

Academic Program:	Sport Management MS	Date:	11/29/2022
Author(s):	Matt Blaszk		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu .			___ Learning Outcomes ___ Curriculum Map ___ Assessment Plan
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.			___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No ___ Hybrid

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	Assessment Strategies Used			Established Benchmark for Proficiency	Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark	Prior Results for Comparison (if applicable)
	Course	Assignment/Activity	Evaluation Tool i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
Presentation Students deliver a professional level presentation on a topic related to the discipline.	SPM637, SPM699	1. A trend analysis is completed in the introduction class to form students research interest 2. The student will complete a research project.	Rubric	Students will achieve a mean score of 85% or higher.	Crisis Project – 89% PR Campaign – 92% Research Project – 95%	N/A new assessments SPM699 is new course
Internship Students apply knowledge, skills, and dispositions gained through program of study in sport management setting.	SPM699 (P)	1. Students will complete an internship log, job goals, and a final internship analysis.	Rubric	Students will achieve a mean score of 85% or higher.	Internship – 95%	N/A new assessment SPM699 is new course

Student Success Activities



Use the “Academic Chair” tab in [Blue Reports](#) to view your program’s data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	The SPM program recently went to 8-week courses. This has allowed students to finish classes more quickly and catch up if necessary. We are seeing our first set of students finish in 12 months.
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	Continue to work on our schedule and improve our 8-week class format. We are in a time of transition and evaluating how this will look going forward.

If you don’t have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. <i>What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?</i>	We began a new curriculum last year. It is still early to say, but so far it has been going over well. Will have more information in coming assessments. Outcomes are being updated.
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	We connect real world with the applications in the classroom. This has helped develop with real world connections and preparing students for careers.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	The assessment plan is currently in transition. Will hopefully have an update for next cycle.
Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	The information will be shared with sport management faculty.

Academic Program:		Date:	
Author(s):			
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an “X.” Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu .		<input type="checkbox"/> Learning Outcomes	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum Map	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If “Yes,” reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Hybrid

Instructions: The narrative format of this report will contain the same information as the table format, but the structure of the narrative is flexible. An outline has been provided for guidance on what to include, but the structure of the narrative need not follow the outline. When applicable, detailed notes from program faculty meetings where assessment was discussed may be copied into this report as the narrative. Please cite to indicate when this is the case.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed this Year

For Each Student Learning Outcome Assessed:

- Assessment Strategies for Each Student Learning Outcome (courses where learning took place, assignments used, tools for evaluation – i.e. rubrics, etc.)
- Established Benchmark for Proficiency
- Actual Student Performance Relative to Established Benchmark (provide specific data rather than general observations)
- Comparison to any Prior Data, if Available

Student Success Activities

Use the “Academic Chair” tab in [Blue Reports](#) to view your program’s data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*

Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*

What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?



What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?

Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: MS Sport Management Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
<p>Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.</p>		<p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle</p> <p>Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning</p> <p>Outcome(s) is measurable</p> <p>Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)</p>	<p>The language of the first LO: “students deliver a professional level presentation on a topic related to the discipline” is more of an assignment description than an LO. I’m assuming the LO is really about communicating sport management concepts/issues in oral and/or written form. The assignment description makes it look like it leans toward research competencies.</p>	Mature
<p>Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understand student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.</p>		<p>Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s)</p> <p>Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s)</p> <p>Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives</p> <p>Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum</p> <p>Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.)</p> <p>Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)</p>	<p>The note about the first LO above gives insight into how it is hard to determine if the LO is effectively measured by the assignment. The LO language presents a yes/no outcome as written, rather than the displays faculty are likely seeking of student mastery.</p> <p>There are multiple part of the second LO and the internship activities. Does the rubric break these activities out into separate criteria for scoring to see which areas students have mastered? The single score reported in the data suggests not, and this isn’t necessarily a bad thing – just something to consider when determining how well the measure reflects whether students actually mastered the LO.</p> <p>Consider adding an indirect measure of a supervisor evaluation relative LO 2 since you have the benefit of the internship setting.</p>	Developing

<p>Results & Analysis</p> <p>Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.</p>		<p>The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used</p> <p>The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program</p> <p>Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used</p> <p>Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included</p> <p>When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery)</p> <p>When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described</p>	<p>The actual performance for LO1 is broken into three assignments, but this isn't reflected in the assessment strategies description. It is a great idea to pull data from multiple assignments to see if they all support similar insights into student mastery. Just be sure to note this in the assessment strategy for clarity on where this data is coming from and why.</p>	<p>Mature</p>
<p>Continuous Improvement</p> <p>Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.</p>		<p>Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty</p> <p>If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed</p> <p>A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment</p> <p>Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders</p>	<p>The plans look generally solid (see a few recommendations for strengthening these, above). I think this area will be "Mature" when the new curriculum and updated assessment plan have had another year or so in use.</p>	<p>Developing</p>

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.