Original: 9/20/2005
Revised: 11/20/2010
Revised: 9/18/15
Revised: 5/20/20

Suzanne & Richard Pieper Family Foundation
Servant Leader Chair
Award Criteria to a $2,600,000 Endowment

INSTITUTION OF CHAIR: **MSOE** **Fully Funded** *Annual: 2025*

	$$	Criteria	Notes	Rating'	Total Dollar Amount
1.	$50,000	Outcomes baseline date - baseline committed, documented, established -1 time. Alumni and students		-	
2.	$50,000	Sound acceptance of servant leadership with students and faculty through their interest, voluntary inclusion in programs, organizations - 1 time		-	
3.	$50,000	Outcomes measures - seniors, graduate in the workplace. Above demographic norms to max this area or #4... just measuring the internal and external data will create an award of some kind	Good intentions, utilization of NSSE, appropriate approach to surveys (3rd party), faculty self-assessment continues.	3	
4.	$100,000	Phenomenally above demographic norms for maximizing this area	No data. In addition to NSSE, consider investigating other surveys.	0	
5.	$100,000	Breakthrough venture that promises new beginnings in acts of goodness - on campus, community, collaborations in our world	Speaker series is promising, Servant Leadership Summit has value, sponsored SLS	3	
6.	$50,000	An excellent year in carrying out all elements of the missions of the Chair as agreed on accepting the Chair	New chair brings enthusiasm and energy. Great planning for the future.	3	
7.	$500,000	A servant leader (past student or faculty) that leads at an element or segment of our world. Example: Nelson Mandela, Mother Teresa, Mahatma Gandhi, William Wilberforse	Lovely professional.	1	
		TOTAL		10	

[1] Each point is worth 20% of the designated amount
1 = Activity that has some promise
3 = Transformational or systemic
5 = Both transformational and systemic - The ideal synergistic nurturing

ADDENDUM 9/18/15

Typical thinking that goes into evaluating the criteria for the awards of "Suzanne & Richard Pieper Family Foundation Servant Leader Chair Award Criteria to a $2,600,000 Endowment"

1. **Outcomes baseline date - baseline committed, documented, established - one time - Alumni and students**
   The servant leader chairs, with the exception of one, established this criteria before the chair was awarded, expressed in the form of a graph. In all cases this has been done through standard student surveys that the school is already conducting. From those surveys, questions were selected that represent the values, characteristics, actions, involvement of someone representative of a servant leader. Institutions were asked to plot this going back five or six years as a baseline .The document established the database that will then be used in the future. The alumni portion of this is more elusive and each school has its own unique process. Whatever the benchmark that is established for the school, it's compared historically going back as many years as possible both for the school and their peers in other schools, which is then continued each year in the future. This is a one time award.

2. **Sound acceptance of servant leadership with students and faculty through their interest, voluntary inclusion in programs, organizations - one time**
   Clear indication that the school is functioning with the qualities of a servant leader; building community, listening, awareness, stewardship, conceptualization and foresight, commitment to the growth of people and empathy. Displayed in multiple examples of what the school is actually doing will validate this area. It is not unusual that the institutions that receive the Chair already have these types of programs underway. If they are of substantive magnitude, both locally, community, nationally and internationally, one could expect to receive this one time award.

3. **Outcomes measures - seniors, graduate in the workplace - Above demographic norms to max this area or #4…**
   just measuring the internal and external data will create an award of some kind
   Measuring each year what was established in #1 above. The baseline data graphs represented in #1 above are updated, both the peer group and the school. If this is considered qualitative data in the minds of the foundation, they will receive an award. If the alumni data is missing, the award will not be made at maximum. If the norms in the institution are reasonably above average one can expect a higher level award. If there are things missing, one can expect a lower level.

4. **Phenomenally above demographic norms for maximizing this area**
   If #3 is profoundly above the norms and a result of the program indicates that they are continuing to track in that way, you can expect awards at this level. E.g. on a scale of 1-10, a typical peer institution might be 4 or 5. A typical institution that would have been considered for a chair might be a 6. Phenomenal performance might be an 8 or a 9. We would expect eventually most of the institutions will be tracking at a 9, which would tend to maximize this award.

5. **Breakthrough venture that promises new beginnings in acts of goodness - on campus, community, collaborations, in our world**
   We are attempting to encourage the institution, its faculty and student body to think beyond their envelope, searching for new ways of networking and collaboration, whole new approaches to enrichment and effectiveness. This is not about ideas, it is about validated actions. If those actions include the institution, the community it lives in, the world it lives in nationally and internationally and they are phenomenally above it or have exhibited a breakthrough and others are following, this would be a max award. If they have something that is really promising and covers all those areas, it might be on the lower end of the scale. Please see description of the rating levels 1 - 5.

6. **An excellent year in carrying out all elements of the missions of the chair as agreed on accepting the chair**
   This is a follow up of #2 and is an annual consideration. Is there a broad range of deliverable areas with some reasonable quantity of people involved carrying out the mission of the chair as agreed to and accepted by the institution?

7. **A servant leader (past student or faculty) that has demonstrated the potential to have a significant impact on a segment of our world - Example: Nelson Mandela, Mother Teresa, Mahatma Gandhi, William Wilberforce.**
   Is there evidence that a professor in their nurturing locally, community, nation and world is consistently contributing or leading service model vs. the power model? Are there multiple students participating in that level? Such a critical mass would be considered promising and obviously if such a leader or professor nurtures someone else who moves into that level, you could expect the maximum award.

All of the above is intended to help illuminate the thinking of the S & R Pieper Family Foundation, describe how that thinking is intended to compliment the mission of the Servant Leader Chair, acknowledge and encourage exceptional level performance shared with the world, school peers and fellow Chairs. *Revised: 09/18/15, 5/20/20*