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The President’s Leadership Development Retreat

The President’s Leadership Development Retreat is designed to create an effective and efficient inclusive organization by enhancing faculty and staff leaders’ understanding of Loyola Marymount University’s mission and goals, building a unified vision of effective leadership, and focusing on essential institutional-specific goals and objectives. During the Retreat, cross-sector and intra-sector conversations provide opportunities for participants to hear a multiplicity of perspectives, observe leadership styles, and build an invaluable professional network. Under the direction of the President, the Vice President for the Office of Intercultural Affairs implements the half-day Retreat annually.
Retreat Participants

1. Hawley Almstedt
2. Kirsten Andresen
3. Katharine Arce
4. Kathy Ash
5. Jason Baehr
6. Ronald Barrett
7. Tom Batsis
8. Cynthia Becht
9. Curtis Bennett
10. Jill Bickett
11. Tobeylynn Birch
12. Lane Bove
13. Kristine Brancolini
14. Mary Breden
15. Sherrill Britton
16. Rae Linda Brown
17. Pam Burrill
18. Barbara Busse
19. Hampton Cantrell
20. John Carfora
21. Robert Caro, S.J.
22. John Carvana
23. Maureen Cassidy
24. Rebecca Chandler
25. Janet Chang Quattrocchi
26. Katharine Clemmer
27. Charles Cownie
28. Iwona Czarny
29. Jeffrey Davis
30. Franca Dell'Olio
31. Raymond Dennis
32. Matthew Dillon
33. Dennis Draper
34. Kay Duenas
35. Celeste Durant
36. Christine Felkel
37. Veronique Flambard-Weisbart
38. Kathleen Flanagan
39. Thomas Fleming
40. Richard Fox
41. Mary Fraser
42. Patrick Frontiera
43. Jeffrey Gale
44. Jose Garcia Moreno
45. Susan Gardner
46. Deena Gonzalez
47. Victoria Graf
48. Catherine Graham
49. Maria Grandone
50. Clarence Griffin
51. Cheryl Grills
52. Katherine Harper
53. Paul Harris
54. Joe Hellige
55. Calvin Hobson
56. Michael Horan
57. Paul Humphreys
58. Lori Husein
59. Matthew Jauregui
60. Paul Jimenez
61. Margaret Kasimatis
62. Rachelle Katz
63. Michael Keane
64. John Kiralla
65. James Konow
66. Chake Kouyoumjian
67. Sharon Krieg
68. Gary Kuleck
69. Nicholas Ladany
70. James Landry
71. Yvette Lapayese
72. Howard Lavick
73. Mark Leach
74. Wenshu Lee
75. Brian Leung
76. William Lindsey
77. Debra Linesch
78. Dorian Llywelyn
79. Juan Mah y Busch
80. Mechele Manno
81. Paula Mark
82. Shane Martin
83. Bryce Mason
84. Laura Massa
85. Nicholas Mattos
86. Mary McCullough
87. Linda McMurdock
88. Joseph McNicholas
89. Mladen Milicevic
90. Cherie Mills Schenck
91. Douglas Moore
92. Olga Moraga
93. Edward Mosteig
94. Teresa Munoz
95. Bernadette Musetti
96. Robbie Nakatsu
97. Adilifu Nama
98. Andrea Niemi
99. Mahmoud Nourayi
100. Irene Oliver
101. Edward Park
102. John Parrish
103. Jennifer Pate
104. K. J. Peters
105. Francesca Piumetti
106. Richard Plumb
107. Anne Prisco
108. Damon Rago
109. La'Tonya Rease Miles
110. Barbara Rico
111. Richard Rocheleau
112. Curtiss Rooks
113. Jonathan Rothchild
114. Csilla Samay
115. David Sanchez
116. Marshall Sauceda
117. Lynne Scarboro
118. Dean Scheibel
119. Mark Evan Schwartz
120. Jeffrey Siker
121. Dennis Slon
122. Jade Smith
123. Tangee Smith-Hill
124. Charles Swanson
125. John Syrjamaki
126. Jennifer Tachouet
127. Stephen Ujlaki
128. Carl Urbinati
129. Robin Wang
130. Kevin Wetmore
131. Caroline Wilhelm
132. Jeffrey Wilson
133. Michael Wong
134. Eric Young
135. Paul Zeleza
1. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the Welcome and Opening Plenary. How satisfied were you:

**Q1.1. Scope of Information Presented**

Of the 91 participants, 90% were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the scope of the information presented during the Welcome and Plenary Session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1.1</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with the scope of information presented?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1.2. Usefulness of Information Presented**

Approximately 84% were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the usefulness of the information presented during the Welcome and Plenary Session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1.2</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with the usefulness of the information presented?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the Break-Out Sessions. How satisfied were you:

Q2.1. Scope of Information Discussed

Of the 90 participants who answered question 2.1, 68% were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the scope of information discussed during the breakout sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2.1</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with the scope of information discussed?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.2. Usefulness of Information Discussed

Of the 90 participants who answered question 2.2, 68% were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the usefulness of information discussed during the breakout sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2.2</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with the usefulness of the information discussed?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following. How satisfied were you:

**Q3.1. Article on Strategic Planning**

Of the 85 respondents who answered question 3.1., 62% were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the article on Strategic Planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3.1</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with the article on Strategic Planning in Colleges and Universities?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3.2. Overall Value of the Retreat**

Of the 91 respondents who answered question 3.2., 79% were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the overall value of the retreat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3.2</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with the President's Leadership Development Retreat overall value in helping you understand the LMU Strategic Planning Process?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following. How satisfied were you: (Continued)

Q3.3. Opportunity to Network

Of the 91 respondents who answered question 3.3., 82% were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the opportunity to network with other LMU leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3.3</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with the opportunity to network with other LMU leaders?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the President’s Leadership Development Retreat?

Of the 91 respondents who answered question 4, 76% were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the retreat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What should be the focus of next year's President's Leadership Development Retreat?

The following themes emerged from 34 responses:

1. **Implementation of the Strategic Plan** (11 comments)
2. **Mission and Identity** (4 comments)
3. **Leadership Development** (4 comments)
4. **Implementation of the Core Curriculum** (4 comments)
5. **Networking and Collaboration** (3 comments)
6. **Changes in Higher Education** (3 comments)