Course Overview

The conceptual framework of the Doctoral Program in Leadership Studies (DPLS) focuses on the personal, organizational, and global levels of leadership. These ‘levels’ are all linked to the phenomenological, moral, philosophical, scientific, and cultural experiences of human beings. This required course is an inquiry into the individual person as both leader and follower and will be an extended discussion on moral, philosophical, scientific, and cultural issues and frames of reference. Three of the texts (Ladkin, Reed, Wertsch) that we will read and discuss during the course are substantive inquiries into the philosophy, sociology, psychology, and phenomenology of experience. These texts also help develop a comprehensive and linked set of ideas around the topics of the self, identity, and human action.

The Harvey & Riggio, Northhouse and Greenleaf texts we will read are meant to describe and contextualize leadership studies such that the Jesuit and DPLS perspectives of leadership are firmly rooted in the scholarship and history of the field. These texts, however, only represent the tip of the “iceberg” of leadership as a discipline in that other core texts by Burns, Bass, Rost, Heifetz, Avolio, and others, should be read and absorbed in your doctoral journey.

The intent of this course is to establish frames of reference for leadership at the personal level of experience with a clear view of connections to both organizational and global perspectives. A basic goal of the course is to forge and maintain a consistent thread between your phenomenological experience as a human being, psychological self, and citizen and your academic understanding of the theory, concepts, and history of the field of leadership studies. There will also be a consistent and pervasive focus on dialogue as a communicative leadership practice throughout the course.

The culminating paper for this course will be a demonstration of your understanding of your own leadership as seen through the filter of the course texts, discussions, and activities.

Course Hopes and Aims (objectives):

- Define and understand epistemological assumptions and frameworks related to thinking about the human person and the agentive activity of persons.
- Survey and critically analyze the discourse on ‘meaning’ and ‘meaning making’.
- Critically analyze selected dominant structuring frameworks in the social sciences.
- Develop and generate dialogue around theoretical perspectives of the development of the self.
• Explore and critically evaluate leadership models, frameworks, & theories in light of paradigmatic sociocultural interpretations.
• Explore gender as a persistent theme in leadership praxis and discourse.
• Explore and discuss Servant Leadership and relate it to the broader themes of the course.
• Identify, analyze, & evaluate the reciprocal effects of society, scale & structure on the self.
• Link theories of the development of the ‘self’ to your narrative and to your experience and goals related to the larger topic of leadership.
• Learn, develop, and practice the specific dialogic skills of listening, suspension, respect, and speaking.

Course Structure
This course is composed of reading, writing, class discussion, lecture, group presentations, and video. We will form small working & presentation groups during the first class that will remain intact throughout the course. These groups or cohorts will serve multiple functions. Among them are:

Content & process support - group participants will have an opportunity to discuss readings, past discussions, and class assignments.

Project and activity work - One of our first activities will be for groups to develop an agreement about group process and individual responsibilities. The major group activity will be presentations from the Harvey & Riggio text (see Blackboard and below).

Each four hour meeting will open with a ‘check in’ by each participant that articulates what is interesting or important from previous reading or meetings. We will also do an overview of the readings. Small group discussions of course notes and readings will then follow. We will generally take a 20-30 minute break. Following the break we will do presentations, conduct full class debriefs, continue class discussion, or review readings or presentations.

My style of pedagogy and theory of knowledge are based on pragmatist, constructivist and interpretivist assumptions. Which is to say that I believe there is no one or singular definition or interpretation of phenomena that holds true in all cases for all people at all times. All of us bring unique perspectives and experiences to the situation we call a DPLS seminar/course. However, it is also the case that the University confers degrees, awards credentials, etc. This larger set of social and cultural norms about what counts as scholarship, depth of thought, originality, academic honesty, and quality is something that I also take very seriously.

Consequently we triangulate interpretations so as to arrive at a rough consensus about what or what is not good deep scholarly work. Each of the writers/authors we present in our courses has a perspective and a unique interpretive lens. Each of you have a perspective and a unique interpretive lens, when we work together in groups or discuss ideas we create yet another interpretation. I, as chief facilitator and designer of the course, also have an interpretive lens. The goal of this course (of all my courses) is that we make use of all these interpretations so that at the end of the day – at the end of the semester – you have had the richest, most complex, and engaging experience possible. What this requires of all of us is a willingness to listen to each other deeply, take risks in what we say and think, and stay present and engaged throughout the
course. My essential perspective on learning is that it is the productive confusion of understanding and knowledge.

I also make available on Blackboard interpretive lecture notes of selected readings. It is my hope that these interpretations inspire and assist students in interpreting and analyzing the readings from their own perspectives in a deeper way. I also prepare a number of slides based on the notes to stimulate discussion and/or communicate concepts and ideas. There may also be additional readings posted on Blackboard.

Assignments, & Grading

Grading:
The grading emphasizes your individual and collaborative learning achievement in this course. You will largely determine your grade in this course. Aside from my analysis of your assignments as reflected in the assignments rubric below I will also note that grades reflect the following:

- Great Effort and great understanding = A
- Great Effort and adequate understanding = A-
- Adequate effort and adequate understanding = B

Assignments

- Read all materials and attend all classes and participate with all your attention. Please let me know if you intend to miss any classes. (10% of assessment)
- Pre-Class reading & assignment. See Blackboard > Assignments for the writing prompt. 20% Also see my reading notes for the two books on Blackboard in the Course Notes > First Meeting Folder
- Group Presentation - Harvey and Riggio. Groups will be assigned by the first meeting. See Blackboard - 10%
- Midterm Paper: Significant work on the conceptual framework and literature review for your final paper. See Blackboard > Assignments > Midterm Final Paper. 20%
- Readings Analysis Assignment - See Blackboard > Assignments > Readings analysis. 10%
- Final paper – Please see Blackboard > Assignments > Final Paper (30% of assessment) Due at last meeting.

Expectations and Assessment

This course requires a significant amount of reading and some of the books may be written in a style unfamiliar to you. I encourage you to devote ample time to the reading. There is also a reading ‘assignment’ due at the beginning of most classes. See Blackboard for more detail.

Assessment of doctoral work in leadership studies is challenging. Interdisciplinary work dealing with complex and sometimes contested theories and concepts requires (from my perspective) a tolerance for uncertainty, ambiguity, and contingency. I am also struck by the need for a high degree of self-directed behavior on the part of doctoral students and candidates. I would like my teaching style, assessment policy, and rubrics to support and facilitate self-direction. The DPLS
is an interdisciplinary program and students come with a variety of experiences, different types of expertise, and different professional and scholarly needs. It is my intention to honor, help cultivate, and support these differences.

However, behind my philosophical questions about assessment and uncertainty in evaluating anyone in an absolute manner there does reside (in my view) a set of skills that serve to hold and shape work with language in a complex world. I believe we need a grammar, syntax, and semantics of clarity, coherence, depth, and breadth. My assumption at the beginning of the term is that all of the students in this class possess the requisite skills, talents, and propensities needed to be clear, cogent, and complete. I admit that the standards I refer to are objectively stated and subjectively enacted. My assessment will be based on the quality and content of expressed thought as exhibited in both written assignments and classroom presentations and participation.

**Grading Criteria for Written Work (adapted from the DPLS Academic papers rubric)**

**Content Criteria:**

The content of papers should reflect the level and style of content in readings and discussions. There is an expectation that doctoral students will reach outside of their comfort zone in terms of appropriation of ideas, concepts, and frameworks. The substance of papers and other writings will be weighed against the general level of discourse in class meetings and the style and density of expression of the readings.

**Thought and Expression Criteria**

Student writing should raise vital questions or issues, formulating them clearly and precisely. I will be looking for evidence of breadth and depth and the insightful, in-depth analysis of complex ideas. Main points should be developed and supported with relevant information and references that are appropriately incorporated.

The organization and logic of your writing is critical. The expectation is for well focused, well organized, and well reasoned conclusions. The writing should flow with the reader not getting lost or having to work to determine what you are saying.

There is also an expectation that your writing/thinking has an open and inclusive character when exploring alternative systems of thought, recognizing and assessing, as appropriate, their assumptions, implications, and/or practical consequences.

**Technical Criteria**

Your writing should be clear and demonstrate a high level of vocabulary through careful word choice. Sentences should be constructed skillfully and purposefully. Transitions between paragraphs and sections are important and will evaluated for their efficacy in weaving your concepts, themes, and purposes together. Summaries and conclusions are also vital elements of good writing and will be evaluated based on their appropriateness and effectiveness.

Of course grammar, punctuation, and spelling are expected to be flawless. Careful proof reading of your paper is a basic expectation.

Papers, unless otherwise noted are to be completed in APA style. References should be cited properly within the text and a complete reference list must be provided. Appropriate use of headings will also be noted.
**Required Texts**


**Other readings assigned (and provided on Blackboard)**

### Summer 2014 DPLS 700—Leadership Theory: Class Outline

**Pre-class reading:** Necessity of Experience (NoE) – Acts of Meaning: Read both books and prepare a 6 page response –due at first meeting. See Blackboard for more specific guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Content</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1st Meeting** | Group Work Group Activity – Images of Leadership | Readings & projects for 2nd meeting:  
- Harvey & Riggio – Leadership Studies: Dialogue of Disciplines (DoD) pp. 3-81  
- Mind as Action pp. 3-108 |
| Beginnings and Introductions Course Overview > Group Assignments > Presentations > Collaboration. Discussion of Readings | | |
| **2nd Meeting** | Group Work – Compare, contrast, and critically assess Readings. Writing and feedback in the DPLS | Readings & projects for 3rd meeting:  
- DoD pp. 82-148  
- Leadership Theory and Practice Chapters 5 – 8  
- Mind as Action pp. 109 – End of Book |
| Check in Discussion of Readings | | |
| **3rd Meeting** | Group Work – Compare, contrast, and critically assess Readings. | Readings & projects for 4th meeting:  
- DoD pp. 149-198  
- Northouse |
| Check in Discussion of Readings | | |
| **4th Meeting** | First Presentation Group Group Work - Group Work – Compare, contrast, and critically assess Readings & TBA | Readings & projects for 5th meeting:  
- DoD pp. 199-229  
- Northouse |
| Check in Discussion of Readings Leadership Theory | | |
| **5th Meeting** | Second Presentation Group Group Work – Compare, contrast, and critically assess Readings | Readings & projects 6th meeting:  
- Servant Leadership pp. 1 – 146  
- Rethinking Leadership |
| Check in Discussion of Readings | | |
| **6th Meeting** | Third Presentation Group Group Work – Servant Leadership | Readings & projects for 7th meeting:  
- Servant Leadership pp. 147 – 359  
- Rethinking Leadership |
| Check in Discussion of Readings | | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7th Meeting</th>
<th>Wrap up</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>