

EDUCATORS'  
REFERENCE  
COLLECTION

*DEVELOPING  
NON-HIERARCHICAL  
LEADERSHIP  
ON CAMPUS*

CASE STUDIES AND  
BEST PRACTICES IN  
HIGHER EDUCATION

EDITED BY  
CHARLES L. OUTCALT,  
SHANNON K. FARIS,  
AND  
KATHLEEN N. MCMAHON

## *Chapter 8*

# Miami's Leadership Commitment

*Dennis C. Roberts*

“To develop the leadership potential in all students for the global and interdependent world of the future” – a pretty lofty and, in some people’s estimation unrealistic and unachievable vision. However, this is the vision of Miami’s Leadership Commitment, which is the name coined by the planning committee that created it. In the following pages you will begin to see why this is not realistic, but necessary, for Miami University. You may even see that it is realistic and necessary for a growing number of colleges and universities of the future.

The model described in this chapter is, as far as we know at present, unique in its comprehensive nature. As the designers of Miami’s Leadership Commitment researched and planned its comprehensive emphasis, there was no evidence that other institutions were attempting to take as seriously a non-positional definition of leadership that allowed all students, faculty, and staff to claim their own leadership potential and that attempted to reach a broad cross-section of the campus community. Granted, Miami has not yet achieved its full objective and it may be a decade before proof will be unequivocal that all our students are reached in one way or another by Miami’s Leadership Commitment. The claim of this chapter is one of serious aspiration, not complete fulfillment. The visionaries who conceived of the program believed that a broad and challenging vision was more important than a more achievable and modest approach to leadership development. There are other examples of institutional initiatives that while not as comprehensive as ours, are attempts at using non-hierarchical leadership at the level of the institution.

This chapter will cover a sequence of issues that will be critical to your understanding of this model. First, the theoretical bases will be introduced briefly. Second, the historic commitment and culture of Miami University will be described. The comprehensive planning effort set in motion in 1995 began with this historical commitment and established an explicit commitment and program that had been only implicit previously. The actual program design will be explained. Finally, the initial evaluation of Miami’s Leadership Commitment as well as issues for the future will be addressed.

## **THEORY BASES OF MIAMI’S LEADERSHIP COMMITMENT**

The theory bases of Miami’s Leadership Commitment are derived from two different arenas. The first theory base is that which studies leaders and leadership. The second theory base involves the emerging conceptualization of leadership development program design in higher education.

While there are numerous definitions of leadership available to us, the one used as the foundational understanding of leadership in our institutional context is Joseph Rost’s,

“Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and their collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (Rost, 1993, p. 99). Rost’s article, “Leadership Development in the New Millennium,” critiqued the historic emergence of our understanding of what leadership is; in this analysis he asserts that we have not really focused on leadership at all but, instead, on “leader development.” This is so because most of the analyses conducted prior to the 1990s looked at behaviors, traits, characteristics, attributes, and interactions of leaders with followers. Instead, he proposes that, if we assume that leadership is an interactive phenomenon, we must take more seriously the dynamics of interpersonal conduct and the exchange and sharing of leadership of many.

The Rost definition was modified for Miami’s purposes and stands as, “Leadership is a mutual influence relationship where people work together to improve or change something to their mutual benefit.” This definition is clearly and directly derived from Rost’s but represents the most direct and simple statement of our post-industrial and changing views of leadership as a shared responsibility and phenomenon.

Rost asserts also that leadership educators, “should admit honestly that we don’t know how to develop leaders” (Rost, 1993, p. 102). Student Affairs staff have assumed that leadership development has been an implicit part of their role literally from the beginning of the twentieth century. However, Rost is probably accurate in his assessment that the implicit assumption that leaders were being developed, was just that – implicit and imprecise.

The second theory base, which was foundational in the development of Miami’s Leadership Commitment, is the literature concerning the means by which leadership development programs can be designed and delivered. The “Student Leadership Program Standards and Guidelines” (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 1996) refrain from defining leaders or leadership in a specific way, but attributes in select positional and authoritative leaders. Even though the standards were not finalized until after the Miami model was in advanced stages, Miami’s Leadership Commitment was informed through use of draft copies of the emerging standards.

## **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF MIAMI’S LEADERSHIP COMMITMENT**

One of the greatest beauties of Miami’s Leadership Commitment is that it is so deeply anchored in the historic traditions and values of the university. Roberts and Ullorn (1989, p. 69) recommended that “a leadership program is strongest when clearly set in historical institutional values.” The mission statement of Miami is, in fact, to educate, “men and women for responsible, informed citizenship, as well as meaningful employment” (Miami University, 1993). Founded in 1809 by George Hamilton Bishop who became its first president, the university was designed as an intense learning community committed to the holistic development of its students. The historic roots of Miami are preserved to this day in the “Functional Mission Statement” approved by the university Senate in 1993-1994. This mission statement indicates that “Our goal in the next several years is to use Miami’s rich co-curricular and out-of-class activities more intentionally to foster the sense of intellectual challenge students experience on campus and to take national leadership in modeling how student life on campuses can be enhanced!” (Miami University, 1993).

The point is that the historic traditions and values of Miami were deliberately adopted in a comprehensive leadership development model borne of the university's real heritage and accomplishments. This establishes a culture that celebrates leadership, encourages all students to develop it, and seeks to serve both the work and living environments into which Miami alumni/ae graduate.

What the historic conditions and culture of the campus achieved was an implicit belief that citizenship and leadership are important. Student engagement in a variety of co-curricular activities including sports, literary societies, student clubs and organizations, student government, philanthropy, and others has always been plentifully available. However, until 1995 no initiative had been undertaken to articulate explicitly what outcomes were expected of students' gains in citizenship and leadership. In addition, no explicit model of what was meant by leadership and how it could be developed was available. This fact led to the formation of the Leadership Program Task Force in 1995, which was charged with the creation of a comprehensive leadership program.

## **CREATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY**

The President and Vice President for Student Affairs established the Leadership Program Task Force and charged me, as Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, to convene and work with this group until an explicit and comprehensive model was designed. The Task Force met in retreats and regularly scheduled meetings for over a year and a half during which time contemporary literature on leadership and other campuses' approaches to leadership development were studied.

While the Miami Task Force was pursuing its work, I was also involved in the Eisenhower Grant project, which eventually resulted in the creation of the "Social Change Model of Leadership Development" (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996). A very catalytic and symbiotic interaction occurred as I served in both these planning initiatives. What is key to understand is that, while both initiatives are linked in their view of leadership, their philosophy, and their purpose, the most important commonality was in the way that the Miami Leadership Program Task Force and "the Ensemble" of the Eisenhower Grant functioned. Both the Leadership Program Task Force and the Ensemble sought to understand newly emerging post-industrial paradigms of leadership while also activating the very philosophies being studied. This resulted in a fascinating and exciting interplay between thought and action, reflecting and doing.

The Miami Leadership Program Task Force was broadly representative of a variety of faculty, staff, and students. One of the criteria consistently exercised in determining who would serve on the Task Force was whether they were "out of the box" thinkers who would view leadership and leadership development in a radically different way. Task Force members included academic administrators, faculty, staff, and students, reflecting those involved in both non-positional and positional leadership. While the Task Force was expected to achieve an outcome, the members were patient with each other and the many unfolding discoveries we would make about leadership and leadership development. Taking a full eighteen months allowed the leisurely, consensual development of a model truly embraced by the planning team.

The importance of my being involved in both of these initiatives at the same time cannot be understated. In the Eisenhower Ensemble I was more of an active participant, trading in and out of leadership, while in the Miami Task Force I could easily have been perceived as the positional leader who was in charge and supposed to make it happen. Because the Eisenhower Ensemble sought deliberately to avoid positional and privileged displays of leadership, it stimulated me to work even more diligently to mirror the same kind of behavior. Several of the Miami Task Force members commented about how unusual their involvement was with this group and how fulfilled they felt as a result of their participation.

A variety of articles, books, and theoretical conceptualizations about leadership were studied during the Task Force deliberations. Graduate students summarized many articles so that the Task Force members' reading could be expedited. Early drafts of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (SCM) were reviewed as they emerged from the Eisenhower Ensemble. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education "Leadership Program Standards" (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 1996) were used as a framework to understand how comprehensive leadership programs could be designed and coordinated. Finally, we studied "The Miami Plan for Liberal Education" for its relevance to leadership.

The latter conceptualization, The Miami Plan for Liberal Education, was particularly critical to the Task Force because it encapsulated both the emerging views of leadership and the core commitments and values of a Miami education. The Miami Plan for Liberal Education requires all students to share in a common intellectual experience that assists students as they develop learning insights in these four areas:

- Thinking critically;
- Understanding contexts;
- Engaging with other learners;
- Reflecting and acting.

The Leadership Program Task Force realized that these core principles of liberal learning are also some of the most important dimensions of successful leadership. The realization that research and theorizing about leadership complemented Miami's commitment to liberal education allowed the Task Force to fuse its history and its view of liberal education with the best and most contemporary understandings of leadership.

The process of study and consideration pursued by the Leadership Program Task Force was long, arduous – and difficult. However, the commitment to a quality and substantive process was essential to achieve quality results as well as build consensus around the conceptualization of Miami's Leadership Commitment.

## **MIAMI'S LEADERSHIP COMMITMENT**

Leadership development was found to be imbedded in a number of different individual programs, offices, and faculty or staff members. However, leadership development as a comprehensive, integrated, and complementary program did not exist prior to the planning of the

Task Force. Miami's Leadership Commitment is based on six assumptions regarding Miami and its historic and contemporary culture that are important to understand.

The first assumption is that "Leadership is a mutual influence relationship." Rost is the author the Task Force used to substantiate this point, but other authors espouse similar views. This assumption indicates that leadership involves the multiple and mutual influences that are exchanged among those engaged in leadership. Imbedded in this assumption is the notion that leadership might be seen as individuals who exercise leadership in positions of authority or might be seen without regard to position at all. Leadership can be exhibited by an individual or it might be exhibited by a group of people working together to achieve their aim.

The second assumption is that we assume that all Miami students are capable of leadership. This assumption requires a shift from focusing on the identification of individuals with the most promise or capability in leadership toward developing the leadership potential in all. This assumption is seen in the vision statement for the program, "to develop the leadership potential in all students." One of the things that concerned the Task Force a great deal was that previous leadership programs at Miami and elsewhere frequently espouse an inclusive definition of leadership while at the same time targeting small, elite groups of students who somehow are identified as having that "something special" that makes them prime candidates for leadership development. How can we maintain integrity and consistency in leadership program design if the definition of leadership is inclusive and the populations served are exclusive?

The third assumption of Miami's Leadership Commitment is that our emerging understanding of changes in knowledge and its acquisition are closely aligned with our changing views of leadership. Post-modernist, feminist, multicultural, and other perspectives of knowledge are now beginning to help us understand that knowledge is context-bound and that, if we seek to be truly educated, we must begin to understand the contexts within which we live. The ability of any one person to have intellectual authority over all others probably made little sense even in the times when this view was the prevailing belief. The point we realized here is that, assuming dramatic changes in the way we view knowledge and how it is acquired, what assumptions do we have about leadership that might require equal examination? Indeed, we find bountiful examples throughout history and in contemporary times that leadership has not, and is not, the exclusive purview of certain kinds of people who have unquestionable authority over others.

The fourth assumption of Miami's Leadership Commitment is derived from the complexity of the way we view leadership coupled with new paradigms of learning. A comprehensive leadership development program that seeks to be effective must have some way of communicating consistent messages about what is valued in relationships, communication, leadership, and the learning community. This area required the greatest depth in our planning efforts. We believed it was essential to identify values that were salient in the culture of Miami University that could be used to frame all of our leadership programs. The Task Force used a brainstorming and refining process to come to an agreement on the "Leadership Values Framework" that would be the foundation for all Miami leadership programs. The Task Force worked by itself initially and then communicated widely with others to see if the values we identified were effective for a broader representation of the campus. Two specific dynamics emerged as this consultation occurred. The first reaction was: "Who are you to tell me what my values are?" This view is a likely aspect of any higher education community that values freedom

of thought, action, and self-determining discovery of knowledge. The response that allowed us to keep these individuals connected was that the Leadership Values Framework is a set of values about the process and the way we live and learn together. The second critique offered by some colleagues was that, since the Leadership Values Framework is so broad and malleable, it was difficult to discern its actual meaning. What good is it if it is not prescriptive and doesn't tell us what to do? The response of the planning group was to challenge those posing this question to identify environments where they were confident that such shared values were present.

The fifth assumption is that, by combining the core values that characterize the learning environment at Miami with what we know about leadership, we can send powerful and repeated messages about what we value and what we expect of one another. Anthropologists and sociologists look for just such repeated messages about what is valued in any community or living group. However subtle or overt, value messages are powerful shapers of individual behavior. When it comes to messages delivered in comprehensive leadership development, we concluded that the nine values should be repeated again and again, in part or whole, to send the kind of message about leadership that was congruent with our mission.

The sixth assumption of Miami's Leadership Commitment is that, if we are to be most successful, the leadership philosophy and values we espouse will have to be matched by the experiences each student, faculty, or staff member has. This is the most difficult assumption to address. We decided that the process started with us, with our close associates, and with sending messages about what we value repeatedly within the area we can affect – our own behavior and relationships. The belief in this assumption gave rise to a process that has been used in small groups in a number of settings throughout the campus. The process is a self-discovery and group experience, including a form titled, "Because this is what we value, then we will. . . ." The nine leadership values are used as trigger statements. Individuals and groups are encouraged to operationalize these values by looking carefully at mutual agreements that can be made about how everyone is treated. This can be a very powerful process but it requires sustained commitment to reach its full potential.

In summary, the key assumptions that provide the foundation for Miami's Leadership Commitment include:

1. Leadership is a mutual influence relationship (Rost, 1993).
2. All Miami students are capable of leadership.
3. Our emerging understanding of changes in knowledge and its acquisition are closely aligned with our changing views of leadership.
4. A value-based approach is most appropriate so that students are engaged repeatedly with related and complementary messages.
5. Miami has a unique set of values that, when combined with what we know about leadership, provide a powerful cultural message about leadership.
6. Students' exposure to the philosophy and values of leadership in programs should ideally be matched by their experiences throughout the University.

## **THE LEADERSHIP VALUES FRAMEWORK**

The Leadership Values Framework is a repeated signal of what is valued in learning and human interactions on the Miami campus. The framework is based on the principles of The Miami Plan for Liberal Education and other key value commitments that are consistent with the emerging research and theory about what characterizes effective leadership. The Leadership Values Framework might or might not work in other organizational or institutional settings. The key issue is that any organization that would seek to discern a set of shared values would have to be willing to go through an arduous process of determining what makes sense in that particular setting.

The Leadership Values Framework includes the following nine commitments:

1. Being active in the campus community and beyond.
2. Seeing potential within yourself and others.
3. Thinking critically and taking time to reflect.
4. Respecting the dignity of others and appreciating diversity.
5. Communicating directly and honestly.
6. Being flexible and open to change.
7. Taking purposeful risks.
8. Being responsible for your actions.
9. Encouraging others to live by these values.

Other than the possible symmetry of the first two providing a foundation and the last two providing a capstone, there is no particular reason that the values should be ordered in any specific way. In some ways the first two values are essential to have an engaged community – members must choose to be active and they must see potential within themselves and others. The other bookends, being responsible for your actions and encouraging others to live by these values, are logical conclusions to a value system or commitment.

The Leadership Values Framework emerged from a consideration of the “Seven Cs” included in the SCM. The Seven Cs are explained in greater detail elsewhere in this book (see Bonous-Hammarth [Chapter 4] in particular for an outline of this Model). Suffice it to say that the articulation of a view of leadership that is composed of issues within the individual, the group, and the resulting service to the broader community was very critical in the identification of the Miami values. But, it was very important that the planning team for Miami’s Leadership Commitment have the opportunity to put their own, and the institutional values, in their own language.

## **THE LEADERSHIP VALUES FRAMEWORK REFLECTED IN PROGRAMS**

If, indeed, a campus of Miami’s size (approximately 16,000 full-time students on the Oxford campus) commits to developing the leadership potential in all students, regardless of position or status, what kind of program or programs could possibly achieve this level of saturation? Our answer was to identify every program that had a direct or indirect effect on students’ views of leadership. After surveying the campus environment, we found a number of programs that could be shaped to complement the leadership values. In addition, we discovered gaps and opportunities to expand programming. In the case of existing programs, we undertook gradual

modification. In cases where a gap was identified, new programs have been and will continue to be added until the goal of full saturation is achieved.

One of the key strategies used to establish an inclusive and pervasive program is a philosophy among the creators of Miami's Leadership Commitment that on all occasions and through every opportunity we should attempt to give away and share our commitment to developing leadership potential. As a result, the various programs and initiatives are sponsored by numerous offices and staff throughout the university. While at present the majority of the programs come from the Division of Student Affairs, we hope that many more offices and divisions will eventually contribute to this emphasis.

At present, Miami offers 24 formal and annual programs that are consistent with and complement the philosophy and values of Miami's Leadership Commitment. In addition to these 24, ad hoc and one-time programs occur throughout the year and staff work with student leadership to design purposeful links to Miami's Leadership Commitment on an ongoing basis. The continuing leadership programs encompass experiences for students that span their interaction with the university. The four broad categories include:

1. Prospective and new student programs,
2. Curricular programs,
3. Co-curricular programs,
4. Launching programs (meaning the preparation and launching of students into the world of work and active community citizenship).

Students choose those programs in which they have interest. While there is some logic to the progression of students' experiences, there is no prescription or prerequisite for most programs. Each reinforces and builds on students' other experiences. For the most current and comprehensive compilation of Miami's Leadership Commitment offerings, please see our web site at: <http://www.muohio.edu/mlc/>

The programs and their relation to student experiences include:

### ***Successful Campus Programs***

#### *Prospective and New Student Programs*

- New Student Reading Program
- First-Year Institute programs and workshops
- Student Activities and Volunteer Fairs
- Emerging Leadership

#### *Curricular Programs*

- Reid and Dorsey Halls Leadership, Excellence and Community Living Learning
- Residential Service-Learning
- McBride Hall Diversity Living Learning
- Buck Rodgers Business Leadership
- Plus-1 Credit Service Learning and Independent Study
- Student-initiated Capstone Course proposals

### *Co-curricular Programs*

- Annual Student Leadership Conference
- Group Opportunities and Leadership (GOAL)
- Multicultural Leadership
- Peer Education
- Women's Leadership
- Greek Leadership
- Kindred Spirits Retreat
- Character Counts Lecture
- LeaderShape
- EMPOWER Social Justice Leadership
- Scholar Leadership Living Learning

### *Launching Programs*

- Awards and Recognition
- Senior Success Seminar Series
- Seniors' Last Lecture

These all reinforce the philosophy of Miami's Leadership Commitment, although some may focus more on a specific subset of the values than others. When students participate in multiple programs, they have the opportunity to gain deeper exposure to all nine values over time.

## **THE LEADERSHIP VALUES FRAMEWORK AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE**

One of the most radical and innovative aspects of Miami's Leadership Commitment is the belief that while the programs sponsored within it are important, probably the most powerful force for leadership development is the organizational or institutional climate around it. An organizational culture that embraces the Leadership Values Framework will demonstrate its commitment by living the values inherent in the framework, and it will encourage its members to exhibit the same commitment.

For Miami, we concluded that culture had to be influenced by encouraging faculty, staff, and students to live and lead according to the shared values of leadership both implicitly and explicitly. The implicit demonstration is seen in individuals' commitment to value-based conduct. A more explicit commitment to any value perspective, and especially the Miami Leadership Values Framework, can be accomplished by using a tool that raises questions and prods one to actively discern and even write down those things that are personal or shared commitments. The planning team for Miami's Leadership Commitment went so far as to create a worksheet for use by individuals or groups based on the Leadership Values Framework. The values are explained on the worksheet, trigger exploratory questions are provided, and a space is left to write those things that respondents expect in order to remain consistent with each value.

## OUTCOMES OF MIAMI'S LEADERSHIP COMMITMENT

While the strategies and initiatives of Miami's Leadership Commitment are relatively young, continuing qualitative and quantitative assessment is already underway to determine the outcomes of the effort in individual and organizational terms.

Focus group interviews were conducted in the spring of 1998 and 1999, and the *College Student Survey* was administered to a sample of graduating seniors at approximately the same time. The focus group study was conducted by staff in Student Leadership, Campus and Community Life. The study confirmed the positive impact of participation in leadership development programs and student leadership roles on broadening students' views of leadership and leadership values, integrative classroom learning, and students' appreciation of diversity. The 1998 *College Student Survey* study was conducted to measure changes over four years for students who entered Miami in 1994. In addition, the study provided the opportunity to compare Miami with institutions that participated in the W. K. Kellogg Foundation Leadership Grants in the years 1990-98. This survey comparison demonstrated that a random sample of graduating seniors from Miami had similar, and in some cases higher, leadership development outcomes than students who were direct participants in leadership programs at the institutions funded by the Kellogg Foundation. Miami leadership program participants are significantly higher on all measures than non-participants. In addition, when Miami leadership program participants are compared to participants at the Kellogg Foundation supported institutions, Miami compares very favorably in the desired outcomes for all categories.

A couple of selected examples from the College Student Survey demonstrate the sort of differences that result for Miami students. Upon entry in 1994, 56% of men and 65% of women agreed or strongly agreed that helping others in difficulty was very important or essential. These same students were assessed upon graduation in 1998 with 65% of the men and 78% of women agreeing with the same statement. When asked to rate themselves as being above average or in the top 10% in leadership ability, 72% of the men and 60% of women students endorsed this statement in 1994. In 1998, the percentages rose to 80% of the men and 68% of the women.

Specific comparisons with Kellogg funded institutions revealed that, among random Miami students, 61 % were committed to developing leadership potential in others versus 56% at the Kellogg institutions. When actual participants in these leadership programs were compared, 82% of Miami participants and 79% of Kellogg participants endorsed the same statement. Endorsement of a commitment to civic responsibility increased from 60% for non-participants to 64% for participants among Miami students while the Kellogg institutions reflected 55% for non-participants and 65% for participants of leadership programs. Achieving greater clarity of personal values increased from 86% of Miami non-participants to 93% for participants while Kellogg non-participants were 87% and participants were 88%. Finally, 71% of non-participants and 88% of participants at Miami said they had significant gains in their understanding of leadership theories while 62% of non-participants and 86% of participants endorsed the same statement at the Kellogg funded institutions.

The assessments indicate that Miami students are satisfied or very satisfied with important aspects of their experience including access to volunteer opportunities, leadership development, and the overall college experience. They also report much stronger ability and skill upon

graduation in critical thinking and leadership. They report important gains in self-perception from entry to graduation. Specific areas include cooperativeness, leadership, and intellectual and social self-confidence. Variables that reflect Miami graduates' commitment to service can be seen in significant increases from entry to graduation on the importance of developing a philosophy of life, helping others in difficulty, influencing social values, and promoting racial understanding. The *College Student Survey* results indicate that 33% of Miami students participate in one or another of the comprehensive leadership programs before they graduate. In addition, records of the number of participants indicate that a minimum of 9,000 students participate on an annual basis. While the goal is that virtually all Miami students will report that they have been participants in the comprehensive leadership programs, the outcomes experienced by both participants and non-participants are encouraging.

A combination of qualitative and quantitative research over the long term will provide evidence of effectiveness of this comprehensive strategy targeting the entire Miami University campus. It is clear that substantive accomplishments have been achieved, but assessment also draws attention to new opportunities that will enhance these efforts.

## **WHAT IS IN THE FUTURE?**

Miami's Leadership Commitment is an emerging and evolving comprehensive strategy to develop the leadership potential in all students. As such, the program required broad participation in its planning and continues to require broad participation in delivery of the programs for students. The bottom line required to be successful in this breadth of program is to give the program away to anyone who desires to be involved. Resource sharing, collaboration, and mutual celebration are key to continuing progress.

The assessment that has been completed thus far demonstrates substantial progress, but much needs to be done to reach all students at Miami and to convince them that they all have the potential to provide leadership and make a difference in the world. Taking the assessments seriously and modifying programs as we go will eventually make the final objective achievable.

As I indicated at the beginning of this chapter, Miami's Leadership Commitment is a one-of-a-kind leadership development approach. Those considering a shift to a leadership development program that embraces both positional and non-hierarchical and shared leadership could benefit from careful review, refinement, and adaptation of this approach to their campus. However, as this chapter indicates, a truly comprehensive program must be anchored in the history and culture of the specific institution to be effective.

Imagine an institution fully committed to the development of leadership potential in all faculty, staff, and students. Imagine a place where there is less reliance on policies and guidelines to create a healthy campus and more reliance on self-monitoring and mutual accountability. Imagine a campus where faculty and staff are eager to serve each other and students and where graduates go into the world prepared and believing that they have a responsibility to engage with others in productive leadership. This is the ultimate vision and impact the creators of Miami's Leadership Commitment had in mind.

## REFERENCES

- Astin, H. (1996, July-August). Leadership for social change. *About Campus*, 4-10.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (1996). *Student leadership program standards*. University of Maryland: Author.
- Miami University. (1993, December). Functional mission statement. Miami, OH: Author.
- Roberts, D. C., & Ullom, C. (1989). Student leadership program model. *NASPA Journal*, (1),67-74.
- Rost, J. (1993). Leadership development in the new millennium. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(1), 91-110.