

School of Human Movement, Sport, and Leisure Studies
Graduate Program
Summary of Assessment Accomplishments, 2007-2008

College: Education and Human Development

School: Human Movement, Sport, and Leisure Studies

Program: M.Ed. in Health, Physical Education and Recreation with Specializations in
Developmental Kinesiology, Leisure and Tourism, and Sport Administration

Submitted by: Dr. Geoffrey Meek, Graduate Program Coordinator

Date: October 2008

Requirements of Report

A. The report should describe your unit's assessment activities, findings, and actions since your previous report including a listing of your current or revised learning outcomes. The report includes:

- 1. Note which learning outcome(s) have been the focus of program assessment this year.**
- 2. Describe the assessments that have been made, describing especially the evidence that was collected and the setting(s) where data were collected.**
- 3. Present the results and conclusions you drew from your analysis of the assessments.**
- 4. Report actions that have been taken based on the assessment findings.**

A. The current School of HMSLS Graduate Program Student Learning Outcomes

The current School of HMSLS Graduate Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLO) are as follows:

- 1 Analyze, interpret, synthesize, and evaluate the literature appropriate to her/his area of study (through thesis defense or poster presentation)
- 2 Integrate learning from courses taken in his/her area of study
- 3 Write clearly, demonstrating grammatical precision and avoiding unnecessary area of study jargon
- 4 Speak clearly at a level appropriate for the listeners
- 5 Articulate reasoned beliefs in a civil manner
- 6 Demonstrate competence in those skills required of his/her area of study
- 7 Provide leadership appropriate to her/his area of study
- 8 Demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to interact with a diverse, multicultural, and global society

1. Note which learning outcome(s) have been the focus of program assessment this year.

In last year's SAAC report, seven recommendations were made that were to be the focus of program assessment for 2007-2008. This report will describe the assessments, present results and report actions in line with the recommendations for 2007-2008. The recommendations were:

1. Graduate faculty will review and possibly develop specialization and core SLO

- with the intention of being able to develop PSLO.
2. Determine how to reconfigure the self-assessment instrument for new Program SLO and if formative assessment continues how this can be related to the classes taken rather than just nominal hours of credit.
 3. Determine whether there remains a viable rationale for the completion of the faculty-advisor PLSO instrument.
 4. Provide student learning outcomes for HMSL 699 and HMSL 691 and assess them using the SLO Assessment form developed under Recommendation 3 for 2006-2007.
 5. Revisit the SLO of the variable credit courses and determine whether these should be developed individually for each variable credit course.
 6. Provide the opportunity for a dialogue/reaction to be included in the SAAC report.
 7. Deal with the relationship between the College of EDHD and also the Graduate College.
- 2. Describe the assessments that have been made, describing especially the evidence that was collected and the setting(s) where data were collected.**
1. Graduate faculty will review and possibly develop specialization and core SLO with the intention of being able to develop PSLO.

A Program Learning Outcome audit was conducted during the Fall semester 2007 in Graduate Faculty meetings (September 11th 2007; October 9th 2007). The rationale was based on commentary from the SAAC Feedback review from 2006-2007.

The September meeting determined Goals for AY. Program Goals; Student Learning Outcomes & SAAC Report

- Everyone who teaches graduate courses needs to re-examine the learning outcomes at three levels: Program, Specialization, and Courses.
- Faculty need to complete the process as shown in the handout (Background for Revisiting Student Learning Outcomes 2007-2008).

The October meeting worked in Specialization liaison meetings to determine Moving Student Learning Outcomes to Specialization Learning Outcomes and Possible Program Learning Outcomes.

The results were reported in the April Graduate Faculty meeting with all three of the specializations recommending Specialization SLO as follows:

Table 1: SLO for Sport Administration Specialization

| Specialization Student Learning Outcomes |
|---|
| 1. Students will connect and apply issues of 'cultural' and administrative understanding with theory and practice in sport administration settings. (previous: <i>with sport and critical theory and practice in a variety of settings</i>). |
| 2. Students will apply and disseminate their academic learning to sports administration and marketing contexts (<i>to the industry</i>). |
| 3. Develop the skills necessary to conduct their own research with a sport administration focus. (<i>in a variety of settings</i>). |

| |
|---|
| 4. Construct and link conceptual models of sport administration to appropriate professional sport administration settings (<i>and issues in a variety of settings</i>). |
| 5. Demonstrate an appreciation for ethical issues and decision making in professional sport administration settings. (<i>sport industry</i>). |
| 6. Provide evidence of accepted behaviors and attitudes appropriate to the sport industry. |

Table 2: SLO for Leisure and Tourism Specialization

| Specialization Student Learning Outcomes |
|---|
| 1. Connect and apply the psychological, sociological and multicultural aspects of leisure and tourism studies |
| 2. Compare and evaluate the unique components of recreation, leisure and tourism as a service industry |
| 3. Demonstrate and develop management, program and strategic planning and policy making skills in the leisure and tourism industry. |
| 4. Communicate the importance of the philosophical foundations of leisure/tourism as it relates to health and wellness. |

Table 3: SLO for Developmental Kinesiology Specialization

Upon successful completion of the Masters program in Kinesiology, the student will:

| Student Learning Outcome | Assessment Modalities | Additional Work Needed | ODE Standards |
|---|---|--|-------------------|
| Demonstrate mastery of specialized literature appropriate to advanced study in kinesiology | Course project/papers; Culminating experience | Standardized rubric for literature mastery; Calibration (rater-objectivity) by faculty | Knowledge |
| Demonstrate competence in specific advanced kinesiology knowledge and skills | Designated “key assessments;” Culminating experience | Identify specific skills and concepts associated with sub-discipline areas | Skill & Knowledge |
| Transfer and integrate knowledge and skill concepts across the graduate kinesiology core and specialized courses | Culminating experience | Standardized rubric for integration of core knowledge, skill, concepts | Knowledge & Skill |
| Effectively communicate in written and oral modes at an advanced technical/scientific level appropriate to graduate kinesiology | Course projects; Course presentations; Culminating experience | Standardized rubric on writing; presenting; Calibration (rater-objectivity) by faculty | Skill |
| Demonstrate mastery of advanced inquiry skills (e.g., research design, statistics, measurement) appropriate to graduate kinesiology | HMSL 653 Project; Culminating experience | Standardized rubric for research design or statistics Calibration | Skill |
| Demonstrate specific knowledge, | Course papers; | Standardized rubric | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------|
| skills, & dispositions a graduate-level kinesiologist needs to interact with a diverse, multicultural, and global society | Culminating experiences; Epistemological reflection essay questionnaire | on diversity disposition; Calibration (rater objectivity) among faculty | Disposition |
| Demonstrate “self-directed learning”/”self-authorship” through engaged participation and leadership in the profession | Membership in professional societies; Committee memberships | Identify additional examples of engaged participation and leadership activities or potential | Skill & Disposition |

The next phase of this process which was started in April 2008 was to complete a Specialization SLO audit of the courses for each specialization. This process is still on-going.

2. Determine how to reconfigure the self-assessment instrument for new Program SLO and if formative assessment continues how this can be related to the classes taken rather than just nominal hours of credit.

This recommendation was not completed during the 2007-2008. The existing self-assessment instrument was completed for each of the three poster sessions. The data has not been supplied for this report. The formal assessment will continue with the addition that from 2008 the *HMSL 691 Master's Project in HMSL* will include a formalized assessment of the percentage of effort for the paper and poster at a 70-30 split. This will allow for formal assessment of the learning outcomes as specified by the 2006-2007 SAAC report. There remain issues with how the self-assessment data and the faculty assignment of percentage of effort are collated and analyzed. This needs to be resolved as a future recommendation.

3. Determine whether there remains a viable rationale for the completion of the faculty-advisor PLSO instrument.

This was suggested in the April 2008 Student Learning Outcomes Update (see attached sheets for each specialization). This data has yet to be collated.

4. Provide student learning outcomes for HMSL 699 and HMSL 691 and assess them using the SLO Assessment form developed under Recommendation 3 for 2006-2007.

Due to the fact the majority of the students complete HMSL 691 the assessment processes have been upgraded for HMSL 691. There remains an issue as to how the student learning outcomes for these courses, as capstone experiences, reflect the program learning outcomes. However until there is consensus about program or specialization learning outcomes the resolution of this process remains in progress.

5. Revisit the SLO of the variable credit courses and determine whether these should be developed individually for each variable credit course.

Currently there are 8 variable credit courses, (HMSL 682; HMSL 684; HMSL 686; HMSL 688; HMSL 690; HMSL 692; HMSL 694; HMSL 695; HMSL 696), excluding Master's Project and Master's Thesis, that on average account for 40 credit hours per semester of graduate student credit. The extent to which student learning outcomes are being provided in the variable credit proposal has yet to be determined, although my inclination is that the variable credit proposals are topic specific not learning outcome specific. There needs to a review of the variable credit SLO by the Student Learning Outcomes Committee and determine whether there should be generic learning outcomes for each variable credit course.

6. Provide the opportunity for a dialogue/reaction to be included in the SAAC report.

This was a meaningful recommendation given the excellent commentary provided by Dr Hakel in 2005-2006, however this is a delayed report-by-report process and is not as effective as is necessary to move the program forwards with regards to the level of the report. I would welcome suggestions as to how this process could be improved. Is it possible to have SAAC representative visit the faculty to indicate the importance of the student learning outcomes in the current learning environment of the University.

7. Deal with the relationship between the College of EDHD and also the Graduate College.

This remains problematic. This report has been submitted without the requisite feedback provided by the Graduate College for the 2006-2007 report. This situation has been mitigated by the fact that during 2007-2008 as graduate coordinator I was asked to provide a Compact Report of the Graduate Program for the School and subsequently the College of EDHD in the Fall semester and also a Graduate Program Review in the spring semester for the Graduate College.

3. **Present the results and conclusions you drew from your analysis of the assessments.**

Table 4: Data from Student Summative Assessment of the PSLO conducted at the completion of HMSL 691.

| # | Program Student Learning Outcomes | Summer 2007 (n = 7) | Fall 2007 (n = 5) | Spring 2008 (n = 6) |
|---|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Analyze, interpret, synthesize, and evaluate the literature appropriate to her/his area of study (through thesis | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.3 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----|-----|-----|
| | defense or poster presentation) | | | |
| 2 | Integrate learning from courses taken in his/her area of study | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.5 |
| 3 | Write clearly, demonstrating grammatical precision and avoiding unnecessary area of study jargon | 4.4 | 3.8 | 4.2 |
| 4 | Speak clearly at a level appropriate for the listeners | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.7 |
| 5 | Articulate reasoned beliefs in a civil manner | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.8 |
| 6 | Demonstrate competence in those skills required of his/her area of study | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.7 |
| 7 | Provide leadership appropriate to her/his area of study | 4.6 | 4.6 | 5.0 |
| 8 | Demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to interact with a diverse, multicultural, and global society | 4.9 | 4.8 | 4.8 |

Table 5: Course Assessment Grade by SLO Matrix for Fall 2007.

| Course/SLO | SLO 1 | SLO 2 | SLO 3 | SLO 4 | SLO 5 | SLO 6 | SLO 7 | SLO 8 | SLO 8 |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| HMSL 613 | 91 | 45 | 100 | 45 | 91 | | | | |
| HMSL 621 | 80-90 | 90 | 75-85 | 80-90 | 75-90 | 80-85 | 75-90 | | |
| HMSL 622 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | | |
| HMSL 640 | 50-70 | 50-70 | 50-70 | 40 | 50-70 | 50-70 | | | |
| HMSL 650 | 85 | 85-100 | 100 | 85-100 | 100 | | | | |
| HMSL 652 | 92 | 92 | 77 | 77 | na | 77 | 92 | na | 92 |
| HMSL 653 | 83 | 81-94 | na | na | 96-100 | na | 87 | | |

The number represents the percentage of students achieving SLO with grade A. When a range is present the SLO was assessed with more than one assessment device. The maximum number of assessment devices was 5 (HMSL 653); the maximum number of multiple assessments for a SLO was four (HMSL 621, HMSL 640). na = SLO not assessed; empty cell = no SLO for assessment.

4. Report actions that have been taken based on the assessment findings.

Reported actions in relation to Table 4

Currently taking actions based on the findings from the student self-assessment remains problematic. The intention is to replace this data for the SAAC report with data from the newly developed assessment device to be employed for HMSL 691 for Fall semester 2008. This will help to alleviate the issues identified in previous SAAC feedback (2005-2006) which indicated that self-assessment offers weak evidence with respect to attainment of learning outcomes.

Reported actions in relation to Table 5

This is faculty generated assessment of SLO achieved by students within the courses for Fall 2007 (Spring 2008 was not fully completed due to Graduate Program Review report). This data indicates that a number of courses are not assessing all of the required SLO, but that the overall achievement of SLO for the courses by students is very high. One issue that will need to be considered is the extent to which multiple assessments achieve the same SLO. While this is not problematic in one sense it needs to be considered when other SLO are not being assessed. The recommendation here is that either the SLO are revisited and amended via green sheets or that the assessment protocols are more aligned to assessing SLO. I will repeat my comment from last year's report from which I have yet to receive a reply:

While I am fully aware of the need for SLO to be aligned with course assessments, this has not been a process that has been evident in the curriculum modification processes of most of the HMSL courses. While the current Curriculum Modification form has the section 2(c) *Plan for assessing student learning outcomes* many of our course modification sheets predate the inclusion of this element. I would be intrigued to know if the School needs therefore to create these plans in order to provide more direct assessment of learning outcomes.

Currently I see the matrix alignment as an audit process for courses to confirm the extent to which SLO are being achieved, if at all. This still falls short of the feedback statement from 2005-2006 which indicated that "accomplished assessments are not systematically incorporated into program decision-making. Program lacks documentation of the impact of undertaken assessments with regards to program changes". My recommendation in relation to this feedback comment is that program changes be based on the development of Specialization SLO rather than course SLO per se and that this process is being completed (see Tables 1-3 in last year's recommendation 1 above).

New Recommendations for 2008-2009

1. The process of aligning Specialization SLO as identified in the Table 1-3 above be completed. This alignment must be with both Course SLO and also with the Program SLO.
2. That either the SLO are revisited and amended via green sheets or that the assessment protocols are aligned to assessing SLO.
3. Program changes are based on the development of Specialization SLO rather than course SLO per se.
4. Review the SLO of the variable credit proposals of the 8 non-project/thesis options.