Sport Management (Bachelor’s) Student Learning Outcomes Matrix – Academic Year 2022-23

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 2140 Sport Analytics and Research:**

**AY 2022-23**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)** | **Identify Benchmark** | **Total Number of Students Observed** | **Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Does not meet expectation****Meets expectation****Exceeds expectation****Insufficient data** |
| **SLO 1 - Students will demonstrate the ability to locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources.** |
| Direct: Data Analysis Proposal (Written) | 80% of students will earn a score of “good” or “excellent” | 35 | 21 | 60 | Does not meet expectation |
| Direct: Data Analysis Proposal (Verbal) | 80% of students will earn a score of “good” or “excellent” | 35 | 34 | 97 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Locate information | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 20 | 95 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Organize information | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 21 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Evaluate information | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 20 | 95 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Analyze data | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 18 | 86 | Meets expectation |
| **SLO 4 - Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written form.** |
| Direct: Data Analysis Report (Written) | 80% of students will earn a score of “good” or “excellent” | 35 | 25 | 71 | Does not meet expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Communicate (Written) | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 16 | 76 | Does not meet expectation |
| **SLO 5: Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form.** |
| Direct: Data Analysis Report Presentation | 80% of students will earn a score of “good” or “excellent” | 35 | 26 | 74 | Does not meet expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Communicate (Verbal) | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 17 | 81 | Meets expectation |

*Note: If you are using different direct and indirect measures for different degree programs, please replicate the matrix, using one matrix for each program that has different measures. If different programs use the same measures, only one copy of the matrix is needed.*

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *SM 2140 – Sport Analytics and Research* are required to complete a major research project. This research project is comprised of two components: a Data Analysis Proposal (DAP) and a Data Analysis Report (DAR). The first half of the course is focused on research design, and the DAP requires students to select a topic, find relevant scholarly research, formulate research questions (or hypotheses), and design the methodology to collect data to answer their research question(s). The DAP is then presented to the class and a written report is submitted to the professor. The second half of the course is focused on data analytic techniques, and the students then follow their proposed methodology to collect and analyze data which is then reported in the DAR. As with the research proposal, the results of their data analysis are presented to the class and a written report is submitted to the professor. Student scores for this major research project were used as a direct assessment of SLOs.

For the indirect assessment of the SLOs, students were asked several questions related to perceptions about their ability to locate research articles using research databases, to organize information from multiple sources, to evaluate information from multiple sources, to analyze data from a survey, and to communicate information clearly and concisely in a research paper as well as in a research presentation. Survey items were rated on a scale from *1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Agree, and 4 – Strongly Agree*. Students reporting a score of 3 or 4 were considered as meeting expectations regarding their perceived ability to complete the respective task.

Interpretation of the Results

As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students did better at meeting expectations for the presentation than the written aspect of the Data Analysis Proposal (presentation: 97%; written: 60%) but the percentage of students meeting expectations was similar for the Data Analysis Report (presentation: 74%; written: 71%). The presentations do not require quite as much detail as the reports, and students seem better prepared for verbal presentations. Since this is a course taken primarily by 2nd year students, they typically have not been required to write scholarly research proposals and reports. Unfortunately, a large number of students did not meet expectations for the written portion of the DAP despite efforts to inform them of the level of detail and specificity that was required. In fact, one group of students did not submit a proposal report. However, the level of work did improve for the written DAR that was required later in the semester. Students meeting expectation improved from 60% (RP) to 71% (DAR). That being said, student performance for the written reports still fell below expectations of 80% of the class having performed in at least the “good” category, and this may be attributed to the difficulty that many students have with statistical analyses and interpretation of these results.

Clearly, indirect assessment of the students’ perceived ability was much higher than the direct assessment of their work on the research project. A majority of students (i.e., 86% or higher) selected *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* regarding their ability to do various tasks related to locating, organizing, evaluating, and analyzing information from multiple sources. Indirect assessments of their ability to communicate the Data Analysis Report in written (76%) or verbal (81%) form were generally consistent with the direct assessment. Thus, strategies used in the classroom to explain requirements of the project were helpful with improving perceived understanding. However, it is clear that additional or alternative strategies are needed to align perceptions with actual performance on the written portion of the project.

Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course

As revealed in the assessment data, students need to be better prepared for the written reports despite their perceived ability to accomplish the required tasks. The following changes will be implemented for AY 2023-24 to help achieve the benchmark for this course:

* Although class time is provided for groups to work together on projects throughout the semester, some students seem to rely on others in the group to perform tasks. This may lead to misperceptions that the student understands the material. Thus, more *Think-Pair-Share* activities will be implemented to ensure all students have time to think individually before discussing the activity with others and then sharing their findings with the class.
* A graduate student will be assigned to the class. If possible, this graduate student will be a former undergraduate of the program or one that has a solid background in research design and statistical analysis. The graduate assistant will attend class and hold office hours for students in the class.
* Although some instructor-created videos have been made available to students for the second half of the semester (i.e., statistical analysis portion covered by the Data Analysis Report), the instructor will create additional videos for the first half of the semester (i.e., research design covered by the Data Analysis Proposal). Hopefully, this additional resource may assist students who may be reluctant 1) to share and ask questions in class and/or 2) visit the professor or graduate assistant during office hours.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 2300 Esports:**

**AY 2022-23**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)** | **Identify Benchmark** | **Total Number of Students Observed** | **Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Does not meet expectation****Meets expectation****Exceeds expectation****Insufficient data** |
| **SLO 5 –** Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form. |
| **Direct: Esports group presentation (verbal)** | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 45 | 40 | 89% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| **Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: Post Project Evaluation (Responses Attached)** | 80% of students selected 3 or 4 on a scale of 1-4 (1=lowest, 4=highest) | 23 | 22 | 96% | 3: Exceeds expectation |

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in SM 2300 *Introduction to Esports* are required to complete several assignments throughout the semester. Broken down below are the materials assigned for Fall 22.

* Fourteen Discussions Boards on topics related to each week’s readings
* Ten reading quizzes over course text
* One reflection paper over Twitch, a popular streaming platform for gamers
* Guest Speaker engagements
* Esport presentation on gamer/group of students’ choosing
* One Sexism in Esports Research Paper
* One Careers in Esports Research Paper
* One MOBA (Multi-player Online Battle Arena) research assignment

All assignments are intended to introduce students to materials related to esports (competitive gaming). Reflection papers allow students to immerse themselves in the gaming community, watching live streams and competitions amongst top competitors. Each paper prompts students to respond to given questions, encouraging critical thinking and reasoning. The esport presentation is a group assignment designed to allow students to work with their peers on a presentation highlighting a current team/gamer in the industry. Students must cover all aspects of the team/gamer, including main game competed, training facilities, staff, wages, rankings, competition, travel, etc.

Interpretation of the Results

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program SLO:** | **Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form. (Assignment: Esports Group Presentation)** |
|  |  |
| Direct Measure | As shown in the results table, students did very well with this expectation. 40 out of 45 earned a C+ or higher on Esport Presentations. This indicates the group exceeded the benchmark at 89%. Of the 5 not passing the benchmark, 3 did not complete the assignment and 2 did not complete the verbal component of the project (50% of the grade). |
|  |  |
| Indirect Measure | Based on the student self-assessment, indirect measure of the student’s perceived experiences of encouraged (verbal) participation resulted in exceeding the benchmark. Of the 23 respondents, 22 (96%) indicated a 3 or 4 (agree/strongly agree) with regards to the verbal participation focused questions. |

**Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course**

As revealed in the assessment, students exceeded expectation in meeting the benchmark for SLO 5 *Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form.* Of the 45 students who took *Introduction to Esports* in Fall 22, 40 received a C+ or higher for their verbal Esport Group Presentations. These presentations required teamwork, research, practice, and an in-depth knowledge of the gamer/team being covered in the presentation. Presentations needed to be 8-10 minutes in length. While the results indicate a strong grasp of the SLO, there are areas to be improved yet. The following will be implemented for AY 2023-2024 to help maintain and elevate these benchmarks:

* The professor will periodically monitor and collect quantitative and qualitative data regarding the course and their self-assessment on the course. The professor will make reflections and changes based on the feedback monthly.
* Offer more opportunities for verbal engagement on course materials, i.e., class discussion/debate prompts, student led lecture (present on readings for the week), etc. In a virtual course, this will mean more video or audio content integrated into student assignments throughout the semester.
* Set class expectations at the start of the semester that foster an environment for open dialogue. Students may be apprehensive to share information, even when accurate, if they do not feel they have a voice.
* Engage with students more on a one-on-one basis, ensuring they have a solid grasp of materials. Should they be asked to share in class, the professor will have a better understanding of where the student is academically and their comfort level in verbally discussing content.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 3300 Leadership in the Sport Industry:**

**AY 2022-23**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)** | **Identify Benchmark** | **Total Number of Students Observed** | **Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Does not meet expectation****Meets expectation****Exceeds expectation****Insufficient data** |
| **SLO 1 - Students will demonstrate the ability to locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources.** |
| Direct: Leadership Article Critique Report | 80% of students will earn a score of “good” or “excellent” | 34 | 32 | 94 | Exceeds expectation |
| Direct: Leadership Article Critique Presentation | 80% of students will earn a score of “good” or “excellent” | 34 | 29 | 85 | Meets expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Locate Leadership Article(s) | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 19 | 90 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Evaluate Information from Leadership Article(s) | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 21 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |
| **SLO 7 - Students will demonstrate leadership and teamwork skills.** |
| Direct: Sport Leader Interview Presentation | 80% of students will earn a score of “good” or “excellent” | 34 | 30 | 86 | Meets expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Take a Leadership Role in a Group Setting | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 21 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Work Effectively with Others on a Group Task | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 21 | 21 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |

*Note: If you are using different direct and indirect measures for different degree programs, please replicate the matrix, using one matrix for each program that has different measures. If different programs use the same measures, only one copy of the matrix is needed.*

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *SM 3300 – Leadership in the Sport Industry* completed a couple of assignments related to the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) of: a) Locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources, and b) Leadership and teamwork skills. For the direct assessment of the first SLO, the Leadership Article Critique Report and Presentation required students to work in groups to locate several scholarly, empirical articles related to a group-selected leadership topic. The professor would let student groups know whether articles were appropriate or not for the critique and then the group selected one from the approved articles to evaluate and critically analyze for the report and presentation. For the direct assessment of the second SLO, the Sport Leader Interview Presentation required students to work again in groups to interview a sport professional in a leadership position. Students worked collectively to determine who their interviewee would be, the questions they would ask of the interviewee, and the questions they would ask of the class related to the interviewee’s responses. In other words, students needed to take the lead in facilitating class discussion integrating the interviewee’s responses with concepts and theories discussed in class.

For the indirect assessment of the SLOs, students were asked several questions related to perceptions about their ability to locate research articles on leadership using research databases, to evaluate information from research articles on leadership, to communicate information clearly and concisely in a leadership article critique, to communicate information clearly and concisely in a presentation on leadership, to take a leadership role in a group setting, and to work effectively with others on a group task. Survey items were rated on a scale from *1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Agree, and 4 – Strongly Agree*. Students reporting a score of 3 or 4 were considered as meeting expectations regarding their perceived ability to complete the respective task.

Interpretation of the Results

As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students did well at meeting or exceeding expectations (80% of the class having performed in at least the “good” category) for the Article Critique (Written: 94%; Presentation: 85%) and Interview Presentation (86%). This is a relatively new course, introduced in spring of 2022. Student performance fell just shy of meeting expectations last year, so adjustments made based on last year’s assessment (e.g., more class time provided for assignments) may have contributed to the improved student performance this year.

Clearly, indirect assessment of the students’ perceived ability for various tasks was high. The vast majority of students (i.e., 90% or higher) selected *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* regarding their ability to do various tasks related to the article critique or leader interview. Thus, strategies used in the classroom to explain requirements of the project were helpful with improving perceived understanding.

Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course

As revealed in the assessment data, students met or exceeded expectations for the current assessment period, which was an improvement from last year. Thus, no changes are required at this point, and the instructor will continue to incorporate the teaching strategies below for AY 2023-24:

* Ensuring class time is provided for students to work together on assignments throughout the semester and have opportunities to ask questions of the professor.
	+ The professor will continue to provide *at least* 10-20 minutes each week class for students to work on major assignments. This opportunity will allow for students to have dedicated time in class to write, ask questions, and solicit feedback from fellow students and the professor about the requirements of the assignments. Hopefully, this will translate to more students achieving the benchmark.
	+ In-class activities will continue to include *Think-Pair-Share* to help ensure all students have time to think individually before discussing the activity with others and then sharing their responses with the class.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 4250 Sport and Gender: AY 2022-23**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)** | **Identify Benchmark** | **Total Number of Students Observed** | **Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Does not meet expectation****Meets expectation****Exceeds expectation****Insufficient data** |

|  |
| --- |
| **SLO 6** – Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written and verbal form  |
| **Direct:****Participation/Attendance** | 80% of students meet score range from B- to A+ | 19 | 15 | 79% | 1. Does not meet expectation |
| **Direct: Discussion Board (Writing Entries/Comments)** | 80% of students meet score range from B- to A+ | 19 | 17 | 89% | 2. Meets expectations |
| **Indirect: Student Assessment of Final Group Presentations** | 80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1- 5 (1=lowest, 5=highest) | 19 | 19 | 100% | 3. Exceeds expectation |

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *SM 4250 – Sport and Gender* were assessed on SLOs #4 and #5, to “communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written and verbal form,” respectively. Three measures were used to assess SLOs #4 and #5 for SM 4250: (1) Attendance- Participation (direct measure, worth max = 135 points); (2) Discussion Board Writing of Entries and Comments (direct measure, worth max = 135 points); and (3) Students’ Assessment of Final Group Presentations (indirect measure, worth max = 30 points). In Spring 2023, the class was smaller than usual with 19 students. Descriptions of each measure follow. (1) Attendance-Participation: while attendance in class was not ‘required,’ students who attended class (or did a make-up in the case of an ‘excused absence’) received a maximum of 5 points per class session, for a total of 135 points. While being in the classroom (or doing a make-up) was one way to evaluate participation, there were other ways to assess students’ participation when they were in the classroom including: 1. *Small group* discussions (verbal); 2. *In-class written work* (individual and/or groups); 3. *Debates* (verbal); or 4. *Brief quizzes* (written). Even in a smaller class, *small group*s met frequently to discuss questions that we often considered in the class-as-a-whole afterwards. Sometimes, small groups submitted the results of their group work at the end of class. *In-class writing* provided a way for students to reflect upon assigned readings at the beginning of class before engaging in discussion in the class as a whole; their writing often provided a way to segue into larger class discussions. Students submitted their writing after our discussion. *Debates* related to Title IX on two topics: a) whether girls should play on boys’ teams (Debate A); or b) whether boys should play on girls’ teams (Debate B) in selected sports. Each person in class signed up for one of four teams: Pros or Cons in Debate A or B. *Brief quizzes* usually consisted of no more than 5 questions and were typically administered at the beginning or end of class. In some cases, scores on the quiz were used as participation points for that day. (2) Discussion Board Writing of Entries and Comments: each week, students were required to write one Discussion Board Entry (min = 250 words) OR two Comments (min = 125 words each). Evaluation of written entries and comments were based on grammar, spelling, articulation of main points, reflection, and flow. Each entry was worth a maximum of 10 points and each comment was worth a maximum of 5 points; students needed to write 2 comments to obtain 10 points for credit on weeks they did not write entries. Regardless of the class size, discussion board entries and comments allow students to elaborate on their understandings of assigned readings discussed in class. (3) Students’ Assessment of Final Group Presentations: Groups of no more than 4 students presented final presentations during the last week of class. The remaining students in class provided written evaluations of each person who presented (max = 10 points) as well as an overall assessment of how they rated the group. While they provided numeric evaluations on a scale of 1-10 for each individual and group, they could also include written comments to explain their observations.

Interpretation of the Results

As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students met or exceeded the benchmarks for this class in SLOs that assessed communications in written and verbal formats: the Discussion Board entries and comments (89%) and the final group presentations (100%). Scores on participation-attendance were slightly below the benchmark (79%) which can be explained primarily by low participation/attendance of 4 students. In a smaller class, that number of students impacts the lower percentage, even though it was only 1% below the benchmark. While students who were absent had the opportunity to make up excused absences so that they still earned points, those four students did not take advantage of that option. By contrast, student performances on Discussion Board Entries were solidly above the benchmark. This means that even the students who had frequent absences were submitting Discussion Board entries and comments. Students did not seem to have problems remembering to submit two comments as has been an issue in previous classes. The final group presentations went very well, as reflected in high scores from student evaluations as well as positive comments. Students were engaged in group presentations, both preparing for them and learning from the presentations of fellow classmates. For example, in response to what students found most interesting about each presentation, one student found it interesting to see the percent of Asian and Latinx athletes in the NBA, NFL, and WNBA. Several presentations touched on or compared media coverage of male and female athletes, especially during March Madness. Several students commented on their surprise at how much the viewership increased for the Women’s Final Four, while it declined for the Men’s Final Four. Another presentation was on Name-Image-Likeness (NIL) and its impact on college and even high school athletes. Several students were commented about athletes, especially in women’s basketball and football, were more incentivized to stay in school rather than go to the pros because they could now make more to play their sport in college and stay in school. Overall, the students in this class did an outstanding job of presenting interesting information related to the class but not previously presented during class lectures. It seemed that students in class were especially appreciative of what they learned from classmates.

Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course

Since this was my last year of full-time teaching and I’m not sure if or when I might teach the class in the future, I will offer observations for those who might teach this class going forward, realizing that they may take a very different approach to the material and pedagogy. Typically, when I have taught this class, it has been closer to full capacity (n = 30-35) than the size of this class. While I have always felt the larger size worked better for discussion, I am also aware that not everyone is as engaged as the students in this class were this past semester. So, I can see the advantage of teaching a smaller class. We don’t always have input into choosing the size of our classes. Based upon my observations and analysis of the assessment data for SM 4250, I suggest that future instructors of this class think about the following changes in AY 2023-2024 to achieve the benchmarks for this course:

* In this class, I have always stressed the importance of attending class since I have found this class to be most effective when students are there and participate fully. I also see it as good preparation for having a full-time job. The smaller class size did seem to enhance the depth and quality of our discussions. An issue that still arises is whether students do the readings prior to class. Giving a quiz on the material that factors into their participation grade would be a good way to reinforce the importance of doing readings before class.
* One thing that seemed to help with doing the Discussion Board entries and comments was having a T.A. who kept up with posting grades on the comments. I also tried to stay on top of giving feedback on entries, introductions, and conclusions. In that way, students had immediate feedback if they did not submit the correct number of comments or wanted to ask why points were deducted. I was fortunate to have a doctoral student as TA and she was great. Students often say that they found their voice in writing on the Discussion Board, and they were interested in reading ideas of other students.
* I was very pleased with the final group presentations that were done in this class – the variety of topics, the depth of their findings and their ability to engage other members of the class. The only shortfall is that most students do not have a good grasp on citing in APA. I would still encourage those who teach this class to encourage students in their writing and citing in APA.
* One other thing that I have learned from previous classes that met in-person is that students respond well to interactive tools such as Kahoot. They seem to listen more intently when they know they will be quizzed using a competitive format such as ‘Kahoot’ at the end of class. Most groups used it in their final group presentations, and it seemed to be appreciated.

Sport Management (Graduate) Student Learning Outcomes Matrix – Academic Year 2022-23

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for HMSL 6290 Legal Aspects of HMSL:**

**AY 2022-23**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)** | **Identify Benchmark** | **Total Number of Students Observed** | **Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Does not meet expectation****Meets expectation****Exceeds expectation****Insufficient data** |
| **SLO 5 -** Evaluate complex issues using appropriate reasoning and analytical skills required of Sport Administrators. |
| **Direct: Logical Reasoning (Legal Analysis; Written)** | 80% of students will earn a score of "good" or "excellent." | 26 | 19 | 73% | 1: Does not meet expectation |
| **Indirect: Reasoning Skill Self-Assessment (Case Brief; Survey)** | 80% of students will earn a score of "good" or "excellent." | 26 | 26 | 100% | 3: Exceed expectation |

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *HMSL 6290 – Legal Aspects of HMSL* are required to complete two analytic assignments, i.e., IRAC Legal Analysis and Case Brief. IRAC Legal Analysis is a writing format based on deductive reasoning process. The analytic method directs students to write a legal memorandum consisted of (1) Issue; (2) Rule; (3) Application; and (4) Conclusion (I-R-A-C). The IRAC requires students to demonstrate their logical reasoning skills, especially for the Application section. First, students receive a hypothetical scenario where a possible legal dispute would emerge. First, they must find an Issue of the given situation, which is a question to be answered by the following analysis. Second, Rule that controls the situation must be located and explained. Third, Application examines the situation under the identified Rule. Lastly, students must articulate Conclusion, which indicates who would prevail in the possible dispute. Students must complete two IRAC Legal Analyses for the final exam, which is a time-constrained (3 hours) take-home exam. The Application prong in the grading rubrics is a direct measure of SLO 5 (“*Evaluate complex issues using appropriate reasoning and analytical skills required of Sport Administrators*”).

Case Briefs also require reasoning and analytic skills. A legal case is a densely written document where a court attempts to publish the following items: (1) Facts (2) Issue; (3) Rule; (4) Rationale; and (5) Decision. Case facts describe what happened in a legal case which results in legal disputes. A legal issue is a question presented to the court, which must be answered based on controlling legal authorities. Rule of law is a set of legal principles that the court relies on. Rationale is the reasoning of the court in which controlling legal principles are chosen and case facts are analyzed under the selected legal rules. Decision is the outcome of the legal dispute. After a series of in-class case briefing practices, students are required to brief cases in reading assignments. Students must use their reasoning skills to identify different components of case briefs from court cases included in readings. At the end of the semester, one-question self-assessment survey is administered (“I understand case brief method” with a 5-point scale answer), which is an indirect measure.

Interpretation of the Results

The Student Assessment Results Summary Table shows that students performed better (100%; exceed expectations) on the Case Brief than Legal Analysis (73%; not meet expectation). Students had multiple in-class case briefing practices (almost every session) before graded case briefs were assigned. Additionally, the number of graded case briefs (14) might have been enough for students to practice the analytic process, which might have helped them build some confidence. In contrast, students completed only two IRAC memoranda (graded assignments) prior to the final exam consisted of two IRAC Legal Analyses. The case briefs were assigned at least one week before the deadlines whereas the final exam was a time-constrained (3 hours) test. Thus, while both IRAC Legal Analysis and Case Brief required students to demonstrate logical reasoning skills, they had to perform different types of information processing. For Case Briefs, students had to find correct components from preexisting court cases. In contrast, IRAC Legal Analysis was likely more challenging because students had to create patterns of reasoning by using their own knowledge and legal documents prepared for the exam. Most of all, the indirect measure was a self-report.

Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course

According to the data, some students need to improve their reasoning skills in terms of understanding the overall IRAC reasoning process, synthesis of different legal principles to formulate controlling Rule, and application of Rule to the given facts. Although they performed relatively well in Case Briefs, the final exam revealed that some students lack command of knowledge on the logical reasoning. Given the problem, the following changes will be implemented for upcoming school years to warrant better learning outcomes:

* More closely supervised discussion sessions. While the instructor had occasionally set up group sessions where students exchanged their ideas to practice the legal analysis process, those sessions were basically student-initiated without clearly predetermined learning goals. The instructor would clarify specific goals for each group discussion session to help them master the concept in a more linear fashion.
* More class assignments and time allocation for covering the concept of IRAC. Previously, the instructor assigned the reading materials for the IRAC process and students submitted two legal memoranda to demonstrate their understanding of the method. Additional in-class activities and/or quizzes about the concept might be helpful for students’ enhanced learning experience.
* Conversion of extra credit assignments to graded ones. There were extra credit assignments for the IRAC reasoning process. Apparently, more graded IRAC assignments would make students more engage in the learning process. The extra credit assignments might be converted to graded ones so that they would be included in the course grading rubrics.
* Practice policy argument. The IRAC process is applicable to non-legal contexts too. For instance, students may want to advocate one of sport programs in the athletics department facing budget cut. To support the program, students may need to find an institutional policy or philosophical principle (e.g., university mission statement, yearly objectives, etc.) that may prioritize the unit’s interest. The supportive policy or principle is equivalent to Rule in the IRAC process. The argument would be made in a similar way as the reasoning process in the Application section. Students may practice such reasoning process by using non-legal contexts first and then gradually be introduce to more heavier legal materials.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for HMSL 6510 – Interpretation of Quantitative Research in HMSL AY 22-23**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)** | **Identify Benchmark** | **Total Number of Students Observed** | **Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation** | **Assessment Results:****Does not meet expectation****Meets expectation****Exceeds expectation****Insufficient data** |
| **SLO 1: Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze, interpret, synthesize, and evaluate information appropriate to Sport Administration.** |
| Direct: Research Report | 80% of students will earn a score of “above average” or “excellent.” | 8 | 8 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Interpret information | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 6 | 6 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Synthesize information | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 6 | 6 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey – Evaluate information | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 6 | 6 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |
| **SLO 5: Students will demonstrate competence in reasoning and analytical skills required of Sport Administrators.** |
| Direct: Research Report | 80% of students will earn a score of “above average” or “excellent.” | 8 | 7 | 88 | Meets expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Skills to analyze quantitative data | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 6 | 6 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey – Skills to interpret results of a data analysis and reason through the practical application of those results | 80% of students will indicate “agree” or “strongly agree” | 6 | 6 | 100 | Exceeds expectation |

*Note: If you are using different direct and indirect measures for different degree programs, please replicate the matrix, using one matrix for each program that has different measures. If different programs use the same measures, only one copy of the matrix is needed.*

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *HMSL 6510 – Interpretation of Quantitative Research in HMSL* completed an assignment related to Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) 1 and 5: SLO1 - *Ability to analyze, interpret, synthesize, and evaluate information appropriate to Sport Administration*; and SLO 5 - *demonstrate competence in reasoning and analytical skills required of Sport Administrators.* For the direct assessment of these SLOs, students were required to write a research report that consisted of writing a review of literature, results of their analysis of a set of data, and a discussion section that summarizes the findings and integrates it with existing research.

For the indirect assessment of the SLOs, students were asked questions related to perceptions about their ability a) to critically interpret, synthesize, and evaluate information appropriate to Sport Administration, and b) to analyze quantitative data and to interpret results of a data analysis and reason through the practical application of those results. Survey items were rated on a scale from *1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Agree, and 4 – Strongly Agree*. Students reporting a score of 3 or 4 were considered as meeting expectations regarding their perceived ability to complete the respective task.

Interpretation of the Results

As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for the SLOs being measured in this course. That is, all 8 students (100%) earned a score of “above average” or “excellent” on one measurement tool (i.e., review of literature and discussion for the Research Report) and 88% on the other measurement tool (i.e., data analysis and interpretation for the Research Report) based on the direct assessment of the SLOs. As this is a graduate course, it is not surprising that the students were able to interpret, synthesize, and evaluate scholarly literature related to Sport Administration. While the writing was technical in nature (i.e., analyzing data and interpreting statistical results), the students achieved the benchmark for SLO 5.

As may be surmised from the results of the direct assessment, the indirect assessment of the students’ perceived ability for various tasks was extremely high. All students who were surveyed (i.e., 6 out of 6) selected *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* regarding their ability a) to critically interpret, synthesize, and evaluate information appropriate to Sport Administration, and b) to analyze quantitative data and to interpret results of a data analysis and reason through the practical application of those results. Thus, strategies used in the classroom to explain requirements of the assignments and prepare them to successfully complete the assignments were helpful and instructive.

Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course

As revealed in the assessment data, students did very well with meeting the benchmark for the SLOs measured in this course. At this time, no changes will be made for this course. Direct and indirect assessments indicate that the SLOs are being met. That being said, assessments will continue to be implemented in course based on the assessment plan.

Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix

Academic Year 2022-23

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identify Each Operational Effectiveness Goal and Measurement Tool(s)** | **Identify the Benchmark (e.g., 80% will achieve a rating of 5)** | **Data Summary** | **Assessment Results:****Does not meet expectation****Meets expectation****Exceeds expectation****Insufficient data** |
| **OEG 1: Keep up to date with the changing sport industry and mirror those practices within our program. Each Operational Effectiveness Goal and Measurement Tool(s)** |
| Practicum andInternship SiteSupervisor reports-Indirect | Incorporate feedback into our classroom teaching | Based on feedback from intern site supervisors, we are up to date with current practices but we will continue to monitor and assess to stay current | Exceeds Expectation |
| **OEG 2: Provide professional development opportunities to prepare students for the transition to the Sport Industry.** |
| Measure 1: Senior graduation Interview - Direct | 85% of students willagree that the professional development opportunities we provide are instrumental in preparing them for transition into the sport industry. | 90% agreed | Exceeds expectations |
| **OEG 3: All faculty are engaged in the sport management industry and/or academia** |
| Measure 1: Facultyactivity - Direct | Each faculty member will attend one sport management-related conference or serve as an industry consultant at least once per academic year | 6 of 6 | Exceeds expectations |
| **OEG 4: Increase communication with Advisory Board** |
| Measure 1: Actual Communication - Direct | We will communicate email/phone/virtually with Board more than 1x per semester | We communicated with multiple Board members each semester. | Exceeds expectation |
|  |
| ***All goals were achieved. Nonetheless we are continuing to review and examine our courses to ensure that our students are receiving the necessary course content to be successful in the sport industry.*** |

PROGRAM INFORMATION PROFILE

This profile offers information about the program in the context of its mission, basic purpose and key features.

**Name of Institution**: Bowling Green State University

Program/Specialized Accreditor(s): Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA)

Institutional Accreditor: Higher Learning Commission (HLC)

Date of Next Comprehensive Program Accreditation Review: 2030

Date of Next Comprehensive Institutional Accreditation Review: 2030

*URL where accreditation status is stated:* [*https://www.bgsu.edu/academics/sport-management.html*](https://www.bgsu.edu/academics/sport-management.html) *(landing page) &* [*https://www.bgsu.edu/education-and-human-development/human-movement-sport-leisure-studies/sport-management/accreditation.html*](https://www.bgsu.edu/education-and-human-development/human-movement-sport-leisure-studies/sport-management/accreditation.html) *(specific COSMA page)*

**Indicators of Effectiveness with Undergraduates [As Determined by the Program]**

1. Graduation Year: \_AY 2022-23 # of Graduates: 72 students Graduation Rate: N/A
2. Average Time to Degree: 4-Year Degree: 8-9 semesters 5-year Degree: N/A
3. Annual Transfer Activity (into Program): Year: AY 2022-23\_\_\_\_\_\_

# of Transfers: Data not collected Transfer Rate: Data not collected

1. Graduates Entering Graduate School: Year: AY 2022-23\_\_\_\_\_\_

# of Graduates: \_\_\_\_\_ # Entering Graduate School: Data not collected

1. Job Placement (if appropriate): Year: AY 2022-23\_\_\_\_\_\_

# of Graduates: \_\_\_\_\_ # Employed: Data not collected

*Form developed by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. © updated 2020*