Priority Sponsor: *"Who is the action plan leader?"* **Julie Furst-Bowe**	**UW-Stout University Priority Initiated Fall 2002**	Expected Completion: Ongoing

University Priority	**Priority Name-Leadership Development (AQIP Project)**
One to two sentences summarizing the answer to the question: *"What solution are you proposing?"*	
Develop infrastructure, training and incentives to encourage involvement in systems of leadership at UW-Stout.	
Linkage to Strategic Plans *University of Wisconsin-Stout Strategic Plan* Goal 3: Promote excellence in teaching, research, scholarship and service	

Statement of the Issue:
One to two sentences summarizing the answer to the question: *"What issue are you trying to solve?"*
Currently there is a lack of interest in and incentives for leadership positions at UW-Stout that may be caused by a non-supportive climate for leadership.
Note: Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP) is a new model of accreditation by the North Central Association (NCA) Higher Learning Commission based on a model of continuous improvement. For more information, visit the website at www.AQIP.org.

Action Plan:	**Responsible:**	**Timeline:**
Write 3 – 5 high level steps needed to accomplish the priority statement above. *"What has to be done for this priority to succeed?"*	*"Who are the positions or people that will be responsible for each step?"*	*MUST be specific target completion date.*
Conduct surveys/focus groups to determine reasons for the lack of interest/involvement and to identify development opportunities -Faculty and Academic Staff Senates -Program Directors -Department Chairs -Unit Directors -Others not in leadership positions	Faculty Senate SAS HR Director Associate VC Deans	December 2002

Clearly define job descriptions/expectations for program directors, department chairs; provide consistency in release time/stipends - Investigate rotating people through temporary leadership positions	Provost Associate VC Deans, Faculty Senate	May 2003
Develop a leadership mentoring program	Associate VC Associate Deans	May 2003
Provide leadership training opportunities	Associate VC Associate Deans VC ASLS	Beginning June 2003

Implication for Resources:

"What is needed for this priority to succeed?"
(Human, fiscal, physical, other)

- Resources needed to correct inequities in release time/stipends – colleges
- Travel funds to send individuals off campus for training or professional development
- Funds to bring trainers/facilitators to campus
- Graduate assistant or LTE (.50) to coordinate mentoring program and leadership activities
- Service and supply funds for resource materials, refreshment breaks, etc.
- Increase Professional Development Funding $10,000

Key Measures of Performance:

Identify no more than six critical Measures of Performance when answering the question: *"What information will be collected to benchmark and measure the priority's success?"*

- Number of employees enrolled in leadership training and mentoring activities

Activity	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Faculty Mentoring program	18	18	16		
Academic Staff Mentoring program	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	46
Classified Staff Mentoring program					
WWHEL conference (leadership conference)					
EDGE program			67	52	49
Jeff Russell Leadership program			28	28	20

- 14 employees attended CMI (Collegiate Management Institute) over the past 5 years.

- Participant evaluation of leadership training and mentoring activities

Evaluation of EDGE program		
	Semester 1	**Semester 2**
Visual	4.1	3.9
Handouts	4.1	4.1
Pace	3.9	4.0
Time of Day	4.4	4.3
Usefulness	4.2	4.3
Knowledgeable	4.4	4.6
Format	4.2	4.3

on a 1-5 scale

Leadership and Professional Development Program 2001-02	
Session topic	*Information Presented was Worthwhile*
Self-management	3.6
The Only Constant is Change	3.4
Working Together Effectively	3.4
Communication and Personal Effectiveness	3.6
Why People Don't Get Along	3.7
Creating a Customer Centered Program	3.6
Decision Making and Problem Solving	3.6
Frontline Leadership	3.5

on a 1-4 scale

- Number of employees in applying for leadership positions

Year	Number of positions available	Total number of people who applied	Range in number of applicants per position	Percentage of positions with only 1 applicant
2001-02	19	31	1-6	42%
2002-03	25	46	1-11	60%

- Satisfaction level of employees in these positions

- Effectiveness of individuals in these positions

- Turnover among individuals in these positions