

Run

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

Due to your dean by the college deadline; due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by Sept. 1

Degree Program Name: _____ Sport Management _____ Contact Name(s) and Email(s) __ Matt Blaszkas matthew.blaszka@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

Part One: Summary of Assessment Activities

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Assessment Demonstrate understanding and ability to use field data collection and statistical analysis techniques in sport settings.	1. Students complete a series of items to demonstrate knowledge and application of assessment concepts 2. SPM604	Aggregated class mean score of 75% or higher on rubric.	21 students were assessed. 14 of 21 (66%) students met the mark. The mean score was 76.48%.	1. Dr. Kim Bodey 2. Dr. Bodey shared them with the faculty. They have been posted to the Sport Management Blackboard site.
2. Facility Planning & Design Demonstrate understanding or definitions, concepts, theories, and application of facility planning, design, and maintenance.	1. The project to include a needs assessment, building wish book, equipment wish book, and 2D & 3D design of the proposed facility. 2. SPM620	Aggregated class mean score of 75% or higher on rubric.	17 students were assessed. All 17 students met the requirement. The mean score was 90.1%.	1. Dr. Ethan Strigkas 2. They have been posted to the Sport Management Blackboard site.
3. Administrative Theory & Management Practice Demonstrate understanding or definitions, concepts,	1. Students prepare a 20 governance document for a preparatory or intercollegiate sport team. 2. SPM621	Class mean score of 80% of higher	It was determined this artifact was not meeting the objectives of this course. Therefore, the instructor of record has redeveloped	1. Dr. Chad Witkemper 2. Dr. Witkemper has retooled the course and has shared that with faculty.

theories, and application of management principles in public and nonprofit sport settings.			SPM 621 to reflect the true nature of the course as according to the catalog. Students are exposed to 7 different organizational behavior theories that have been examined over the past several decades. After full exposure to the course the students complete a final exam. After the first semester of implementing this new course structure, 90% of students earned an B+ or better on the final exam.	
--	--	--	---	--

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

Part Two: Engagement and Improvement

Students in the SPM graduates program have shown they are able to build a facility from scratch based on their prior knowledge in other courses (e.g. SPM510). As far as what we can do better as faculty, the assessment shows that students struggle on retaining material. The SPM program is currently in retooling many classes as changes have been made to the curriculum over the last two academic years. In order to improve our assessment, the SPM faculty will be analyzing each class individually to ensure they are meeting the needs of the SPM program and that the assessment is appropriate for the classes they are built into. Below is what we will focus on during the 2017-18 academic year.

SPM622 Finance

Demonstrate understanding of the principles, practices, and application of fiscal operations in the sport setting.

Measure: Business Plan for a fictional sport organization.

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The student will develop a business plan including a market analysis and financial plan for a fictional sport organization.

Target: Aggregate class mean score of 75% or higher on rubric.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every fourth year

Responsible Individual(s): Instructor of record (Strigkas)

SPM623 Sport Law and Risk Management

Demonstrate understanding of definitions, concepts, theories, and application of legal concepts including risk management in the sport setting.

Measure: Students will complete a risk management audit and plan for a sport organization and a legal research

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Each student will complete a risk management audit and plan for a sport organization (real not fictional) of their choice. Further, they will complete a 4-5,000 word research paper on a legal issue of their choice.

Target: Aggregate class mean score of 75% or higher on rubric.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every fourth year

Responsible Individual(s): Instructor of record (Bodey)

SPM624 Sport Marketing

Demonstrate understanding of theories and issues in sport marketing, grounded within traditional marketing principles, and emphasizing unique application in the sport setting.

Measure: Marketing Plan

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students, in groups, develop a detailed marketing plan for an innovative sport related product/service.

Target: Aggregated class mean score of 75% or higher on rubric.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every fourth

Responsible Individual(s): Instructor of record (Strigkas)

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: MS in Sport Management Date: 01.08.17

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to

				<p>master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p>

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do. Provided last year
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. Provided last year
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement &	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty

<p>Improvement</p>	<p>responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p>responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p>are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ??</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.</p>	<p>members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
<p>Overall Rating</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary</p>

The program's outcomes are clear and measurable, and at least two of the measures align with them (not sure about outcome #1's "series of items."). Performance expectations seem a bit low for a graduate program. In any case, as evidenced by last year's plan, the program uses scoring rubrics to assess student work, and the scores are calibrated to specific criteria and levels of achievement (thank you!). Students met standards set for two of the three outcomes; no action plan for improving the score on outcome #1 was provided. Three faculty members collected and analyzed data, which they share with the

larger faculty via Blackboard, but it is not clear how actively engaged in assessment the larger faculty is. In any case, the report identifies one change, course retooling, which has resulted in improved final exam scores; as well as the need to revise additional courses and to disaggregate assessment results by class.

Thank you for sharing your 2017 Student Learning Summary Report!