Developing the Talent Within:

USG Executive Leadership Institute

Evaluation Report

Prepared for:
Chancellor Erroll B. Davis, Jr.
Board of Regents

May 26, 2011
Evaluation Team:

Tina Woodard, USG Assistant Vice Chancellor for Professional Development
Deborah Covin Wilson, Georgia Institute of Technology
Patrice Masterson, Georgia Perimeter College
Joy Schweiger, Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia

ELI 2010-2011 Committee Members

Denise Bogart, Valdosta State University
Ale Kennedy, Georgia Southern State University
Linda Lyons, Kennesaw State University
Patrice Masterson, Georgia Perimeter College
Rebecca Murphy, Valdosta State University
Lanous Wright, Georgia Institute of Technology
Dorothy Zinsmeister, Kennesaw State University

We thank the following individuals for their vital contributions to, and their support of the Executive Leadership Institute.

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia
Chancellor Erroll B. Davis, Jr.
Institution Presidents
ELI Shadow Leaders
ELI Mentors
The Steering Committee of the Executive Leadership Institute
Staff of USG Human Resources Offices
University System Office Information & Web Services
The Leaders Lyceum
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2006 the University System of Georgia (USG) identified formal leadership development as a strategy for building a leadership culture and increasing efficiency of its business operations as identified in Strategic Goal Number Six: *Increasing Efficiency Working as a System*. The Executive Leadership Institute was launched in 2009 and currently 125 scholars have completed the program. The ELI Steering Committee conducted a program evaluation of the 2010 Pilot ELI one year after its completion to assess the effectiveness of learning activities, identify areas for improvement, and address factors that support or inhibit the transfer of learning.

The evaluation research questions that guide this evaluation are:

1. What proportion of the scholars developed and implemented innovative processes or programs?
2. What progress have the scholars made in completing the individual leadership development plan?
3. Did the scholars maintain development relationships with peers and shadow leader?
4. Are improved leadership skills incorporated into daily work six to twelve months after the institute?
5. What portions of the institute are most useful to scholars?

The evaluation team administered a survey to 61 scholars who participated in the pilot institute, which yielded a 61% response rate. The evaluation team also interviewed 34% of the survey respondents to validate survey findings.

**Findings (One-Year, Post-Program)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Made progress towards accomplishing Leadership Development Priority (LDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Incorporated ELI skills into their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Leading or are involved in implementing new programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Maintained developmental communication with mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Experienced job expansion since completing ELI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Satisfied with their overall ELI experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Would recommend ELI to their peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most useful components:** Presidents’ Panel, Leader Levels, 360 Feedback and Job Shadowing

**Least useful components:** Driving Results, Values and Inclusiveness
PILOT ELI EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Immediate Implementation

Target Audience
- Before and during the nomination cycle, emphasize to Chief HR Officers and Presidents the need for Presidents to nominate scholars who fully meet the institute criteria.
- Continue the practice of mixing the cohort membership to ensure institutional sector diversity in each cohort.

Content
- Include more examples and case studies relevant to both faculty and administrators.
- Driving Results – Provide this session earlier in the program to allow more time for scholars to identify a project and work on it during the institute. Change session to 1.5 days with the remaining half day structured as a working session and an opportunity for scholars to discuss their projects with scholars outside of their cross mentoring group.
- Inclusiveness – Redesign the session to include a simulation to focus on how to create an environment of inclusiveness. Explore professional training vendors to deliver the simulation and collaborative debrief with primary ELI facilitators.

Mentoring
- Emphasize during orientation and throughout the institute the need to maintain developmental communications with Cross Mentoring Group Members and Job Shadow Leader. Send a discussion guide and intermittent reminders to scholars and job shadow leaders to reconnect on a regular basis.
- Increase efforts to educate the scholars about the purpose for having an ELI Alumni Mentor and provide an opportunity for them to meet then select a mentor. Delay the matching mentor-protégé matching process until after orientation to allow more education about the mentoring program to occur and obtain more input from Scholars about the type of mentor they feel would be the best fit.

Short-term Implementation (6 – 12 months)
- Offer a Leadership Development Priority (LDP) refresher as an alumni event.
- Provide a content summary to scholars’ direct managers after each session along with discussion prompts that will facilitate follow up conversations between the manager and scholar about what the scholar is learning and how the supervisor can support their development during the institute.
• Expand the concept of system wide leadership development through the Professional Development Consortium to target management levels deeper within the System for leadership development opportunities.
• Explore the expansion of the number of leaders who can participate from larger institutions by adding a third cohort using a shared cost model.

ONE-YEAR, POST- PROGRAM CONCLUSION

The USG ELI is an effective and worthwhile investment in the future leaders of the USG. The institute is beneficial to USG leaders and should be continued and expanded to serve more leaders.