>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Kapp</td>
<td>Dean-Professor</td>
<td>School of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Keary</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>Public Safety Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Luther</td>
<td>Director Major Division/School</td>
<td>Office of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Maigaard</td>
<td>Director Major Division/School</td>
<td>Financial Aid &amp; Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorin Maletsky</td>
<td>Associate Dean/Associate Professor</td>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Melvin</td>
<td>Vice Provost for Enrollment Management</td>
<td>Provost Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Mielke</td>
<td>Associate Dean/Professor</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Miles</td>
<td>Director-KU Card Center</td>
<td>Provost Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason O’Connor</td>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Perkins McGuinness</td>
<td>Associate Director Major Division/School</td>
<td>Applied English Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Trendel</td>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>School of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Anguiano</td>
<td>Police Captain</td>
<td>Public Safety Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Appelhanz</td>
<td>Financial Analyst Intermediate</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Baker</td>
<td>IT Technology Manager</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elenor Buffington</td>
<td>SSC Manager</td>
<td>Engineering, Technology, &amp; Environment SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Jones</td>
<td>Education Program Coordinator</td>
<td>School of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Marsh</td>
<td>Director of Debruce Center</td>
<td>KS Memorial Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Mercer</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Institute for Policy &amp; Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mueller</td>
<td>Student Program Manager</td>
<td>Edwards Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Ostreko</td>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Pryor</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Rose-Mockry</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>Emily Taylor Women’s Resource Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Administrative Support and Project/Program Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kari Balthazor</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>Applied English Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Brewer</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cady Bush</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Higuchi Biosciences Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Crawford</td>
<td>Executive Associate</td>
<td>Office of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Denning</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Campus Administration &amp; Operations SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennille Fincham</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baden Fox</td>
<td>Academic Advisor</td>
<td>School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Koslowsky</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>School of Public Affairs &amp; Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Krambeer</td>
<td>Administrative Associate</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Mehmudovic</td>
<td>Executive Associate</td>
<td>Provost Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Thompson</td>
<td>Administrative Associate</td>
<td>Provost Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Wright</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>School of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facilities Service Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Brown</td>
<td>Assistant Custodial Supervisor</td>
<td>FS Custodial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aileen Dingus</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>FS Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Lauer</td>
<td>Custodial Supervisor</td>
<td>FS Custodial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald McClaskey II</td>
<td>Zone Manager</td>
<td>FS Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Paul</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>FS Custodial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Robinson</td>
<td>General Maintenance Repair Tech</td>
<td>FS Zone Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Spainhower</td>
<td>Zone Manager</td>
<td>FS Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Swisher</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>FS Custodial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: INTERNAL RESEARCH FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1) If you have participated in a leadership development training or program here or elsewhere, tell us about it.
2) What are the various ways to lead, regardless of titles? In other words, how do you define “leader”?
3) To be considered a leader in your specific profession, what would someone have to accomplish?
4) Think about the most impactful leaders in your life. What skills do they possess that make them so effective?
5) Imagine you were able to request leadership development tailored specifically to your needs. What would you want included?
6) Is there anything else important for us to consider as we move forward with our leadership roadmap?
### Appendix C: EXTERNAL RESEARCH LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison Vaillancourt</td>
<td>VP Human Resources &amp; Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsteen Anderson</td>
<td>Program Coordinator, Academic Leadership Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Burkgren</td>
<td>Senior Director, Organizational &amp; Workforce Development Division of Human Resources</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Parks</td>
<td>Director, Training &amp; Organizational Development</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikole Mac</td>
<td>Director, UI Leadership Development Organizational Effectiveness, HR</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Broshar</td>
<td>Learning and Development Consultant University Human Resources</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Turner</td>
<td>Sr. Learning &amp; Development Specialist</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Frey</td>
<td>Interim Manager of Organizational and Professional Development Office of Human Resources</td>
<td>University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Driscoll</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Development</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorinda Schrammel</td>
<td>Training &amp; Development Manager</td>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elida Lee</td>
<td>Director, HR Organization Effectiveness</td>
<td>University of Texas - Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie West</td>
<td>Talent Development Section Supervisor Human Resources</td>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Reese</td>
<td>Center for Leadership Excellence</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David VanDeusen</td>
<td>Training &amp; Organizational Development Specialist</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Moehr</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, Fully Prepared to Lead</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin – Madison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: EXTERNAL RESEARCH SURVEY QUESTIONS

1) How would you describe the Leadership Development (LD) program/s at your organization?
2) Is the LD program available to all employees?
3) What are the components of the LD program? Do the components vary by employee’s job or employee’s LD needs?
4) How did your organization assess your employees’ LD needs and/or select the components of the curriculum/content when creating the LD program?
5) What is the delivery method/s of the LD program?
6) Are there any costs associated with the program? If so, what are the costs and who bears those costs?
7) Are there any incentives to the employees for completing this program? If so, what?
8) What do you feel are the greatest strengths of your organization’s LD program?
9) What do you feel are the weaknesses or future areas of growth for your organization’s LD program?
10) What advice would you offer to an organization that is working to create a successful LD program?
11) Do you have specific retention goals, and do you find that these training options affect those?
Appendix E: EXPANDED VIEW OF ROADMAP

**Tracks**

**Leading Yourself**
- Assess impact of personal strengths on the department/unit.
- Understand how strengths affect relationships, performance, and business outcomes.
- Coach and develop self-awareness in others.

**Leading Teams**
- Influence organizational culture.
- Increase motivation and productivity.
- Communicate shared vision.
- Solicit meaningful feedback.

**Leading KU**
- Create partnerships across the university, leading across the various levels of the organization.
- Set and realize the vision, direction, and goals for the university.
- Manage institutional change.
- Manage budgets.

---

**Administrator Leadership Certificate**
- Set personal priorities within a team context.
- Identify key partnerships that are essential to individual growth and team performance.

**Supervisor Leadership Certificate**
- Increase commitment and engagement to improve team effectiveness.
- Build and strengthen relationships to build trust.
- Improve performance, allowing for effective delegation and constructive conflict resolution.
- Balance competing priorities.

**Project Leader Leadership Certificate**
- Assess impact of personal strengths on the project.
- Develop design thinking.
- Lead teams with emotional intelligence.
- Influence without authority.

**Developing Leader Leadership Certificate**
- Assess strengths and impact in the workplace.
- Develop self-awareness, self-regulation and empathy for others.
- Manage and prioritize responsibilities.
- Create personal leadership and career goals.
- Build relationships and networks across campus.

---

Foundation

Job Training, Diversity Training and Technology Training