

Florida State Alternative Breaks: Student Coordinator Development

David Schieler

Florida State University

Table of Contents

Introduction & Background.....p. 5

Grounding Leadership Theory.....p. 8

Learning Outcomes.....p. 9

Schedule & Program Timeline.....p. 13

Spring Retreat.....p. 14

First Meeting.....p. 18

Second Meeting.....p. 20

Third Meeting.....p. 21

Conclusion.....p. 23

References.....p. 25

Appendix.....p. 27

    Spring Retreat Facilitator Guide.....p. 27

    Spring Retreat Materials.....p. 37

    First Meeting Facilitator Guide.....p. 63

    First Meeting Materials.....p. 69

    Second Meeting Facilitator Guide.....p. 85

    Second Meeting Materials.....p. 91

    Third Meeting Facilitator Guide.....p. 115

    Third Meeting Materials.....p. 121

## **Introduction & Background**

This leadership intervention was designed for Florida State Alternative Break student coordinators. Florida State Alternative Breaks is a program of The Center for Leadership and Social Change at Florida State University. It's mission and vision are:

### **Mission**

Florida State Alternative Breaks (FSAB) facilitates accessible service immersion experiences for students to create sustainable change in partnership with local and national community organizations and their constituents.

### **Vision**

Active citizenship (Break Away, 2014) is informed by social issue education, community-centered service, and critical reflection. FSAB participants will practice active citizenship by grounding their engagement in intersectional and contextual knowledge of a community need, partnering with host community members to create meaningful change, and engaging in sustained social change practices after returning to their home communities.

Organizationally, FSAB relies on a student director to lead the program and two student coordinators to lead each service immersion experience. In recent years the program has featured four to seven service experiences. Currently, the program is further supported by one graduate assistant and a professional staff member, both with additional job duties beyond FSAB.

Student coordinators are selected following an application and interview process. Chosen pairs of student coordinators are responsible for leading service experiences to various locations in the southeast United States during University breaks. These service experiences range from three days to seven days dependent on the length of the University break. During these experiences, student coordinators are given a significant amount of responsibility in leading

groups of five to fifteen student participants. The potential for student participants to gain valuable insights in supporting community-based social change is largely contingent on the student coordinators' leadership.

When I became the FSAB Graduate Assistant in August 2018 the program featured 12 student coordinators and 2 student co-directors. The co-directors arranged biweekly (every other week) team meetings beginning the first week of classes and continuing until two weeks after Spring Break. These team meetings consisted of get-to-know-you activities, discussion of assigned academic readings, and preparation for the service experiences. While a "syllabus" was developed prior to student coordinator selection, it was not followed by the co-directors beyond the extent of which readings would be covered each week. The readings were as follows:

- *The complexity of identity: Who am I?* (Tatum in Readings for Diversity & Social Justice, 2010).
- *Identities and social locations: Who am I? Who are my people?* (Kirk & Okazawa-Rey in Readings for Diversity and Social Justice, 2010).
- *The cycle of socialization* (Harro in Readings for Diversity and Social Justice, 2010).
- *The cycle of Liberation* (Harro in Readings for Diversity and Social Justice, 2010).
- *Citizenship* (Bonnet in Leadership for a Better World, 2009).
- *Citizen leader: A community service option for college students* (Perreault, 1997).
- *Leader-member exchange theory* (Northouse, 2007).
- *The five practices of exemplary leadership* (Kouzes & Posner, 2008).

The "syllabus" had fourteen identified learning outcomes, but no attention was given to them. The learning outcomes were separated into Knowledge, Skills, and Values areas. Three to five indicators of each outcome were also outlined. To my recollection they were never discussed openly at a team meeting.

- K1: Understand the alternative break movement as it relates to overall college student service learning as well as the Break Away organizational mission.
- K2: Understand the current trends, tensions, and practices of college student service learning.
- K3: Understand the relevant vocabulary and conceptual theory involved in educating others about effective community engagement.
- S1: Communicate with local, national, or international community partners to coordinate logistic planning and sustainable development of a student engagement experience.
- S2: Market FSAB to the Florida State student body and community to increase program participation.
- S3: Educate participants about the social issue focus area(s) in relationship to the specific community need.
- S4: Facilitate reflection, dialogue, and other opportunities for participants to process their learning and experience.
- S5: Manage participant responsibilities and behavior throughout the alternative break experience.
- S6: Comply with Florida State, Center for Leadership & Social Change, and FSAB liability expectations.
- S7: Objectively measure community impact based on qualitative and quantitative measures.
- S8: Reflect on personal identities as they relate to relationship with service, social issues, and leadership development.
- V1: Believe leadership is a values-based process designed to increase the leadership capacity in everyone.

- V2: Believe college students are partners - not the sole catalysts - in community engagement work with vulnerable populations.
- V3: Believe social change and active citizenship are lifestyle choices participants can make given the appropriate knowledge and experience.

It is my perception that the program outlined by the “syllabus” learning outcomes and indicators is not sustainable in the current environment of support available through the Center for Leadership and Social Change. Principle to this consideration is the acknowledgement that prior to 2018 the FSAB program was supported by a dedicated professional staff member, a graduate assistant, and three graduate interns. This significant change in program support necessitates the program be revised and simplified. Noting that program change occurs best in steps, the significant change in learning outcomes and the more direct integration of leadership concepts will be met with consistency of meeting frequency (every other week), meeting time and length (one hour Tuesday evenings), and general structure (team building activities, readings and discussion, and skill-building activities).

### **Grounding Leadership Theory**

The selection of the Social Change Model of Leadership (HERI, 1996) as the grounding leadership theory within the FSAB program is driven by relationship of The Center for Leadership and Social Change and Break Away, the national alternative break organization, of which Florida State University is an associate member. In 2014 Break Away established the Active Citizen continuum (Break Away, 2014), which emphasizes a commitment to community in creating change. The 2014 explication of both commitment and community in creating change appeared to connect Break Away to the Social Change Model of Leadership. A year later, in 2015, Break Away’s book *Working Side by Side: Creating alternative breaks as catalysts for*

*global learning, student leadership, and social change* (Sumka, Porter, Piacitelli, 2015)

confirmed the organization's use of the Social Change Model,

“they [alternative breaks] are effective student leadership development programs...students increase their leadership skill and capacity, particularly in the areas of ‘common purpose’ and ‘civility,’ both core leadership values in the Social Change Model of Leadership” (p. 15).

The alignment of four of the ‘seven C’s’ of the Social Change Model of Leadership through the Active Citizen Continuum (Break Away, 2014) and *Working Side by Side* (Sumka, Porter, Piacitelli, 2015), leaves practitioners to connect the remaining three (Consciousness of Self, Congruence, and Collaboration) through program design.

### **Learning Outcomes**

Moving from 14 learning outcomes each with three to five indicators to three concise and easily communicated learning outcomes with three indicators each allows student coordinators to take ownership of their own development. The revised learning outcomes are below. An explanation of each outcome, with theoretical justification, follows.

By participating in Florida State Alternative Breaks student coordinators will be able to...

- Outcome 1: Define the concepts of active citizenship and leadership.
  - Indicator 1A: Order the stages of the active citizen continuum.
  - Indicator 1B: Identify the ‘seven C’s’ of the Social Change Model of Leadership.
  - Indicator 1C: Recognize the role of identity in active citizenship and leadership.
- Outcome 2: Synthesize FSAB materials and experiences into a personal definition of active citizen leadership.
  - Indicator 2A: Write a personal definition of active citizen leadership.
  - Indicator 2B: Present and defend personal definition of active citizen leadership.

- Indicator 2C: Plan future use of personally defined active citizen leadership.
- Outcome 3: Practice personally defined active citizen leadership during their respective service immersion experience.
  - Indicator 3A: Predict and prevent conflicts to personally defined active citizen leader values and ethics.
  - Indicator 3B: Promote personally defined active citizen leadership to service experience student participants.
  - Indicator 3C: Reflect on and revise personal definition of active citizen leadership following service immersion experience.

***Outcome 1: Define the concepts of active citizenship and leadership.***

The ability to define leadership theories and related concepts is an underlying skill to gaining leadership knowledge, which is itself identified as “a critical part of leadership education” (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 59). Placing the ability to order the Active Citizen Continuum (Break Away, 2014) and identify the ‘seven C’s’ of the Social Change Model of Leadership at the foundational knowledge and comprehension level of Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy acknowledges the primacy of leadership knowledge within leadership education.

By identifying salient personal social identities and their related values, and by aligning those values to the values of community partners and service agencies student coordinators should develop a consciousness of self, and an understanding of congruence. This action of identification and alignment is represented by Indicator 1C, “recognize the role of identity in active citizenship and leadership.” Select readings related to Culturally Relevant Leadership Learning (Guthrie, Bertrand Jones, & Osteen, 2016) provides additional support to understanding the importance of identity in leadership and relationship building. Because of their shared



process-oriented approach to creating change, Culturally Relevant Leadership Learning can be used in complement the Social Change Model of Leadership in this way.

The organizational structure of pairing student coordinators to lead service immersion experiences and the nature of working with community partners and service agencies establishes a culture of collaboration within FSAB. FSAB is also careful to acknowledge collaboration with community partners and service agencies because of the positive impact of reciprocity in relationship building (Sumka, Porter, Piacitelli, 2015).

***Outcome 2: Synthesize FSAB materials and experiences into a personal definition of active citizen leadership.***

Having a personal definition of a larger concept allows student coordinators to put theory into practice. This “ability to recognize, control, and employ” (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 69) leadership knowledge is leadership metacognition. Metacognition is a highly reflective process that requires student coordinators to think about their thinking. While specific pedagogies are discussed later, the longitudinal self-assessment of indicator 2A – write a personal definition of active citizen leadership – allows student coordinators to investigate their own development over time. The synthesizing reflective essay and presentation that results from this investigation (Indicator 2B – Present and defend personal definition of active citizen leadership) closes the metacognitive loop by allowing student coordinators to witness their own development, an important aspect of metacognition (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). Planning for use of a personal definition (Indicator 2C) asks student coordinators to apply their leadership knowledge, skills, and metacognitive reflections to real life by using critical thinking skills to engage in “an in-depth and forward-thinking reflection process” (Rudd, Baker, & Hoover, 2000, as cited in Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 71).

***Outcome 3: Practice personally defined active citizen leadership during their respective service immersion experience.***

Leadership learning does not end at the conclusion of the formal intervention. The experience of leading a service immersion experience is understood to have a profound effect on student coordinators perception of their leadership abilities. Guthrie and Jenkins (2018) refer to this as leadership engagement. In *The Role of Leadership Educators: Transforming Learning*, (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018) service learning is given a significant review, particularly as an engaged pedagogy of leadership learning. The integration of the Social Change Model of Leadership and its emphasis on self-awareness (consciousness of self) and reciprocal relationships (community), overcomes many of the identified challenges of traditional service as a pedagogy (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). The reinforcement of whiteness, power, privilege, and oppressive systems is addressed by educating student coordinators on social issues which underlie each service immersion experience. An example of this would be to talk about specific laws/policies which create and replicate poverty, which may lead to instances of homelessness and food insecurity (a planned 2020 service experience). The challenge of using vulnerable communities for personal gain is confronted by placing the desires of the community before personal desires. Student coordinators spend nine months (June – March) communicating with local service agencies about what service is sought by the community, rather than imposing service plans on them.

Outcome three and the above described leadership engagement suggests student coordinators have some predeveloped leadership skills. Through leadership training student coordinators will be prepared to “deal with complex challenges” (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 64). This training, done through specific pedagogies (discussed later), will allow student coordinators to “Predict and prevent conflicts to personally defined active citizen leader values

and ethics” (Indicator 3A) as well as “Promote personally defined active citizen leaders to service experience student participants” (Indicator 3B).

By participating in post-engagement reflection student coordinators will be able to make-meaning and process their experiences. This reflection will be tailored to meet the goals of Indicator 3C – “Reflect on and revise personal definition of active citizen leadership following service immersion experience.”

**Schedule and Program Timeline**

From a more elevated point-of-view, this leadership intervention consists of biweekly (every other week) one-hour meetings from the first week of classes in the Fall semester until two weeks following Spring break with each outcome and indicator relating to a portion of the program. The student coordinator schedule is below:

Date	Topic	Indicator
Sat. April 13, 2019, 10am	Spring Retreat: Intro to Alt Breaks	1A, 2A
Tue. August 27, 2019, 7pm	Semester Welcome & Overview	2A
Tue. September 10, 2019 7pm	Social Identities	1C, 2A
Tue. September 24, 2019, 7pm	Leadership Identity	1C, 2A
Tue. October 1, 2019, 7pm	Socialization & Liberation	2A
Tue. October 15, 2019, 7pm	Social Change	1B, 2A
Tue. October 29, 2019, 7pm	Community	2A
Tue. November 12, 2019, 7pm	Charity/Service/Community Engagement	2A
Tue. November 26, 2019, 7pm	Semester Wrap-Up	2A, 2B
Tue. January 7, 2020, 7pm	Semester Welcome & Overview	
Tue. January 21, 2020, 7pm	Skill Building: Principle of Thrift	2C, 3A
Tue. February 4, 2020, 7pm	Skill Building: Grocery/Packing Lists	2C, 3A

Tue. February 18, 2020, 7pm	Skill Building: Schedule/Itinerary	2C, 3A
Tue. March 3, 2020, 7pm	Skill Building: Social Media	2C, 3A
Sat. March 14 – Sat. March 21	SERVICE IMMERSION EXPERIENCES	3B
Tue. March 31, 2020, 7pm	Post-Experience Reflection & Feedback	3C

While a facilitator guide, grounded in leadership theory, will be developed for each of these meetings, this paper will only outline the theory underlying the Spring retreat and first three Fall semester meetings – a total of 6.5 hours of programming. As mentioned earlier, the general structure of the meetings will be retained from before my time as the FSAB graduate assistant. Each meeting, and the retreat, will begin with team building activities before transitioning to a discussion on the reading, followed by FSAB-related skill building activities. New to the 2019-2020 program will be a closing summary, reflection, and time for student coordinator questions to conclude the meetings.

**Spring Retreat**

The choice to host a Spring retreat was made for two reasons. First, the program has traditionally featured a Spring retreat for the newly selected student coordinators. Second, because the student participant application launches in the early Fall semester, much of the service experience planning takes place over the summer months, while the team is dispersed. Because of this, it is necessary to set foundational expectations and convey base knowledge to the student coordinators before their departure from campus. The retreat was hosted on Saturday April 13, 2019 from 10am to 1:30pm in Dunlap Success Center (DSC) 1006. The abbreviated schedule is below:

Topic	Time (section length)
Welcome & Introductions	10am-11:10am (70mins)

What is an Alternative Break?	11:10am-12:12pm (62mins)
Roles & Commitment	12:12pm-12:45pm (33mins)
Summer Planning	12:45pm-1:15pm (30mins)
Wrap-Up & Reflection	1:15pm-1:30pm (15mins)

Each section, listed above, leveraged one or more theory-based pedagogical choices.

Beginning the retreat, was a series of activities that allowed students to explore and build relationships with one another. This progression from names (an activity designed to associate names with a physical action) to partner introductions (an activity designed for student coordinators to share what is important or salient on an interpersonal level) to group similarities (an activity designed for connections between coordinators) and eventually to group differences (an activity designed to show unique lived experiences) created “opportunities for team members to get to know one another and discuss individual differences” (McKendall, 2000, as cited in Gutrie & Jenkins, 2018). A series of debriefing questions following the activities brought attention to the intentionality of the activities. The debriefing was structured to reflect Kolb’s (1984) framework, moving from concrete experience through reflective observation and abstract conceptualization to active experimentation, where student coordinators related the activity to their future actions in teambuilding. The series of get-to-know-you activities had the added benefit of increasing student coordinator comfort with fellow team members, enabling greater participation in the retreat’s following activities.

During the next and second longest portion of the retreat – second to the get-to-know-you activities – student coordinators facilitated a peer discussion on a reading completed before the retreat. The reading was “Alternative Breaks Defined,” the first chapter from *Working Side by Side* (Sumka, Porter, Piacitelli, 2015). This reading introduced the Active Citizen Continuum

(Break Away, 2014), common pitfalls of service, and outlined the unique yet general traits of alternative breaks. Because of the importance of student participation in discussion (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018), coordinators were prompted to generate a singular question on an index card based on their interpretation of the reading. Student coordinators then passed the index cards in to the student director, who shuffled the cards and redistributed them, ensuring nobody received their own card. Students then took turns responding to each other's questions. Interestingly, while the facilitator guide suggested that questions be prompted to the group only in the case that a student coordinator could not think of an answer, the group took turns replying to each question, generating considerable discussion. The foundational discussion was followed by a second peer-led discussion on materials presented during the retreat. Groups of student coordinators were given 10 minutes to review provided documents and conduct additional independent research. They then presented this material back out to the team in three-minute intervals.

Since only one student coordinator is returning to the role for a consecutive year, time was dedicated to clarifying roles and expectations. This third component of the Spring retreat follows closely to McKendall's (2000) suggestion that the team develop a "contract" (p. 278). For FSAB, this contract came in the form of a list of commitments that all student coordinators made a verbal agreement to uphold. Items on the list of commitments included:

1. Attend all meetings as able.
2. Develop a meaningful relationship with co-coordinator.
3. Communicate regularly with all team members.
4. Prepare for meetings; do assigned readings & complete necessary outside work.
5. Follow-through on all commitments.

6. Be transparent and honest when things arise that prevent your upholding of these commitments.

The process of clarifying roles and setting expectations is discussed (labeled as “debrief” within the facilitator guide) by a series of directed questions. The use of directed questions to lead a “structured [or] pre-planned discussion” is described in Guthrie and Jenkins (2018, p. 174) as a method which “elicits higher level reflective thinking, problem solving, and retention of information” (p. 175). Acknowledging these as positive outcomes, whether stated goals of the FSAB program or not, the pedagogy was chosen.

The next 30 minutes of the Spring retreat was spent setting plans and working with Break Away’s online service agency database. By connecting the identified challenges of service learning (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018) with the *Working Side by Side* (Sumka, Porter, Piacitelli, 2015) reading, student coordinators were poised to select agencies which prioritize community-identified service. Student coordinators were also given a list of needed information for each service experience, along with summer deadlines.

The final 15 minutes of the Spring retreat was spent summarizing and reflecting on covered material as well as allowing time for questions and announcements. During the reflection component of the retreat conclusion student coordinators were asked to define “Active Citizen Leadership” on large index cards. While itself reflective, this prompt is also part of a longer longitudinal reflection that concludes at the end of the Fall semester. Reflection, as outlined in Guthrie and Jenkins (2018), “connects to the metacognition aspect of the leadership learning framework” (p. 207), discussed earlier in this report. In the form presented during the conclusion of the retreat, the reflection activity also serves as a self-assessment. Guthrie and Jenkins (2018) confirm this dual-service by saying, “self-assessment is inextricably linked to reflection as a tool for connecting experience to meaning” (p. 253). It is planned that at the end

of the Fall semester student coordinators will write a culminating essay detailing their personal development, by reviewing their submitted definitions. Student coordinators were added to a Google Drive and a group messaging application (GroupMe) before they departed the retreat. Email, text, phone, and GroupMe messaging will be utilized to maintain group relationships during the summer months.

### **First Meeting**

Acknowledging that classes begin Monday, August 26, 2019 student coordinators will begin bi-weekly (every other week) Tuesday evening team meetings August 27, 2019. In the past these meetings have lasted one hour. Respecting students' competing commitments the hour meeting was maintained through the curricular redrafting.

The first third (20 minutes) of the meeting will be spent playing a get-to-know-you game – Two truths and a lie – allowing student coordinators to share three exciting moments from their life since the Spring retreat, two of which are true and one of which is a lie. Fellow student coordinators will then attempt to figure out which statement was the lie. Time is then given for each student coordinator to expound on their truths and to share greater details with the team. While this game does not directly address individual differences suggested by McKendall (2000), it does engender listening, which is identified by the same article as a positive team building activity. The next activity takes this concept of sharing and listening one step further.

Giving a brief introduction and example, the student director will demonstrate a storytelling activity titled “I am...” presentations. Stories and storytelling, “can be a powerful pedagogical method in leadership education” (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 200). Student coordinators will leverage this pedagogical method by being asked to integrate meeting concepts into their presentations. The presentations will feature an intentionally vague prompt to encourage student creativity. Encouraging creativity in storytelling, while relating course



material, has the ability to draw attention to reflective meaning making practices (Polkinghorne, 1996 as cited in Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). These presentations will be short (3 minutes) and time will be given for student coordinators to ask questions, further encouraging active listening and the positive outcomes attributed to hearing stories.

In order to scaffold the setting of team expectations, time is spent outlining the program's student coordinator learning outcomes and the Fall semester schedule. While it was not highlighted as a pedagogical choice during the Spring retreat, the scaffolding includes the distribution and debriefing of a selected quote. Each week the facilitation will integrate a quote into the learning to allow students a memorable take-away. The August 27, 2019 meeting features an oft-repeated proverb, easily related to teamwork, "If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together." After debriefing the quote by connecting it to the desire to make far-reaching social change, the team will host a peer-led discussion prompted by: "What are a few things you all need to create the best environment for teamwork and learning?" The format of this question is taken from Guthrie and Jenkins (2018), as well as McKendall (2000). Using a summarized series of directed questions, the expectation setting discussion is debriefed and related to future actions as a student coordinator, leading a service experience. This structure of restating concrete experiences, reflecting on them, making-meaning of them, and planning to apply it to future actions is rooted in Kolb's (1984) framework.

The final ten minutes of the initial Fall semester meeting are spent summarizing and reflecting on meeting content and allowing time for questions and announcements. As part of the content summary, the date, time, location, and needed materials for the next meeting are shared. Student coordinators then re-engage in the reflective practice of defining "Active Citizen Leadership," initially introduced during the Spring retreat.

## Second Meeting

Again, maintaining the overall structure of previous years, the meeting will begin with a get-to-know-you activity. The activity is simply called “Name Game,” and involves two teams and a barrier between them, in this case a blanket. Teams choose someone to approach the barrier, the barrier is then quickly lowered, and the two individuals compete to shout each other’s name first. The person who does not win joins the other team. The game continues until all student coordinators are on one side, or ten minutes passes. Frequent opportunities to learn names helps reinforce the team structure (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). The activity is followed up by allowing two student coordinators to present their personal “I am…” stories. As before, time is given for questions to both student coordinators presentation.

The next portion of the meeting revolves around a peer-discussion of the reading assigned at the end of the previous meeting. The reading is “Authenticity in Leadership: Intersectionality of Identities” by Susan R. Jones in *Developing Culturally Relevant Leadership Learning: New Directions for Student Leadership* (Eds. Guthrie, Bertrand Jones, & Osteen, 2016). While the reading is found in as part of an edited volume on Culturally Relevant Leadership Learning, a different leadership framework than the Social Change Model that is used to ground this intervention, it does not directly discuss the model. Jones presents the Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity (MMDI), discusses intersectionality, and relates the tenets of intersectionality to the concepts of power, privilege, and oppression. The reading challenges student coordinators to see how individual level identities, group membership, and societal systems of power, privilege, and oppression are linked to one another. This reading is chosen as the first reading of the semester because of its transcendence of the Social Change Model’s three levels of focus (HERI, 1996). As greater time is spent investigating the three levels of focus, this foundational reading will help student coordinators remember their inter-dependence. The

discussion is followed with a meaning-making activity, where student coordinators will label the components of their own MMDI. This activity was interpreted from a class activity in Student Personnel Work (SDS5040). A pair and share approach (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018) to debriefing the meaning-making activity completes this portion of the meeting.

The meeting continues through a transition from personal identities to relationship building by sharing a quote from bell hooks, “Many of us seek community solely to escape the fear of being alone. Knowing how to be solitary is central to the art of loving. When we can be alone, we can be with others without using them as a means of escape” (hooks, 2000). Following the transition, student coordinators watch the first six and a half minutes of Matt Mattson’s 2017 TEDx talk at Valparaiso University, “When we gather, we matter.” The constructivist-interpretivist use of film and television media is outlined in Guthrie and Jenkins (2018) as a means of encouraging reflectivity. Since a significant portion of the meeting has already been spent outlining new concepts, taking time to reflect and apply these concepts to relationship building is ideal. The transition and brief discussion which lead into the TEDx talk can also be justified using McMahon and Bramhall’s (2004) “Activity Planning Template.”

The meeting concludes with a summary of material, the sharing of necessary information for the next meeting, the longitudinal reflection on “Active Citizen Leadership,” and time for questions and announcements. Specific to this reflection prompt, student coordinators are encouraged to “consider the role of identity in [their] definition[s].”

### **Third Meeting**

The third meeting of the Fall semester will be spent focusing on Leadership Identity Development. Acknowledging that student coordinators likely know each other’s names by this point, the meeting will start off with an activity that simulates things competing for attention. While not a simulation as defined by Guthrie and Jenkins (2018), this activity was chosen also

due to timeliness, as the third meeting occurs nearing the onset of mid-term exams. Student coordinators will be challenged to toss a ball in an established pattern while additional balls are added. Student coordinators will have to remain focused, communicate clearly, and establish routines in order to be successful. While the activity serves as a learning opportunity, it primarily functions as an energizer at the beginning of the meeting. Following the activity two more student coordinators present their “I am…” stories to the group. As before, time is left for questions.

The meeting continues into a longer peer-led discussion (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018) on leadership identity development, based on Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, and Osteen (2005). To maintain variety in the format of the peer-led discussion, the team will be split up into pairs to review the five major sections of the article. Student coordinators will have three minutes to re-review the article and one minute to present their summaries to the team. To build familiarity with the debrief structure – a condensed questioning of the six phases identified in Guthrie and Jenkins (2018) – used during previous meetings, three directed questions will be asked. The discussion and debrief are transitioned using a quote from Bennis and Nanus (2007), “Managers are people who do things right, and leaders are people who do the right thing.” This quote is related to risk management, where leaders are asked to do both the right thing and do it right.

For Florida State Alternative Breaks risk management and harm reduction is taught through the use of case studies. Beginning the third week of the Fall semester and continuing until the second to last meeting of the semester, student coordinators will be given five minutes to review and respond to a pre-developed scenario. Direct case studies, as outlined in Guthrie and Jenkins (2018), allow students “to read, analyze, and then engage in discussion” (p. 192). Questions included with the case studies will allow students to bridge risk management concepts

to eventual practice. The themes of each case study have been determined based on feedback provided from the 2018-2019 student coordinators. As an introductory case study, the first theme is on the importance of setting group expectations, specifically in regard to risky behaviors. Using a Confucius quote, and a reference to material covered during the Spring retreat, the meeting transitions to a lesson on reflection activities.

Similar to the risk management case studies, reflection activities will be covered each meeting from the third to the second to last meetings of the Fall semester. Student coordinators from each service experience will lead a reflection activity, as listed in the Florida State Alternative Break Reflection Guide, or of their own design. The provided example activities have been collected by previous FSAB graduate assistants. For the first reflection activity the student director will walk student coordinators through directed questioning (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018), specifically “What, So What, Now What?”

Sticking to the established structure of the meeting, the meeting concludes with a summary of content, sharing information for the next meeting, the longitudinal reflection, and time for questions and announcements. In an attempt to encourage further meaning-making, student coordinators are prompted to “consider the role of leadership identity and particularly the section of the reading related to ‘Broadening View of Leadership’ (Komives et. al, 2005).”

## **Conclusion**

The intervention and justification described above hopes to make one point clear: Leadership learning has the ability to transform lives when done intentionally. Student coordinators are given an opportunity to critically investigate their multiple and intersecting social identities and the values that develop from them, relate those identities and values to relationship building, and leverage those relationships in a reframed service orientation, where systems of power, privilege, and oppression are addressed. None of this would be possible

without the attendant skills of reflection and self-awareness developed as part of leadership learning (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). These metacognitive skills will continue to serve student coordinators through and beyond their service immersion experiences. In addition to metacognitive skills, student coordinators should find themselves better equipped with technical skills (agency selection and communication, schedule planning, meal planning, packing, risk management, etc.) suited for future service leadership.

While this intervention has been designed for the development of student coordinators, the understanding of leadership as a relational change-oriented process necessarily involves me as a leadership educator. By remaining open to new experiences, embracing the relationships developed, and continually reflecting on my own development, I may encourage my own leadership learning and the furtherance of my own leadership educator professional identity (Seemiller & Priest, 2015). For future graduate assistants who may use this intervention the same should be promoted.

## References

- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (2007). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. New York, NY: Longmans, Greens.
- Break Away (2014). Active Citizen Continuum [PDF file]. Retrieved from:  
<http://alternativebreaks.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Active-Citizen-Continuum-2014.pdf>.
- Guthrie, K. L., Bertrand Jones, T., & Osteen, L. (Eds.). (2016). *New Directions for Student Leadership: No. 152, Developing culturally relevant leadership learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Guthrie, K. L., & Jenkins, D. M. (2018). *The role of leadership educators: Transforming learning*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- hooks, b. (2000). *All about love: New visions*. New York, NY: William Morrow Publishing.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(6), 593-611.
- Mattson, M. (2017). When we gather, we matter [Video file]. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U5xUK1fKuAU>.

- McKendall, M. (2000). Teaching groups to become teams. *Journal of Education for Business*, pp. 277-282.
- McMahon, T. R., & Bramhall, R. (2004). Using entertainment media to inform student affairs teaching and practice related to leadership. In D. S. Forney & T. W. Cawthon (Eds.), *New directions for student services, no. 108: Using entertainment media in student affairs teaching and practice* (pp. 61-70). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1996). Explorations of narrative identity. *Psychological Inquiry*, 7(4), 363-367.
- Rudd, R., Baker, M., & Hoover, T. (2000). Undergraduate agriculture student learning styles and critical thinking abilities: Is there a relationship? *Journal of Agriculture Education*, 41(3), 2-12.
- Seemiller, C., & Priest, K. L. (2015). The hidden “who” in leadership education: Conceptualizing leadership educator professional identity development. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 14(3), 132-151.
- Sumka, S., Porter, M. C., & Piacitelli, J. (2015). *Working side by side: Creating alternative breaks as catalysts for global learning, student leadership, and social change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing