

## **Master of Science in Management and Leadership - Implemented Continuous Improvement**

**Implemented Improvement:** Increase student awareness of the University Writing Center.

**Outcome:** Written Communication: Students will demonstrate the use of effective written communication skills within the context of a leadership role.

**Action:** The program faculty and committee need to continue to monitor the level of student writing quality. Faculty were encouraged to refer students to the University Writing Center (UWC), and a description of and contact information for the resource were added to 75% of program course syllabi to help students improve their writing.

**Evaluation:** The program assessed a small number of students in 2015 who did not perform well on the rubric. In 2016 and 2017, more students were assessed, but still in smaller numbers than desirable. Student performance improved over the three-year period, and students are now achieving the ideal target.

However, anecdotal reports from program faculty that students write poorly continue to drive efforts to improve in this program outcome. A review of the rubric is in order. Consideration should be given to the possibility that individual program faculty members offer differing levels of scrutiny, nuance, and precision in reviewing student writing.

**Data:** In 2015 for the Written Communication 1 rubric, three students attended this online course in the fall semester. Falling below the ideal 85%, two students (or 66.67%) reached the target performance level of at least 75% of the possible points on the writing rubric. The small sample size makes it impossible to draw any firm conclusions. For the Written Communication 2 rubric, nine M.S. in Management and Leadership students enrolled in this course in Fall 2015, and three (33.3%) reached the target performance level of 80% on the writing rubric.

In 2016 for the Written Communication 1 rubric, 13 program students attended this course (offered in multiple sections, including both face-to-face and online formats across the spring, summer, and fall semesters) and all 13 (100%) met the target performance level of 75%. For the Written Communication 2 rubric, nine program students attended this course in the fall semester only in a face-to-face format, and eight (89%) reached the target performance levels.

In 2017 for the Written Communication 1 rubric, 11 of 12 students (91%) scored 80% or higher on this measure during the current assessment cycle.