### Outcomes Assessment Results
### For Academic Year: 2015-16

**Section I: Student Learning Assessment**

#### M.S. in Strategic Leadership

### Student Learning Assessment for Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (General Program ISLOs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Ethical Formation and Decision-Making</strong> - Students will articulate and apply an ethical formation and decision making foundation for decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Stewardship</strong> - Students will demonstrate effective stewardship of their gifts, talents, and abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Leadership Courage</strong> - Students will demonstrate leadership courage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Servant Leadership</strong> - Students will demonstrate the ability to positively influence others by leveraging servant leadership skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Communication Skills</strong> - Students will demonstrate effective communication skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Human Development Strategies</strong> - Students will demonstrate the ability to develop and implement human development strategies for themselves and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Listening Skills</strong> - Students will demonstrate effective listening skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Teamwork Skills</strong> - Students will demonstrate the ability to build effective teams and achieve high-level team results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Strategic Insight and Agility</strong> - Students will demonstrate their ability to integrate and apply their leadership habits, knowledge, and skills to identify strategic issues and recommend and implement strategic solutions for an organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes—Direct Measures of Student Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **Leadership Ethics Case Study Summary Paper**  
**General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure:** 1  
• The mean score for all students on the Leadership Ethics Case Study Summary Paper (assessed in BUS 540) using the related rubric will be at least 80%. |
| 2. **Leadership Development Plan or LDP**  
**General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure:** 2,3,7,8  
• The mean score for all students on the LDP paper (BUS 536) using the related rubric will be at least 80%. The assignment addresses:  
  - Personal assets and talents and how these are being utilized  
  - Greatest opportunities for personal growth  
  - Greatest learning in the self-assessment process  
  - Metrics/tactics for personal and professional advancement  
  - Metrics/tactics for team contribution and development  
  - Metrics/tactics for organizational contribution/development |
### 3. Leadership Practices Inventory
**General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure:** 5
- 90% of students will achieve *improvement* in three out of the five Practices of Exemplary Leadership: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart.

### 4. Integrative Strategic Audit Board Presentation
**General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure:** 6,9,10
- All teams will score at least 80% on the final integrative strategic audit board presentations (BUS 560) using the related rubric. This is primarily an assessment of oral communications.
- The mean score for all teams will be 8 or higher (out of 10) on the Q&A section of the final integrative strategic audit board presentations (BUS 560) using the related rubric.

### 5. Integrative Strategic Audit Board Report
**General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure:** 6,8,10
- All teams will score at least 80% on the final integrative strategic audit report (BUS 560) using the related rubric, reflecting effective responses to board feedback and effective written communication skills.

### 6. Integrative Strategic Audit Board Peer Evaluation
**General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure:** 2,4,9
- The mean integrative strategic audit peer evaluation rubric (BUS 560) score will be 4 or higher (out of 5) across the following dimensions: participation in team meetings, preparation for team meetings, cooperativeness, and contribution to team success.

### Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes—Indirect Measures of Student Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Targets/Criteria (Objectives) for Indirect Measures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **Alumni Survey**  
*General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1-10*  
- Alumni Survey will have a mean score of 4.00 or higher (5.0 scale) for the following items: 1C, 1D, 1G, 1H, 1I, 1J, 1K, 1L, 1M, 1O, 1P, 1Q, 1S, 1T, 1U, 1V |
| 2. **Employer Survey**  
*General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1-10*  
- Employer Survey will have a mean score of 4.00 or higher (5.00 scale) for the following Items: 1B, 1E, 1F, 1G, 1H, 1I, 1J, 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 2E, 2F, 2G, 2H, 2I, 2J |
Assessment Results

Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:

1. Leadership Ethics Case Study Summary Paper – 100% of cohorts achieved a mean of 80% or better [79 = 100%, 80 = 100%, 81 = 100%]
2. Leadership Development Plan or LDP - The means score for all the students on the core content of the LDP was 97% [76 = 12 students, 77 = 5 students [cohort 75 did not run]]
3. Leadership Practices Inventory - 70% of students, achieved improvement in 3 out of 5 practice areas. [7 out of 10 students – 19 other post assessments were not completed]
4. Integrative Strategic Audit Board Presentation
   6/7 teams achieved 80% or better on the final integrative strategic audit board presentations. The other team scored 78%.
   The mean score for all teams was 8 or higher (out of 10) on the Q&A section of the final integrative strategic audit board presentations (BUS 560) using the related rubric.
5. Integrative Strategic Audit Board Report - 100% of the teams achieved 80% or better

Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:

1. Alumni Survey (N=7)
   The following alumni survey items will have a mean score of 4.00 or higher (5.00 scale); results are noted in bold; changes of more than .2 noted:
   - Ethical Formation and Decision Making
     - 1D (Recognize and Deal with Ethical Dilemmas) – 4.4
     - 1O (Clarified Personal Values and Ethics) – 4.4
   - Stewardship
     - 1R (Resource Deployment) – 4.6
   - Work-Life Balance
     - 1T (Effectively Managing Work and Life) – 4.3
   - Leadership Courage
     - 1U (Courageous Action by Conviction) – 4.4
   - Servant Leadership
     - 1C (Leadership Parity with Colleagues) – 4.4
     - 1K (Organizational Leadership) – 4.6
     - 1L (Community Leadership) – 4.3
     - 1S (Leading Others) – 4.1

2. Employer Survey (N=5)
   The following employer survey items will have a mean score of 4.00 or higher (5.00 scale); results are noted in bold:
   - Ethical Formation and Decision Making
     - 1l (Ethical Standards) – 5.0
     - 2A (Ethical Formation and Decision-Making) – 4.2
   - Stewardship
     - 2C (Stewardship) – 3.8
   - Work-Life Balance
     - 2l (Work/Life Balance) – 4.5
   - Leadership Courage
     - 2B (Leadership Courage) – 4.4
   - Servant Leadership
     - 1B (Leadership Ability) – 4.6
     - 2H (Servant Leadership) – 4.4
   - Communication Skills
     - 1G (Written Communication Skills) – 4.1
     - 1H (Oral Communication Skills) – 4.7
   - Human Development Strategies
     - 1P (Leveraging Personal Strengths) – 4.6
   - Listening Skills
     - 1Q (Effective Listening) – 4.6
   - Teamwork Skills
     - 1M (Effective Teaming and Leveraging Strengths) – 4.4
   - Strategic Insight and Agility
     - 1I (Critical Thinking Abilities) – 4.4
     - 1J (Analyze Complex Business Situations) – 4.3
     - 1V (Synthesizing Business Disciplines for Business Solutions) – 4.6
   - Communication Savvy
     - 2D (Communication Savvy) – 4.4
   - Strategic Human Development
     - 2E (Strategic Human Development) – 4.6
   - Effective Listening
     - 2F (Effective Listening) – 4.4
   - Effective Teaming and Leveraging Strengths
     - 1M (Effective Teaming and Leveraging Strengths) – 4.4
   - Critical Thinking Skills
     - 1I (Critical Thinking Abilities) – 4.4
     - 1J (Analyze Complex Business Situations) – 4.3
     - 1V (Synthesizing Business Disciplines for Business Solutions) – 4.6
   - Building Effective Teams & Communities
     - 2G (Building Effective Teams & Communities) – 4.4
Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Direct Measure 1</th>
<th>Direct Measure 2</th>
<th>Direct Measure 3</th>
<th>Direct Measure 4</th>
<th>Direct Measure 5</th>
<th>Direct Measure 6</th>
<th>Indirect Measure 1</th>
<th>Indirect Measure 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Program ISLOs</td>
<td>Performance Target Was...</td>
<td>Performance Target Was...</td>
<td>Performance Target Was...</td>
<td>Performance Target Was...</td>
<td>Performance Target Was...</td>
<td>Performance Target Was...</td>
<td>Performance Target Was...</td>
<td>Performance Target Was...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ethical Formation and Decision-Making</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stewardship</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leadership Courage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Servant Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Human Development Strategies</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Listening Skills</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teamwork Skills</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Strategic Insight and Agility</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from previous action plans (review action plans from previous three years and assess progress based on subsequent results):

- Leadership Practices Inventory Results – In 2011-12 we implemented an LPI pre-test (baseline) and training as part of the program orientation to better integrate this learning with the curriculum. LPI results were positively impacted by these changes in the short-term, but longer-term results have been mixed. However, we are showing improvement. In 2014-15 59% of students demonstrated improvement in 3 out of 5 practice areas. In 2015-16 70% of our students demonstrated improvement in 3 out of 5 leadership practices (and 30% demonstrated improvement in all 5 practices).
- Integrative Strategic Audit Peer Evaluation Results – In 2011-12 the program director and faculty advisor met with and mentored teams as teamwork issues arose. In 2012-13 we retooled the BUS 530 course to focus on team charters, team leadership, and project management. This course is now the lead course in the final three-course capstone sequence, culminating in a strategic audit presentation to a board in BUS 560 by each consulting team. These actions have not significantly impacted the peer evaluation results. In 2014-15 the target was refined to focus more specifically on the following elements of the peer evaluation: participation in team meetings, cooperativeness, and contribution to team success.
- Alumni Survey Results –Over the past four years changes were made to the program orientation to provide more tools and discussion around work-life balance, including exercises where students must map out the allocation of time each week and consider what adjustments will be necessary during the course of the program. The impact has been significant. Alumni ratings for work-life balance have increased from 3.0 in 2011-12 to 4.4 in 2015-16. Our Alumni Survey feedback across 9 out of 10 learning outcomes (Ethical Formation & Decision-Making, Stewardship, Work-Life Balance, Servant Leadership, Communication Skills, Human Development Strategies, Listening Skills, Teamwork Skills, Strategic Insight & Agility) showed improvement. In fact 16 out of 17 indirect measures taken from this assessment increased. One remained unchanged (Leadership Courage = 4.4 [on a scale of 1-5]). None of these indirect measures decreased.

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met (include review of results from previous three years to provide context for current year results):

1. **Course of Action 1 Servant Leadership** – Based on results in 2011-12 and 2012-13 the performance target was adjusted from a set target for each leadership behavior to 90% of students achieving improvement in three of the five leadership behaviors. Although this target was not achieved in 2015-16, we are making progress (2014-15 59%; 2015-16 70%). This progress is likely due to our efforts to integrate The Leadership Challenge 5 Practices through the addition of a reflective application in more of the coursework writing assignments. We feel we are already doing a good job of helping the students establish goals and that we need to integrate more of the curriculum to this tool and engage them in more designed activities in this regard throughout the program. At present, we only have 3 of 12 courses (BUS 500, BUS 575 and BUS 536) in the program that have assignments that are tied to this tool (adding one last year and two the year before). The LPI coordinator and program director will continue to work together to better integrate LPI orientation with program orientation at the start of the program and to clarify with students in their other coursework how this tool delivers professional development value. We would like to add an LPI element to BUS 540, BUS 530, BUS 510 and BUS 560).

2. **Course of Action 2 Employer Survey** (Indirect Measures) – The majority of these targets were met (16 out of 17). In the case of the 1 that was not met, the score was a 3.8 (1 = Declining performance, 2 = No change in performance, 3 = Slight improvement in performance, 4 = Moderate improvement in performance, 5 = Significant improvement in performance). In fact 15 of the 17 indirect measures assessed by this tool showed improvements, while one declined (Stewardship 3.8 to 3.7) and one remained unchanged (Human Development Strategies = 4.6). Improvement is clearly taking place in these competencies, but according to employers our greatest strength is in developing Leadership Courage, Teamwork Skills, Communication Skills and Servant Leadership. However, we need to examine the Stewardship learning outcome in more detail. It could be we need to bolster performance in this area, but it could also be that the descriptor (e.g. Stewardship) in unclear, and therefore a part of the issue. We will look at this with a focus group of our graduates. No further action is warranted at this time.
## Operational Outcomes for M.S. in Strategic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Operational Outcomes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Resources - Students are appropriately supported in their learning by an outstanding team of faculty and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical Resources - Appropriate physical space is available to provide a high-quality learning experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Financial Resources - Sufficient resources are allocated to the business department to provide a high-quality learning experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Productivity and Growth – Generate a reasonable share of institutional credit hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Resource Allocation – Academic expenditures allocated to the business programs will be commensurate with credit hours sold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty Load – Faculty will maintain a reasonable number of course preps and teaching load.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Full-time Faculty Coverage – Students will get significant exposure to full-time faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Staffing Levels – Sufficient full-time faculty and staff will be retained to provide personalized service/support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Measures/Methods for Intended Operational Outcomes:</th>
<th>Performance Targets/Criteria (Objectives) for Operational Assessment Measures/Methods:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Measures/Methods for Intended Operational Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance Targets/Criteria (Objectives) for Operational Assessment Measures/Methods:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Annual Director Evaluation – Faculty / Staff Satisfaction</td>
<td>• The overall mean score will be 4 or higher (five-point scale) on the Program Director Evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOOs Assessed by this Measure: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty Loading – Average number of Overloads, % Credits taught by adjunct faculty</td>
<td>• The percentage of credits taught by adjunct faculty will be 50% or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOOs Assessed by this Measure: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | **Bovee Database** – Faculty Deployment, Average number of Preps, Staffing / Faculty Levels, FT students/FT faculty, FT students/FT staff, Resource Allocation, Credit Hours Generated, Allocation of Academic Expenditures to the Business Department  
IOOs Assessed by this Measure: 3,4,5,6,8 |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
|   | • The average teaching overloads will be less than 1.5 per FT faculty  
• The average number of class preps per FT faculty will be less than 4 per academic year, with no faculty carrying more than 6 preps  
• The percentage of dollars allocated to MSL will be commensurate with the percentage of credit hours generated by MSL.  
• Maintain the percentage of MSL student credit hours sold as a percentage of graduate credit hours sold at 12% or higher.  
• 25 FT students per FT faculty  
• 40 FT students per FTE staff member |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
|   | **Faculty Evaluation Form** –  
IOOs Assessed by this Measure: 1 |   |   |
|   | • The program will have at least three professors that can achieve a rating of 4.0 or better in each course that makes up the program. |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
|   | **Annual Assessment (Chair)** – Physical Resources  
IOOs Assessed by this Measure: 2 |   |   |
|   | • Each faculty and staff member has an individual office that is appropriately furnished.  
• Appropriate space exists and is being utilized by faculty, staff, and students for study, meeting, and social networking purposes.  
• Adequate classroom space exists to serve the learning needs of business students. This includes proximity of classrooms to faculty offices, classroom setup, and technology. |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
|   | **Alumni Survey** – Quality of relationships with faculty/staff, Career Preparation Satisfaction, Career Advisement Satisfaction |   |   |
|   | • Alumni will indicate satisfaction with the MSL program, through a mean score of 4.0 or higher on the question of their willingness to recommend this program to others (Alumni Survey question 8, 5-point Likert-styled scale)  
• Alumni will indicate satisfaction with the quality of support from academic support departments through a mean score of 4.0 or higher on a 5-point Likert-style scale. |   |   |
**Summary of Results from Implementing Operational Assessment Measures/Methods:**

1. **Summary of Results for Annual Director Evaluation** –
   - **Target:** The overall mean score will be 4 or higher (five-point scale) on the Program Director Evaluation.
   - **Result:** Program Directors are evaluated on a three-year cycle. Dr. Hoomans is next due for review in 2016-17.

2. **Summary of Results for Faculty Loading/Coverage Review** –
   - **Target:** The percentage of credits taught by adjunct faculty will be 50% or less; **Result:** 43%

3. **Summary of Results for Annual Report** –
   - **Target:** The average teaching overloads will be less than 1.5 per FT faculty; **Result:** 2.0
   - **Target:** The average number of class preps/FT faculty will be less than 4 per academic year; **Result:** 2.3
   - **Target:** The percentage of dollars allocated to MSL will be commensurate with the percentage of credit hours generated by MSL; **Result:** MSL generated 13.1% of Grad student credit hours and accounted for 13.1% of Grad academic expenditures
   - **Target:** Maintain the percentage of MSL student credit hours sold as a percentage of graduate credit hours sold at 12% or higher; **Result:** The MSL program generated 13.1% of graduate credit hours
   - **Target:** 25 FT students per FT faculty / Faculty FTE to FT student ratio of 1:25; **Result:** 1:21
   - **Target:** 40 FT students per FTE staff member; **Result:** 1:126

4. **Summary of Results for Faculty Evaluation Forms** –
   - **Target:** The program will have at least three professors that can achieve a rating of 4.0 or better in each course that makes up the program.
   - **Result:** We have three professors prepared to teach 10 of 12 courses in the program. In the case of the two courses that only have two professors that have presently achieved a rating of 4.0 (BUS 590 and BUS 530) we have identified adjunct faculty to step in and shadow sometime in the 2016/2017 school year.

5. **Facilities Assessment** –
   - **Target:** Each faculty and staff member has an individual office that is appropriately furnished.
   - **Result:** All FT faculty have an office appropriately furnished. Our adjuncts share access to an adjunct office as needed.
   - **Target:** Appropriate space exists and is being utilized by faculty, staff, and students for study, meeting, and social networking purposes.
   - **Result:** Space is adequately provided
   - **Target:** Adequate classroom space exists to serve the learning needs of business students. This includes proximity of classrooms to faculty offices, classroom setup, and technology; **Result:** Space that serves the learning needs of our business students is accessible and equipped with the technology needed to facilitate learning.

6. **Summary of Results for Alumni Surveys** –
   - **Target:** Alumni will indicate satisfaction with the MSL program, through a mean score of 4.0 or higher on the question of their willingness to recommend this program to others (Alumni Survey question 8, 5-point Likert-styled scale); **Result:** 3.7
   - **Target:** Alumni will indicate satisfaction with the quality of support from academic support departments through a mean score of 4.0 or higher on a 5-point Likert-style scale; **Result:** Admissions, Billing, Registration, and the Library all had scores exceeding 4.0. Financial Aid (3.8), Security (2.8), IT Services (3.0) and MSL Administration (3.6) all fell below this standard.
## Summary of Achievement of Intended Operational Outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Operational Outcomes</th>
<th>Operational Assessment Measures/Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Director Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Target Was...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Human Resources</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Physical Resources</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Financial Resources</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Productivity and Growth</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Resource Allocation</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Faculty Load</strong></td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Full-time Faculty Coverage</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Staffing Levels</strong></td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results from previous action plans (review action plans from previous three years and assess progress based on subsequent results):

- **Alumni Satisfaction** - As long as we have been measuring student overall satisfaction with the program with the *Alumni Survey*, we have always had scores that exceed 4.4 or higher. This is the first year we have missed this objective. When asked of their willingness to recommend this program to others (Alumni Survey question 8, 5-point Likert-styled scale), responses from MSL 73 alumni averaged 5, responses from MSL 74 averaged 4.7 and the two respondents from MSL 76 averaged 1. Only 2 of 12 alumni in MSL 76 completed the Alumni Survey. This cohort had encountered a number of interpersonal conflicts throughout the program - one involving an adjunct professor, who was removed from the program as a result. We clearly need to find ways to get more of our alumni to complete the *Alumni Survey* and will work on incentivizing this feedback (along with participation in the *Employer Survey*).

- **Faculty Loading and Human Resources** – We need to share all of this feedback regularly with the full faculty and staff team so that they have line of sight collectively to the perceptions of our students and their employers via the survey feedback, as well as the goals we have set at a program/school. We have shared aspects of this information in the past, but have not shared all of it with the team. As a result, we have missed opportunities to enlist their help in celebrating successes and tackling our opportunities.

### Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Operational Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met (include review of results from previous three years to provide context for current year results):

- **Alumni Satisfaction** - Alumni satisfaction with the quality of support from academic support departments will be addressed by sharing this feedback with our partners to create awareness that can be celebrated (where it exceeded the mean score of 4) and improved upon (where it failed to attain a mean score of 4). Added security presence/staffing at our Jefferson Road campus has been put in place and will help with this. We will also put together an alumni focus group to develop strategies and suggestions to help provide qualitative and descriptive input that can help with further improvements in all areas.

- **Alumni Satisfaction** - When asked of their willingness to recommend this program to others (Alumni Survey question 8, 5-point Likert-styled scale) we can likely improve these scores by helping to facilitate and manage the interpersonal issues that arise in the course of the program (18 months). We are looking into the development of a one week conflict resolution workshop/certificate to imbed towards the beginning of the program to help in this regard. This will enhance the overall satisfaction with the program.

- **Faculty Loading and Human Resources** – We will invite the entire faculty and staff team to an update in December 2016 to review this feedback, enlist their input and get their help in celebrating our top successes and tackling our major opportunities.