

IACBE Annual Report
For Academic Year: 2012-13

Program-Level Intended Outcomes Form: MSL Program

Student Learning Information for the MSL Program	
Mission of the MSL Program:	The MSL program prepares leaders to cast a compelling vision of a preferred future and to develop and execute business strategies to pursue these opportunities.
Intended Student Learning Outcomes for the MSL Program :	
1.	Students will demonstrate good stewardship of their gifts, talents, and abilities.
2.	Students will articulate and apply an ethical formation & decision making foundation for decision-making
3.	Students will demonstrate effective communication savvy across situation specific needs (writing, presenting, etc.).
4.	Students will effectively utilize human development strategies
5.	Students will demonstrate effective listening skills.
6.	Students will demonstrate the ability to build effective teams and communities .
7.	Students will demonstrate the ability to positively influence others by leveraging servant leadership skills
8.	Students will maintain healthy work-life balance
9.	Students will demonstrate leadership courage
10.	Students will demonstrate strategic insight & agility

Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Student Learning Outcomes - Direct Measures of Student Learning	Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:
Leadership Ethics Summary Paper	All students will score at least 80% on the Leadership Ethics Summary Paper (assessed in BUS 540 using related rubric). Result: 100% of students fulfilled this objective
Leadership Development Plan	All students will score at least 80% on the Leadership Development Plan (assessed in BUS 536 using related rubric). Result: 100% of students fulfilled this objective
Leadership Practices Inventory	All students will earn an average score of 45 or higher (out of 60, i.e., 75%) in each of leadership behaviors (assessed in BUS 536): model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, Enable others to act, and Encourage the heart. Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36 of 41 students (88%) fulfilled the objective of Model the way • 27 of 41 students (66%) fulfilled the objective of Inspire a shared vision • 31 of 41 students (76%) fulfilled the objective of Challenge the process • 37 of 41 students (90%) fulfilled the objective of Enable others to act • 36 of 41 students (88%) fulfilled the objective of Encourage the heart
Integrative Strategic Audit (board presentation)	All teams will score at least 80% on the final integrative strategic audit board presentations (assessed in BUS 560 using related rubric). Result: 90% of students (36/40) fulfilled this objective
Integrative Strategic Audit (written report)	All teams will score at least 80% on the final integrative strategic audit report (assessed in BUS 560 using related rubric). Result: 100% of students (40/40) fulfilled this objective
Integrative Strategic Audit (peer evaluation)	All students will score at least 80% on the peer evaluations for the integrative strategic audit (assessed in BUS 560). Result: 75% of students (30/40) fulfilled this objective

Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Student Learning Outcomes - Indirect Measures of Student Learning	Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures:
Alumni Survey (N=17)	<p>The following alumni survey items will have a mean score of 4.00 or higher (5.00 scale); results are noted in bold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stewardship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1R (Resource Deployment) – 4.2 • Ethical Formation and Decision Making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1D (Recognize and Deal with Ethical Dilemmas) – 4.1 ○ 1O (Clarified Personal Values and Ethics) – 4.2 • Communication Savvy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1G (Written Communication Skills) – 4.3 ○ 1H (Oral Communication Skills) – 4.4 • Strategic Human Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1P (Leveraging Personal Strengths) – 4.2 • Effective Listening <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1Q (Effective Listening) – 4.1 • Building Effective Teams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1M (Effective Teaming and Leveraging Strengths) – 4.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Servant Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1C (Leadership Parity with Colleagues) – 4.3 ○ 1K (Organizational Leadership) – 4.3 ○ 1L (Community Leadership) – 4.2 ○ 1S (Leading Others) – 4.1 • Work-Life Balance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1T (Effectively Managing Work and Life) – 3.6 • Leadership Courage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1U (Courageous Action by Conviction) – 4.1 • Strategic Insight and Agility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1I (Critical Thinking Abilities) – 4.2 ○ 1J (Analyze Complex Business Situations) – 4.5 ○ 1V (Synthesizing Business Disciplines for Business Solutions) – 4.2
Employer Survey (N=6)	<p>The following employer survey items will have a mean score of 4.00 or higher (5.00 scale); results are noted in bold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stewardship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2C (Stewardship) – 4.2 • Ethical Formation and Decision Making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1I (Ethical Standards) – 4.8 ○ 2A (Ethical Formation and Decision-Making) – 4.2 • Communication Savvy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1G (Oral Communication Skills) – 4.0 ○ 1H (Written Communication Skills) – 4.0 • Strategic Human Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2E (Strategic Human Development) – 4.0 • Effective Listening <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2F (Effective Listening) – 4.3 • Building Effective Teams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1E (Ability to Work in Teams) – 4.5 ○ 2G (Building Effective Teams & Communities) – 4.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Servant Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1B ((Leadership Ability) – 3.8 ○ 2H (Servant Leadership) – 4.0 • Work-Life Balance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2I (Work/Life Balance) – 4.0 • Leadership Courage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2B (Leadership Courage) – 4.2 • Strategic Insight and Agility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1F (Critical Thinking Skills) – 4.3 ○ 1J (Analyze Complex Issues) – 4.2 ○ 2J (Strategic Insight & Agility) – 4.3

Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
Leadership Ethics Summary Paper	✓	
Leadership Development Plan	✓	
Leadership Practices Inventory		✓
Integrative Strategic Audit (board presentation)		✓
Integrative Strategic Audit (written report)	✓	
Integrative Strategic Audit (peer evaluation)		✓
Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
Alumni Survey	Mostly	
Employer Survey	Mostly	
Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:		
<p>Leadership Practices Inventory We recently implemented an LPI pre-test (baseline) and training as part of the program orientation and will be evaluating post-test vs. pre-test results as part of assessment efforts in the future. These data will be much more useful in assessing value added from the program.</p>		
<p>Integrative Strategic Audit Peer Evaluation The MSL faculty and BUS 560 professors continue to seek innovative approaches to enhancing teamwork and proactively dealing with conflict within groups. In some respects it is almost too late to effectively address these issues in the final capstone course and the intensity of the work in this course tends to reveal preexisting conflicts. In response to this concern we have retooled the BUS 530 course to focus on team charters, team leadership, and project management. This course will be 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.</p>		
<p>Integrative Strategic Presentation Ninety percent fulfillment on this objective reflects significant strength in this area, given the stretch expectation of 100% fulfillment and the fact that the team scoring below 80% was just below the target.</p>		
<p>Alumni and Employer Surveys Alumni and employer feedback increased nearly across the board, indicating satisfaction at or very close to target levels in all areas. The lowest scores were in alumni self-assessment of work-life balance (3.6/5, down slightly from 3.8) and employer assessment of leadership ability (3.8/5, down slightly from 4.0). In reviewing alumni feedback over recent years, work-life balance continues to be a consistent concern. Perhaps this is not surprising in an accelerated graduate program, but this is an area the faculty continues to be concerned about. We have taken some steps to address this (introducing the iPad, better coaching at orientation, etc.), but results persist below our target. The faculty will continue to discuss strategies for addressing this.</p>		

Operational Information for the MSL Program		
Mission of the MSL Program:	The MSL program intentionally cultivates ethical and effective servant leaders throughout the diverse organizations in our community, positively transforming society.	
Operational Factor:	Performance Targets:	
Faculty/Staff Satisfaction	The overall mean score will be 4 or higher (five-point scale) on the Program Director Evaluation. Result: 3.9	
Comparative Program Best Value	Maintain the lowest per credit hour tuition cost against comparable graduate programs at St. John Fisher and RIT. Result: MSL tuition remains the highest graduate tuition rate charged by RWC and is higher than all local competitors except the U of R and RIT. However, the MSL tuition rate has been held flat for three years now, which has closed some of the gap both internally and externally.	
Organizational Customer Service	Ratings above 4.0 on a 5-point Likert-style scale from the Alumni Survey question evaluating support service areas. Result: Admissions-4.1; Financial Aid-2.8; IT Services-3.1; Library-4.2; MSL Office-4.4; Registration-4.0; Security-3.4.	
Bench Strength	Develop a bench of at least three professors that can achieve a rating of 4.0 or better in each course that makes up the program. Result: Of the 12 MSL courses, 8 have three professors who are qualified to teach. Two courses need a third qualified teacher and faculty have been designated and are being developed to teach these courses.	
Comprehensive Scholar Practitioner Customer 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). Result: 4.5.	
Summary of Operating Results:	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
Faculty/Staff Satisfaction		✓
Comparative Program Best Value		✓
Organizational Customer Service		Partially
Bench Strength		Partially
Comprehensive Scholar Practitioner Customer Satisfaction	✓	
Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:		
Faculty/Staff Satisfaction – The chair and program director will review these results and discuss implications during the faculty growth process. Not a concern.		
Comparative Program Best Value - We have been in ongoing dialogue with the administration and the budget team regarding tuition pricing. As a result, we have held tuition flat for the past three years and continue to enhance our value proposition. These strategies and more aggressive financial aid strategies have significantly increased enrollment and program revenue over the past year.		
Organizational Customer Service - We will share the results of the alumni survey with IT Services, Financial Aid, and Security and explore opportunities to enhance service satisfaction in these areas.		
Bench Strength - We are currently identifying and developing additional qualified faculty in the courses where we are not three-deep in faculty bench strength, though it is a challenge with increased full-time faculty teaching loads to find these opportunities.		