

# Sport Management (Bachelor's) Student Learning Outcomes Matrix – Academic Year 2021-22

## Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 2010 Introduction to Sport Management: AY 2021-22

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
<b>SLO 6 – Collaborate with others in diverse group settings</b>					
<b>Direct: Final Exam Review Session (Group Work)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	102	84	82	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: Course Evaluation (questions and frequency below)</b>	80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)	41	37	90	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Question 9: The instructor fosters an environment of diversity and inclusion</b>					
1= Strongly Disagree (0)	2= Disagree (0)	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree (4)	4= Agree (12)	5= Strongly Agree (25)	

### Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in SM 2010- *Introduction to Sport Management* are required to complete thirteen reading quizzes, two exams, fourteen discussion boards, attend numerous guest speaker engagements, five random attendance checks, 3 papers including a marketing, international sport, and documentary reflection, and two exam review sessions. The variety in assignments between Fall 21 and Spring 22 results from changes in faculty mid Fall term and new faculty joining the Sport Management program at the start of Fall term.

Written assignments are intended to increase student's proficiency in concisely and accurately presenting information related to the sport industry and topics assigned. This includes all discussion boards (varied in topic) and papers.

- Marketing Paper
  - Elements of the marketing mix
  - Assessment of goods and services provided
  - Use of sponsorship, licensing, or endorsement
- International Sport Paper
  - Evaluation of International Sport Programs of choice

- Discussion on location, participants, and costs associated with the event
- Responsibilities of hosting body
- Athlete A Reflection Paper
  - Review of Larry Nassar assault case within USAG
  - Offer solutions to a complex sport issue
  - Compare these events to other large sport organizations
  - Provide feedback/suggestions on areas for improvement

Interpretation of the Results

**Program SLO:**

**Collaborate with others in diverse group settings  
(Assignment: Final Exam Review Session)**

Direct Measure

As shown in the results summary table, students did very well at meeting expectation (82%) for Final Exam Review Session. In this assignment, students are required to a. form informal class groups to compete in a Jeopardy formatted review session and b. work collectively with their peers to answer course related content questions correctly. The expectation is students participate and work together to have an outcome of 80% earning a grade of C+ or higher. Unfortunately, between Fall and Spring semester eighteen students did not meet this expectation.

Indirect Measure

Based on the student self-assessment, indirect assessment of the student’s perceived experiences of diversity and inclusion in the classroom, it was higher than the direct measure. A majority of those responding (90%) indicated a 4 or 5 (agree & strongly agree) regarding “The instructor fosters an environment of diversity and inclusion”.

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

As revealed in the assessment data, students did well with the SLO of *Collaborating with others in diverse group settings*. While true, there are several changes to be implemented to further enhance and elevate the benchmark scores for this SLO. The following will be implemented for AY 2022-2023 to help maintain and elevate this benchmark:

- 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.
- The course will offer more opportunities for students to interact and engage with one another, allowing students to learn from perspectives different than their own. A proposed assignment may be a group project spanning the length of the semester which students need to work together to complete successfully.
- Some students may be apprehensive to sharing experiences, backgrounds, or views with their classmates. The professor will work collaboratively with students at the start of the semester to create class expectations that foster a welcoming space for sharing, even when views differ from others.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 2140 Sport Analytics and Research:  
AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Does not meet expectation Meets expectation Exceeds expectation Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 1 - Locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources.</b>					
Direct: Data Analysis Report (Written)	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	30	20	67	Does not meet expectation
Direct: Data Analysis Report (Verbal)	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	30	25	83	Meets expectation
Indirect: Survey - Locate information	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	24	23	96	Exceeds expectation
Indirect: Survey - Organize information	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	24	23	96	Exceeds expectation
Indirect: Survey - Evaluate information	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	24	20	83	Meets expectation
Indirect: Survey - Analyze data	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	24	22	92	Exceeds expectation
<b>SLO 2 - Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written and verbal form</b>					
Direct: Research Proposal Report (Written)	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	30	16	53	Does not meet expectation
Direct: Research Proposal Presentation (Verbal)	80% of students meet score	30	25	83	Meets expectation

	range from B- to A+				
Indirect: Survey - Communicate (Written)	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	24	21	88	Meets expectation
Indirect: Survey - Communicate (Verbal)	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	24	24	100	Exceeds expectation

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 research proposal (RP) and a data analysis report (DAR). The first half of the course is focused on research design, and the RP 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 RP 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 presentations (RP: 83%; DAR: 83%) compared to the written reports (RP: 53%; DAR: 67%). 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 2<sup>nd</sup> year students, they typically have not been required to write scholarly research reports. Unfortunately, a large number of students did not meet expectations for the written portion of the research proposal despite efforts to inform them of the level of detail and specificity that was required. However, the level of work did improve for the written DAR that was required later in the semester. Students meeting expectation improved from 53% (RP) to 67% (DAR). That being said, student performance for the written reports still fell below expectations of 80% of the class receiving a grade of C+ or higher, and this may be attributed to the difficulty that many students have with statistical analyses and interpretation of these results. Also, some students may have needed a little more time to get back to speed when the university resumed in-person classes.

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., 83% or higher) selected *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* regarding their ability to do various tasks related to the research project. 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 2022-23 to help achieve the benchmark for this course:

- Brief quizzes will be implemented periodically throughout the semester to ensure students are completing the required readings and understand course concepts.
- 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.
- Last, but not least, the professor will make an effort to find opportunities for students to work on projects for agencies outside of the classroom. For example, students may meet with representatives from the university athletic department or from external sport agencies to conduct survey research or analyze archived data for these agencies. The practical application to an actual sport agency may improve motivation, especially if these reports and presentations are to be made to representatives of the sport agencies.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 2300 Introduction to Esports: AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 5 – Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form (Fall 21)</b>					
<b>Direct: Esports group presentation (verbal)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	29	29	100	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: Course Evaluation (questions and frequency below)</b>	80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)	12	12	100	3: Exceeds expectation
Question 5: The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, having discussions, asking students to express their opinions, or other activities).					
1= Strongly Disagree (0)	2= Disagree (0)	3= Neither Agree nor Disagree (0)	4= Agree (2)	5= Strongly Agree (10)	

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 21, the course was not offered in Spring 22.

- Eleven reading quizzes over course text
- Five reflection papers over Twitch, a popular streaming platform for gamers
- Guest Speaker engagements
- Esport presentation on gamer/group of students’ choosing
- Final Exam over entirety of course content

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:**

**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. 29 out of 29 earned a C+ or higher on Esport Presentations. This indicates the group exceeded the benchmark at 100%.

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 12 respondents, 12 (100%) indicated a 4 or 5 (agree/strongly agree) with regards to "The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, **having discussions**, asking students to **express their opinions**, or other activities)."

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

As revealed in the assessment, students exceeded expectation in meeting the benchmark for SLO *Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form*. Of the 29 students who took *Introduction to Esports* in Fall 21, all 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 2022-2023 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.
- 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. Through class expectations, the professor can maintain a respectful environment where students feel more at ease having verbal dialogue.
- 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 3050 Sport Promotions and Sales:  
AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 7 - Leadership and Teamwork Skills (Spring 22)</b>					
<b>Direct: Marketing Plan Group Presentations (verbal)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	40	38	95	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: Course Evaluation (questions and frequency below)</b>	80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)	12	12	100	3: Exceeds expectation
Question 5: The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, having discussions, asking students to express their opinions, or other activities).					
1= Strongly Disagree (0)	2= Disagree (0)	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree (0)	4= Agree (3)	5= Strongly Agree (9)	
<b>SLO 6 – Collaborate with others in diverse group settings (Spring 22)</b>					
<b>Direct: Marketing Plan Group Presentations (written)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	40	40	100	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: Course Evaluation (questions and frequency below)</b>	80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)	12	12	100	3: Exceeds expectation
Question 9: The instructor fosters an environment of diversity and inclusion					
1= Strongly Disagree (0)	2= Disagree (0)	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree (0)	4= Agree (3)	5= Strongly Agree (9)	
<b>SLO 3 – Critical thinking and reasoning skills to solve sport-related problems (Fall 21)</b>					

<b>Direct: Social Media Paper (written)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	40	27	68	1. Does not meet expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: Course Evaluation (questions and frequency below)</b>	80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)	19	16	84	3. Exceeds expectation
Question 2: The instructor sets high standards for learning.					
1= Strongly Disagree (1)	2= Disagree (1)	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree (1)	4= Agree (5)	5= Strongly Agree (11)	

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in SM 3050- *Sport Promotions and Sales* are required to complete a variety of assignments. Broken down below are the course materials assigned in both Fall 21 and Spring 22, variations are a result of new faculty joining the Sport Management program and adjusting based on course outcomes from the Fall semester. New faculty joined four days prior to the start of the Fall term. Fall 21:

- Seven quizzes over course text
- Eight discussion boards on current events in sport promotions and sales
- Attend various guest speaker engagements
- Campus scavenger hunt for course related marketing efforts by BGSU Athletics
- Social Media paper evaluating two social media accounts of an athlete/team and the use of the marketing mix
- Final exam covering course content from the entirety of the semester

Spring 22:

- Thirteen quizzes over course text
- Eleven weekly discussion boards on current events in sport promotions and sales
- Attend various guest speaker engagements
- Five random attendance checks
- Market yourself presentation at start of semester emphasizing importance of selling yourself
- A midterm and final exam over course content
- Marketing Plan assignment, including written and verbal components
  - This in-depth assignment required groups to create a written plan and power point presentation outlining:
    - Executive plan
    - Business objectives
    - Situational analysis
    - Consumer information
    - Marketing strategies
    - Evaluation methods

All assignments are intended to increase students' knowledge of the marketing mix associated with promotions and sales in the sport industry. Group assignments allow students to engage and foster leadership skills through meaningful exchange with their peers of diverse backgrounds.

Interpretation of the Results

**Program SLO:**

**Leadership and Teamwork Skills  
(Assignment: Marketing Plan Group  
Presentation (verbal))**

Direct Measure

As shown in the results table, students did very well and exceeded the benchmark outlined. 38 of 40 (95%) students earned a C+ or higher on presentations. Two students fell just short of the C+ to A+ range, but still earned C's on the assignment

Indirect Measure

Based on the student self-assessment, indirect assessment of the student's perceived experiences of leadership, teamwork, and participation in the classroom was higher than the direct measure. 12/12 responding students chose a 4 or 5, indicating agreement or strong agreement with the statement "The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, having discussions, asking students to express their opinions, or other activities)".

**Program SLO:**

**Collaborate with others in diverse group  
settings  
(Assignment: Marketing Plan Group  
Presentations (written))**

Direct Measure

As shown in the results table, students did very well and exceeded the benchmark outlined. 40 out of 40 (100%) students earned a C+ or higher on their written presentation group materials.

Indirect Measure

Based on the student self-assessment, indirect assessment of the student's perceived experiences of collaboration in diverse group settings resulted equal to that of the direct measure, exceeding the benchmark. 12 out of 12 (100%) responding students indicated 4 or 5 (agree/strongly agree) with regards to "The instructor fosters an environment of diversity and inclusion".

**Program SLO:**

**Critical thinking and reasoning skills to solve  
sport related problems  
(Assignment: Social Media Paper)**

Direct Measure

As shown in the results table, students struggled to meet this expectation. 27 out of 40 earned a C+ or higher on their social media papers, meaning 13 did not meet the benchmark.

Indirect Measure

Based on the student self-assessment, indirect measure of the student's perceived experiences of high standards for learning resulted in exceeding the benchmark. Of the 19 respondents, 16 indicated a 4 or 5 (agree/strongly agree) with regards to "The instructor sets high standards for learning". One student each indicated 1,2, and 3 (Strongly disagree/disagree/neutral).

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

As revealed in the assessment, students did well with both the SLO *Leadership and Teamwork Skills* and *Collaborate with others in diverse group settings*. Students struggled with SLO *Critical thinking and reasoning skills to solve sport related problems* as indicated by the direct measure from Fall 21. The following will be implemented for AY 2022-2023 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.
- The professor will continue to offer opportunities for meaningful engagement with peers, fostering diverse discussions and interactions in the classroom. This may include additional group assignments, outside engagements on diverse sport marketing topics, and other related course content.
- The professor will create more opportunities for research and critical thinking, with self-evaluations reflective of students' feelings regarding their engagement with the material and ability to navigate problems using reasoning

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 3100 Sport Facility and Event Management:  
AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 4 &amp; 5 - Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written and verbal form.</b>					
<b>Direct: SWOT Analysis (Written)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	60	48	80	2: Meets expectation
<b>Direct: SWOT Analysis (Verbal)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	60	48	80	2: Meets expectation
<b>Direct: Case Studies (Written)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	60	39	65	1: Does not meet expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment Survey</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	60	48	80%	2: Meets expectation

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

*SM 3100 – Sport Event and Facility Management* is the new course that combined two previous courses, *SM 3010 – Sport and Event Management* and *SM 4750 – Sport and Public Assembly Facilities*. This course was designed to provide students with information and practical knowledge and skill competencies needed for facility and event management within the context of sport activities. Among the topics to be explored include sport facility and venue trends, planning and designing sport facilities, and facility and event operations related to sport facility and event management.

In doing this assessment, I used the Program SLO that was assigned to the old SM 3010 which was **Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written and verbal form**. Students enrolled in *SM 3100 – Sport Event and Facility Management* are required to complete a SWOT Analysis (SWOT) and topical case studies (CS). These assignments are different than what was previously determined as the measurement tool due to the combination of classes and my unwillingness to require students to attend in-person sporting events knowing not everyone was comfortable or ready to do that given that the pandemic still existed.

For the SWOT Analysis assignment, the students must work with a group to identify the strengths, weaknesses, objectives, and threats of the BGSU Athletic Department. Prior to this assignment, the students have listened to a lecture on what a SWOT Analysis is and how one can be conducted. They are

given guidelines and we do one collectively as a class. Following that, the students work in groups of 3-4 to perform a complete SWOT Analysis. They must identify five strengths, weaknesses, objectives, and threats. Then, they must use the five items from the first section and list the ways in which the athletic department can enhance or improve each of the previously identified items. The students must present their assessment to the class.

The case studies align with the chapter topics. There is a scenario provided to the students and they have specific questions they must answer that integrates various elements from the assigned topic. The students must use the material to clearly argue their point in written form.

#### Interpretation of the Results

As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students did better at completing the SWOT in class (80%) and giving their presentation on their SWOT analysis (80%) than completing their case study homework assignments (65%). For both, the students who did not meet expectations was due to their failure to actually complete the assignment rather than not understanding the material.

The indirect measure was a brief survey given to students in the spring sections asking them how they perceived their written and verbal contributions to their assignments and the SWOT analysis. All students who participated in the survey (n=48) all rated themselves a 4 or a 5 on a 5-point likert scale.

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

As the assessment data shows, the students need to improve on their case study assignment grades. While roughly 2/3 of the class met the expectations, the lower grade on the remaining third of the class was due to the students having several missing assignments. In order to motivate students to do the assignments, which will help them learn the content, I will brainstorm different incentives or ways to engage the students to actually complete the work.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 3300 Leadership in the Sport Industry:  
AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Does not meet expectation Meets expectation Exceeds expectation Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 1 - Locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources.</b>					
Direct: Leadership Article Critique Report	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	36	25	69	Does not meet expectation
Direct: Leadership Article Critique Presentation	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	36	34	94	Exceeds expectation
Indirect: Survey - Locate Leadership Article(s)	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	29	27	93	Exceeds expectation
Indirect: Survey - Evaluate Information from Leadership Article(s)	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	29	29	100	Exceeds expectation
Indirect: Survey - Communicate Information in a Leadership Article Critique	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	29	29	100	Exceeds expectation
<b>SLO 3 - Leadership and teamwork skills</b>					
Direct: Sport Leader Interview Presentation	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	36	28	78	Does not meet expectation
Indirect: Survey - Take a Leadership Role in a Group Setting	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	29	28	97	Exceeds expectation
Indirect: Survey - Work Effectively with	80% of students meet score	29	29	100	Exceeds expectation

Others on a Group Task	range from B- to A+				
Indirect: Survey - Communicate Information in a Leadership Presentation	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	29	27	93	Exceeds expectation

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 better at meeting expectations (80% of the class receiving a grade of C+ or higher) for the presentations (Critique: 94%; Interview: 78%) compared to the written report (Critique: 69%). This is a new course and the spring of 2022 was the first time it was available to students to enroll. Being able to critique an article in written format was not a focus on the course and some students had not yet taken SM 2140 which helps prepare students to critically analyzing research. That being said, the percentage of students fell just short of criterion of meeting expectations, and the observed percentage was not significantly different from the expected percentage (69% vs 80%,  $p = .11$ ). As noted earlier, students did well with the presentations and were either on par with (78% vs 80%,  $p = .74$ ) or exceeded expectations (94% vs 80%). The performance on the direct assessment for the presentations seemed to be more in line with the indirect assessment than the direct assessment for the critique report.

Clearly, indirect assessment of the students’ perceived ability for various tasks was high. The vast majority of students (i.e., 93% 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. However, additional or alternative strategies may be needed to align perceptions with actual performance on the written article critique report.

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

As revealed in the assessment data, students need to be better prepared for the written report despite their perceived ability to accomplish the required tasks. The following changes will be implemented for AY 2022-23 to help achieve the benchmark for this course:

- Additional class time will be provided for students to work together on assignments throughout the semester and have more opportunities for them to ask questions of the professor.
  - The professor will 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 be revised to include more *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.
- The assignments in this course were all related to leadership, but they were considered somewhat independent. Although not discussed in this assessment report, students had to reflect on their leadership philosophy as an early assignment. Based on experiences from the initial offering of this course and feedback from students in the class, linking assignments in a more integrative, reflective, and comprehensive project may further enhance their understanding of the purpose of these assignments and produce better results. In other words, the student's *Leadership Philosophy Portfolio* will serve as a dynamic and culminating project (or measurement tool) that is reflected on and revised over the course of the semester based on the textbook readings, class discussion, critique of scholarly literature on leadership, and the interview of a sport leader.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 3660 Psychological Aspects of Exercise and Fitness: AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 1</b> - Locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources <b>SLO 2</b> - Quality solutions to complex sport industry problems <b>SLO 3</b> - Critical thinking and reasoning skills to solve sport-related problems <b>SLO 5</b> - Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form					
Direct: Removing Barriers group presentation	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	35	32	91%	3: Exceeds expectation
Indirect: student evaluations of group members	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	35	30	86%	3: Exceeds expectation
Indirect: reference list contents	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	35	10	28%	1: Does not meet expectation

**Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools**

Direct Assessment: The final major project in this class is titled, *Removing Barriers*. This assignment addresses several learning outcomes (see table x) by requiring students to select a group of people often marginalized or overlooked in physical activity and (a) introduce why it is important to be inclusive of this group in physical activity, (b) describe common barriers affecting this group of people, and (c) develop a plan for a fictional physical activity establishment to become more inclusive.

Indirect assessment #1: Assessment tool: Rate your group members on the following (1=unacceptable/minimal involvement; 5=excellent/maximal involvement)

1. How involved was this group member during on-line communications (e-mail, discussion board, cloud, etc.)?
2. How involved was this group member during in-class group discussions?
3. How prepared was this group member to discuss content during group meetings?
4. How much did this group member contribute content beyond what was in the textbook (e.g., find examples, exercises, etc.)
5. How much did this group member contribute to the completion of this section?

Indirect assessment #2: reference list contents. Scored 1-5 on the number of appropriate scholarly sources cited.

**Interpretation of the Results**

In the breaking barriers group presentations, students demonstrated strong verbal communication and critical thinking skills as they creatively developed solutions to complex challenges inherent in inclusive outreach. As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, on the direct assessment,

students exceeded expectations with 33 of 35 students (91%) earning a C+ or better on the assignment.

The indirect assessments had mixed results. When students rated their group mates, 86% of the students were actively engaged in the development of the group project/final presentation. However, when examining the sources students used to develop the presentations, few accessed appropriate academic sources.

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

While students generally embraced the content and intent of the assignment, they need more guidance and practice at seeking out appropriate scholarly sources. In the future, I can provide more instruction and guidance on what appropriate scholarly sources are and how to find them (e.g., in oral and written instructions).

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 3900 Legal Aspects of Sport:  
AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Does not meet expectation Meets expectation Exceeds expectation Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 2 - Critical thinking and reasoning skills to solve sport-related problems</b>					
<b>Students' self-assessment of group performance (indirect)</b>	80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+	65	61	94%	Meets expectation
<b>Students' self-assessment of individual peer evaluation (indirect)</b>	80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+	66	64	97%	Meets expectation
<b>MLB Salary Arbitration prospectus (direct)</b>	80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+	67	67	100%	Exceeds expectation
<b>MLB Salary Arbitration memorandum (direct)</b>	80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+	67	67	100%	Exceeds expectation
<b>MLB Salary Arbitration oral argument (direct)</b>	80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+	67	61	91%	Meets expectation

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *SM 3900 – Legal Aspects of Sport and Recreation* are required to complete a Semester Project: Major League Baseball Salary Arbitration (“MLB Arbitration”). The MLB Arbitration is a dispute resolution system that is designed to determine annual salaries of eligible players under the Major League Baseball Collective Bargaining Agreement (“CBA”) in case of impasse in salary negotiation. Initially, students were assigned to multiple groups that represented either MLB teams or players. The groups mainly needed to complete three tasks during the semester: (1) arbitration prospectus; (2) memorandum; and (3) oral argument. The prospectus was a preliminary research paper that highlighted arbitrated players’ strengths and weaknesses, comparable players, market values of the arbitrated players, and asking salaries. The memorandum was an advocative paper in which students were required to present elaborated arguments on behalf of their clients for the arbitration. The oral argument was a set of adversarial proceedings in front of a presiding arbitrator (instructor) and a jury (rest of class). As such, the semester project provides three different direct assessment tools.

While a pair of student groups performed the oral argument, the rest of the class not participating in the process became a jury that essentially evaluates the merits of the participating groups’ arguments. Given the information presented to them, the jury determined the salary of the arbitrated player in terms of the so-called midpoint analysis, a decision-making scheme specifically mandated under the real-world CBA.

The jury must complete the midpoint analysis for each arbitration case that they do not participate as advocates. At the end of the semester, students' self-assessment of group performance and peer evaluation were conducted. Such self-assessment and individual peer evaluation provide indirect assessment tools for the student learning outcome.

### Interpretation of the Results

The Student Assessment Results Summary Table shows that students performed better (100%; exceed expectations) on the prospectus and memorandum than the oral argument (91%; meets expectation), self-assessment of group performance (94%; meets expectation) and peer evaluation (97%; meets expectation). The oral argument required students to respond their opponents' arguments, which might not be easy without thorough preparation. While the instructor shared all groups' memoranda via the learning platform (Canvas), some students in the class were seemingly unprepared to rebut their opposing sides' arguments. The self-assessments also revealed some negative feedback about the group collaboration setting through the indirect assessment tools (group performance and peer evaluation survey). This might be related to the lack of collective learning experience which has been missing during the recent years due to the pandemic. Compared to previous years, there has been a fair number of anecdotal reports about this problem. Since the course is exclusively for juniors and seniors, previous students in the past had showed a high comfort level when they were required to work with other classmates. The lack of personal interaction prolonged during the recent health crisis might have impacted students in this regard.

### Action Plan: Assessment-Based Changes to the Course

According to the data, some students would need to improve on their critical thinking and reasoning skills in relation to the advocative setting. Although they performed relatively well in the first phase of the semester project, i.e., prospectus and memorandum, they should have demonstrated more command on the advocative communication, i.e., oral argument. In addition, the indirect measure (self-assessment of group performance) also suggests that the students would need to develop more social and communication skills dealing with colleagues. Given the problem, the following changes will be implemented for AY 2022-23 to pursue better learning outcomes:

- More class sessions and time covering the basic concept of advocative argument. Previously, the instructor assigned the reading materials for the overall process and explained the relevant skills as a part of lecture. Additional practices for oral argument skills would be implemented based on Socratic method and in-class handouts.
- Additional exam questions. There were extra credit questions on the midterm that asked some aspects of the relevant CBA provisions (e.g., inadmissible information in the process). Additional exam questions about the oral argument skills and strategies will be included in the exam so that the students would be engaged with the concept more.
- More closely supervised group discussion sessions throughout the semester. While the instructor had occasionally set up group sessions where the group members exchanged their ideas, the sessions were basically student-initiated. The instructor would assign more specific goals for each group so that more linear development would become achievable.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 3950 Facilities: AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 4 – Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written form (Fall 21)</b>					
<b>Direct: Facility Tour Research Paper</b>	80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+	110	95	86	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: Course Evaluation (questions and frequency below)</b>	80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)	41	33	80	2: Meets expectation
Question 5: The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, <b>having discussions, asking students to express their opinions</b> , or other activities).					
1= Strongly Disagree (1)	2= Disagree (0)	3= Neither Agree nor Disagree (7)	4= Agree (7)	5= Strongly Agree (26)	

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in SM 3950 *Facilities* are required to complete several assignments throughout the duration of the semester. Below are materials assigned for Fall 21 and Spring 22. Variations are a result of new faculty joining the Sport Management department and adjusting based on Fall semester outcomes for the Spring term.

Fall 21

- Eleven discussion boards on course text and current events
- Three exams covering course text and supplemental materials provided throughout the semester
- Twelve sets of chapter questions addressing course text (written format only)
- Facility Tour Research Paper
  - In depth tour of facility of choice
  - Must present a visual as though the professor has toured the space themselves
  - Photos required
  - Comparison to other facilities required
  - 8-12 pages in length

Spring 22

- Fifteen discussion boards on course text and current events
- Two exams covering course text and supplemental materials provided throughout the semester

- Twelve sets of chapter questions addressing course text (written and multiple-choice formats)
- Facility Tour Research Paper
  - In depth tour of facility of choice
  - Must present a visual as though the professor has toured the space themselves
  - Photos required
  - Comparison to other facilities required
  - 8-12 pages in length

As this course is a self-guided online format, the largest area of focus is proficiency in communicating in written form. Both the Facility Tour Research paper and Chapter Questions address this SLO, providing students opportunities to communicate in written form their grasp of the course materials as related to the assignments. Exams address retention of course content and the ability to think critically with regards to current issues in the sport industry. Discussion boards further allow students to practice their written communication, prompting them to respond to real world scenarios and situations, providing appropriate solutions or insights.

Interpretation of the Results

**Program SLO:**

**Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written form  
(Assignment: Facility Tour Research Paper)**

Direct Measure

As shown in the results table, students did very well with this expectation. 95 out of 110 earned a C+ or higher on their Facility Tour Research Paper. This indicates the group exceeded the benchmark at 86%.

Indirect Measure

Based on the student self-assessment, indirect measure of the student’s perceived experiences of encouraged (written) participation resulted in exceeding the benchmark. Of the 41 respondents, 33 (80%) indicated a 4 or 5 (agree/strongly agree) with regards to “The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, **having discussions**, asking students to **express their opinions**, or other activities).”

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

As revealed in the assessment, students did a good job at meeting the SLO *Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written form*. Of the 110 students completing the Facility Tour Research Paper (direct measure) assignment, 95 earned a C+ or higher (86%). This exceeds the benchmark of 80%. Of those 41 completing the indirect measure of course assessment, 33 indicated a 4 or 5 (agree/strongly agree) with regards to “The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, having discussions, asking students to express their opinions, or other activities)”. While both measures indicate meeting or exceeding the benchmark, there are areas yet to be improved. The following will be implemented for AY 2022-2023 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.
- The professor will provide a more varied approach to engaging via written/verbal communication. It was noted in course evaluations that while consistency was nice regarding assignments/course schedule, materials became redundant. To better engage students, it is suggested that zoom meetings be integrated to allow the development of verbal communication skills as well as written.
- To improve proficiency and accuracy in communicating in written form, the professor will allow students to turn in their facility paper draft three weeks prior to the final draft being due. Many students struggle with writing, and this additional step/check provides the professor the opportunity to provide early feedback and students the chance to make edits that enhance their final paper.

## Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 4240 Social Justice in Sport: AY 2021-22

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
<b>SLO 2</b> - Quality solutions to complex sport industry problems <b>SLO 5</b> - Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form <b>SLO 6</b> - Collaborate with others in diverse group settings					
Direct 1: Social Justice and Inclusion in Sport group presentation	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	28	26	92%	3: Exceeds expectation
Indirect 1: student evaluations of group members	80% of students meet score range from B+ to A+	28	23	82%	3: Exceeds expectation
Direct 2: Diverse conversation (written paper)	80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+	28	23	82%	3: Exceeds expectation
Indirect 2: Diverse conversation (small group discussions)	80% of students meet score range from B+ to A+	28	15	53%	1. Does not meet expectation

### Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Direct assessment 1: Social Justice and Inclusion in Sport group presentation. In small groups, students identified a contemporary social justice issue in sport and developed a proposal for making sport better. Their goal was to create strategies or describe actions for further progress to improve sport or to use sport to improve society. Their group presentation included: (a) a rationale/introduction grounded in what we know about this topic and why the proposal is needed, (b) support for why the proposal will be effective, and (c) distinct actions leading toward change.

Indirect assessment #1: Assessment tool: Rate your group members on the following (1=unacceptable/minimal involvement; 5=excellent/maximal involvement)

1. How involved was this group member during on-line communications (e-mail, discussion board, cloud, etc.)?
2. How involved was this group member during in-class group discussions?
3. How prepared was this group member to discuss content during group meetings?
4. How much did this group member contribute content beyond what was in the textbook (e.g., find examples, exercises, etc.)
5. How much did this group member contribute to the completion of this section?

Direct assessment 2: Diverse conversation (written paper). In this assignment, students interviewed someone in sport who identifies differently than themselves based on race, sexuality, gender identity, etc. They reflected upon how this individual's experiences differed from their own; considered how privilege and oppression were reflected in the person's experiences; discussed issues that surprised them or stood out; and presented reactions to the interviewee's experiences. Students shared their interview findings in a written paper.

Indirect assessment 2: Diverse conversation (small group discussions). In groups of 4-5, students discussed their diverse conversations with their classmates.

### **Interpretation of the Results**

In the Social Justice and Inclusion in Sport group presentations, students demonstrated strong verbal communication and critical thinking skills as they creatively developed solutions to complex challenges inherent in social justice engagement. As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, on the direct assessment, students exceeded expectations with 26 of 28 students (92%) earning a B- or better on the assignment. On the student evaluations of group members indirect assessment, 82% of students rated their group mates as actively engaged in the development of the group final presentation.

Similarly, on the Diverse Conversation written papers, most students demonstrated strong written communication as well as interviewing skills (collaborating with others in diverse group settings) with 23 of 28 (82%) earning a B- or better on the assignment (direct assessment). The small group discussion indirect assessment was skewed by poor attendance. That is, all students in class adequately demonstrated verbal communication, critical thinking, and the ability to collaborate with others in diverse group settings. Students who did not meet this expectation received low scores because they were absent and did not complete this part of the assignment.

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

Students generally embraced the content and intent of the Social Justice and Inclusion in Sport assignment, which was presented during finals week. One possible reason for their strong projects is that they had 2 class periods dedicated to working with their group members. During this time, they also interacted with, and asked question of, the professor and teaching assistant. This is a practice I will continue using in the future.

Regarding the Diverse Conversation assignment, students completed this assignment early in the semester. The discussions they had opened their eyes to experiences different from their own. The students who also participated in the small group discussions tended to demonstrate greater insights and critical thinking in their written papers.

In both assessments, the biggest setback was related to attendance. As we returned to the classroom after the pandemic flip to on-line learning, attendance has become a national problem (Bladd, 2022, *EducationWeek*). Current students missed 1-2 years of peer modeling regarding in class participation. They also may still be navigating a range of pandemic-related challenges. As a faculty we have discussed the need for more mentoring of the current students across a variety of contexts (e.g., class, student sport management extracurricular activities). In the future, I plan to provide more direct and concrete expectations concerning attendance and participation during class.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 4250 Sport and Gender: AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 6 – Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written and verbal form</b>					
<b>Direct: Participation/Attendance</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	36	29	81%	2. Meets expectation
<b>Direct: Discussion Board (Writing Entries/Comments)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	36	21	58%	1. Does not meet expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Assessment of Final Group Presentations</b>	80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)	36	35	97%	3. Exceeds expectation

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *SM 4250 – Sport and Gender* were assessed using 3 measures: (1) Attendance-Participation (max = 140 points); (2) Average of Midterm and Final Exam Scores (max = 200 points); and (3) Final Group Presentations (max = 30 points). In Spring 2022, the class was at full capacity with 36 students. It was the second semester that classes met face-to-face following the pandemic. 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. While being in the classroom (or doing a make-up) was one way to evaluate participation, there were other ways to assess students’ participation once they were in the classroom including: 1. *Small group* discussions; 2. *In-class writing*; 3. *Debates*; or 4. *Brief quizzes*. Due to the size of the class, *small groups* 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 afterward. *In-class writing* provided a way for students to engage with the topic and/or readings at the beginning of class; 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. On rare occasions, scores on the quiz were used as participation points for that day. (2) Midterm and Final Exam Average: the midterm and final exam were similar in that each consisted of approximately 35 M/C

(each worth = 2 points) and the remainder were short answer questions. Despite receiving study guides prior to taking the midterm and final, students' scores on the two exams were well below the benchmark for this course as explained in results below. There appeared to be a high correlation between a student's participation score in class and results on a student's exam scores, although I did not conduct a statistical analysis to test for significance.

### Interpretation of the Results

As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students met the benchmarks for this class in activities that required some collaboration: participation-attendance (80.5%) and the final group presentations (97%). Scores on the midterm and final exams were well-below the benchmark (47%) which suggests that while they are responding well to being in the classroom and participating with classmates, students are not retaining (or perhaps learning) the information conveyed in class as much as I hoped. Class attendance remained relatively high throughout the semester with almost half of the class (n = 15) missing one or no classes. The overall attendance-participation rate would have been much higher had it not been for those who missed considerably more classes. At the beginning of the semester, approximately 10-12 students notified me that they tested positive for or had to quarantine for Covid. While they had the opportunity to make up those classes so that they still earned points, most did not. There may have been more who did not report Covid as the reason for their absences; however, fewer said they tested positive or had to quarantine for Covid as the semester proceeded. It appeared that students were grateful to meet face-to-face after 3 semesters of taking classes online. The scores on the midterm and finals were lower than I have observed in recent classes. Perhaps that has to do with exams being administered online and/or students devoting less time to their classes now that they are back on campus. Even the highest grades on the midterm were lower than on previous exams and there were fewer A's. Having a study guide should have enabled students to perform well on both exams. Students often admit to not using the study guide on the midterm but usually prepare with it for the final, meaning that scores on the final exam tend to be higher. That did not appear to be the case in this class. My sense is that the majority of students do not keep up with the readings when they are due and cannot make up all of the information when studying for the exams. By contrast, students performed quite well on the Final Group presentations which they did during the last two weeks of classes. In this class, as in the graduate class that I taught, I observed a cohesion among group members that I had not seen prior to the pandemic. Even students who did not know others in the class when it started worked well with their groups for the presentations. The overall good performances on the final group presentations prompted me to consider doing presentations earlier in the semester for future classes.

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

Based upon my observations and analysis of the assessment data for SM 4250, students clearly need to have a better understanding of material as it is presented. The following changes will be implemented for AY 2022-2023 to help achieve the benchmark for this course:

- While this class met the benchmark for participation and attendance, there were still quite a few students who did not attend regularly or do make-ups so they could still earn participation points. For many of those students, this had a negative impact on their midterm and final scores. I have always stressed that it is important to be there since this class is most effective when students are there and participate fully. There may also need to be greater emphasis on doing the readings and learning the material presented in each class. In my observations, students do not always keep up with the readings for a variety of reasons – conflicts with other classes, extracurricular commitments, or they think the readings are too long and/or difficult to understand. Throughout my years of teaching, I have tried to locate more readings that are student-friendly and accessible, without losing the academic focus of the class. In some cases, there may still be longer, more detailed

readings than most students are willing to commit to doing. I will continue to look for readings that are accessible and updated.

- Besides students missing for Covid, several students were dealing with extenuating health and/or mental health issues. In one case, a student told me up-front that she might have difficulty being in the classroom on a regular basis due to a health issue. She regularly communicated with me before each class about her status and what she could do to participate if she could not attend in-person. At first, she did make-up assignments, but eventually, the T.A. provided access to the class for her via Zoom and she was able to hear the lecture and participate in her group via text messages when they met in groups. By contrast, another student was dealing with mental health issues, which he did not report to me until he had missed a substantial number of classes. I had noticed his absences because I had him in a previous class where he was one of the best students in class. I considered reaching out to him but did not. When he finally informed me of the issue, I let him know that I understood and allowed him to do make-ups for those days he had missed. I asked him to keep me in the loop about his needs.
- Meeting with students face-to-face enabled me to get a better sense of what students were comprehending as I could gauge reactions and facial expressions (to a lesser degree when there was still a mask mandate). It was puzzling when students missed questions that we had discussed in class that were also on the study guide, especially if I knew those students were in class when we discussed them. There needs to be a way to hold students accountable for the material when we go over it in each class so that they do not have to learn it all before the exams. This may require me to give more in-class quizzes at the end of class and count those for the attendance-participation grade that day.
- One of the things that students did not grasp fully was how to cite in proper APA format. In previous classes, I have gone into great detail about how to use it, posted sample references and emphasized the importance of learning how to cite properly. Even when doing that, there were always a third of the students who seemed to have learned nothing. I must admit that I have grown weary of emphasizing proper citation formats although I continue to believe it is important. In future classes, I plan to post guidelines and sample references at the beginning of the semester and hold students accountable for citing properly. I will also devote a portion of an early class to proper citations and let students know that they must learn how to use APA properly in order to do well in the class.
- While students did well in their final group presentations, those scores did not reflect areas in which they could improve, meaning that perhaps the rubric for that assignment needs to be revised. Few students presented as professionally as they should as mostly juniors and seniors. It was clear that several groups met and practiced beforehand, while too many read from the slides that were already too wordy. I need to outline what a professional presentation should look like and hold students accountable in their grades.
- 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 attentively when they know they will be quizzed using a format such as 'Kahoot' at the end of class. I plan to implement it more in future semesters of this class.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 4260 Globalization of Sport: AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 6 – Collaborate with others in diverse group settings (Spring 22)</b>					
<b>Direct: Participation/Attendance</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	9	5	56%	1. Does not meet expectation
<b>Direct: Final Group Presentation</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	9	9	100%	3. Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Self-Assessment of Participation (rubric)</b>	80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)	9	4	44%	1. Does not meet expectation

**Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools**

Students enrolled in *SM 4260 – Globalization and Sport* were assessed on SLO #6, to Collaborate with others in diverse group settings. Three measures used to assess students’ collaboration with others included: (1) Participation/attendance grade (direct measure); (2) In-Class Group Presentation (direct/verbal); and (3) Self-Assessment of Participation (indirect measure). The Participation/attendance grade is based upon students’ attendance in class meetings (n = 28 classes x 5 points for each class/total = 140 points maximum) which includes in-class activities that required them to discuss questions related to the day’s assigned readings with other students. In response to their small group discussion, students handed in worksheets and/or shared their answers with the whole class. The second direct measure was based upon students’ in-class group presentations at the end of the semester. Students could obtain a maximum of 30 points for their in-class presentations. Being in the classroom enabled students to work together and prepare for in-class presentations, which they had not been able to do during Covid. The final assessment measure was a Participation Grade rubric (see: attached) which I asked students to fill out to provide a self-assessment of their overall participation throughout the semester. On that rubric, students assessed their participation on 4 components: a) Attendance (how many classes they attended in person, including a written make-up if they had an excused absence); b) Preparation was the second factor they assessed (how frequently they completed the readings before class or brought up other sources related to class materials); c) For Discussion, students were asked to assess how frequently they contributed to class discussion and/or raised questions related to the material; and d) They could add points if they had extenuating circumstances that made it difficult to be present for class or to do a make-up (e.g., due to Covid, a family emergency, etc.). The first 3 components were worth 30 points each, while the fourth was worth a maximum of 10 points, for a total maximum of 100 points.

### Interpretation of the Results

The Student Assessment Results Summary Table (in Excel) reveals that students exceeded expectations on the final group presentations (100%) but did not meet the benchmark of 80% for the Participation/Attendance (56% - does not meet expectations) or for the Self-Assessment of Participation rubric (44% - does not meet expectations). It is difficult to generalize for a class of only 9 students, especially since the class had not been offered since 2011. When I taught it twice before, both classes had approximately 30 students, which changed the class dynamic considerably. A small class could still be interactive if students attended regularly and came to class prepared to discuss the assigned readings. As the Participation/attendance measure reveals, most students did not attend as regularly as I had hoped. It was difficult to gauge how prepared students were when it came to Discussion since most students did not seem eager to participate in discussion aside from a handful of excellent discussions we had in class. Grades on the midterm and final suggested that most did not keep up with the readings and/or prepare for the exams as much as they should have. Students were most interactive when they worked in small groups and prepared for their final group projects. The instrument that was most helpful in assessing student performances in the class was the Participation rubric that I asked them to fill out during the last week of class. Students' recollections of their attendance, preparation, and participation in discussions reflected my observations of their overall contributions and participation in the classroom. One student who met expectations acknowledged that although he missed a few classes, he always made sure to post his discussion board entries or comments for the days he was absent. Another student who admitted to missing a third of the classes said that he made sure to post his discussion board entries and comments every week. Several students wrote that they were dealing with numerous outside responsibilities or distractions – e.g., one student's father had a heart attack; another student had to pick up work; another had Covid the second week of the semester; others referred to the cumulative stress they faced throughout the semester. In many cases, students provided explanations that clarified to me why they were struggling. Those insights will enable me to address similar situations going forward.

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

My observations and analysis of the assessment data for SM 4260 makes it clear that students need to have a better understanding of my expectations from the first day of class. I also need to be attentive to outside influences impacting their participation (or absences) and to address them more quickly rather than waiting until the last week of class to administer an instrument that provides such insight. The following will be implemented to achieve the benchmark for this class:

- In preparation for future classes, it will be helpful to focus on providing readings that relate better to undergraduate student interests. The world of 2022 is very different from the world of 2011 when I last taught this class. Understandings of globalization have changed since that time as well. It will be important to account for how Covid-19 revealed the interconnectedness of the world, especially through sport. Readings need to reflect that reality.
- While I geared this class to specific interests of students in the class, I still believe a course in the Globalization of Sport needs to expose students to sports that are not as well-known or popular in North America (e.g., rugby in New Zealand; Australian-rules football; cricket in India; hurling in Ireland; kabaddi in Asia). Having outside speakers from other countries can inform students and broaden their interests to gain a more global perspective. In this class, we had two guest speakers (Dr. Cho spoke about the 2002 World Cup of Soccer co-hosted by Korea, and Dr. June Won spoke about the future of the PGA and the Saudi Golf League). In addition, I posted an interview of a former student, Everett Fitzhugh, who recently became a member of the first all-Black announcing team for the NHL's latest expansion team, the Seattle Kraken. His insights were especially inspiring to Sport Management students. Having guest speakers is a great way to inform and inspire students.

- When studying the upcoming Soccer World Cup that will be held in Qatar later this year, we read about the abuse of migrants from countries like Nepal who traveled to Qatar to work on building facilities. Subjects like that are important to cover and can be eye-opening to students. When we talked about American football, around the time of the Super Bowl, we read about the practice of ‘hiding the homeless’ that happened right in the U.S. It is important to show students the ‘seedy side’ of sport that often gets obscured in grand spectacles like the Super Bowl.
- The most important thing that I can do for students in their written assignments is to provide prompt and relevant feedback. While I did not always give immediate feedback on discussion board entries, the TA did a good job of providing feedback on their comments. I need to commit to providing weekly feedback and comment on student submissions in class.
- Even though I reiterated in class that 2 comments were due each week, it still did not register with several students that they were required to write two comments each week that they did not do DB entries. While it is ultimately their responsibility to keep up with assignments, that is another reason I need to provide prompt feedback.
- In future classes, when it becomes clear that students are not prepared to discuss assigned readings, I need to give pop quizzes to hold them accountable and let them know that I expect them to prepare for each class.
- As noted above, students performed well on the final group presentations, which suggests that it may be good to do additional presentations throughout the semester to encourage greater collaboration.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 4270 Sport in Contemporary U.S. Society: AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 1 - Locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources</b>					
<b>SLO 5 - Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form.</b>					
<b>Direct: Current Event Presentation (Verbal)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	19	19	100%	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Direct: Current Event Presentation Articles (Written)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	19	19	100%	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment Survey</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	19	18	94%	3: Exceeds expectation

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *SM 4270 – Sport in Contemporary U.S. Society* learn to evaluate current issues in the sport industry through analyses of scholarly and professional literature. This is a new course that was taught for the first-time during Spring 2022. Among the topics explored in this course were sports and media, sport symbols, behaviors of sport constituents and deviance in sport, structured inequality in sport, and athlete development.

In doing this assessment, I used the following SLOs:

- Locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources
- Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in verbal form

These SLOs were evaluated using the current event presentations. For this assignment, students paired up in groups of three and led a discussion on a current event topic that is impacting college athletics. The professor was required to approve each topic two weeks prior to the scheduled presentation. Additionally, each group was required to provide the professor and class with a reading list at least one week prior to the presentation date.

For the indirect assessment of the SLOs, students were asked several questions related to perceptions about their ability to locate research articles on their chosen current event topic using research databases, to evaluate information from research articles on their topic, to communicate information clearly and concisely during their presentation, 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 concerning their perceived ability to complete the task.

### Interpretation of the Results

As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students exceeded expectations on the current event presentation (100% of the class receiving a B- or higher). Students chose appropriate topics that corresponded with the week's subject matter, found empirical articles from appropriate research databases to provide the class background information on the topic, and led the entire class period in a discussion of their chosen topic. All of the students in this course were seniors or second semester juniors so they had prior experience using research databases and giving oral presentations in class.

The indirect assessment of the students' perceived ability for several tasks was high. I believe this is due to thoroughly explaining the directions for the assignment and where they should look for research articles during one of our class meetings. Additionally, as stated earlier, the students at this point in their college career have had a variety of opportunities to search for appropriate sources and present that material to their peers in class.

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

Overall, I was very happy with how this assignment, and the overall course, went especially considering it was the first time teaching it. However, I do believe that it is important to reflect upon what can be done to continue to improve the course. Based on the learning outcomes used to assess this course, I will add an additional written component where students need to synthesize all the literature used to provide the background information for their presentation. The breakdown will need to include the article cited in APA format, major findings, theory and methods used, and the results.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 4500 Sport Revenues and Expenditures: AY  
2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 6 – Collaborate with others in diverse group settings</b>					
<b>Direct: Pardon the Interruption Group Presentation</b>	80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+	77	73	95	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: Course Evaluation (questions and frequency below)</b>	80% of students selected 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 (1=lowest, 5=highest)	36	36	100	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Question 9: The instructor fosters an environment of diversity and inclusion</b>					
1= Strongly Disagree (0)	2= Disagree (0)	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree (0)	4= Agree (17)	5= Strongly Agree (19)	

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in SM 4500- *Sport Revenues and Expenditures* are required to complete a variety of assignments. Broken down below are the course materials assigned in both Fall 21 and Spring 22, variations are a result of new faculty joining the Sport Management program and adjusting based on course outcomes from the Fall semester. New faculty joined four days prior to the start of the Fall term.

Fall 21

- Seven quizzes covering course text and ancillary materials
- Midterm and Final Exam covering course text and ancillary materials
- Assignment #1: Financial Statements
  - Covers the primary financial statements used in sport finance
    - Balance sheet
    - Income Statement
    - Cash Flow
    - Retained Earnings
- Assignment #2: Capital Budgeting
  - Covers primary terminology with regards to budgeting
  - Students must complete calculations for incremental and cumulative cash flow
  - Students must make budgeting decisions based on payback period with regards to maximum periods outlined in the assignment
- Pardon the Interruption presentations on current Sport Finance issues and situations
  - Groups must prepare scripts comparable to the short *Pardon the Interruption*
  - 5 topics, one required to be strictly finance related

- 8-10 minutes in length presentation with accompanying slides
- Requires groups to be engaging and knowledgeable on presented materials

Spring 22

- Attend various guest speaker engagements
- Midterm and Final exam covering course text and ancillary materials
- Seven discussion boards on current financially relevant events in the sport industry
- Four case studies based on course readings
- Twelve reading quizzes covering course text and ancillary materials
- Pardon the Interruption presentations on current Sport Finance issues and situations
  - Groups must prepare scripts comparable to the short *Pardon the Interruption*
  - 5 topics, one required to be strictly finance related
  - 8-10 minutes in length presentation with accompanying slides
  - Requires groups to be engaging and knowledgeable on presented materials

All assignments are designed to enhance students grasp of the financial elements of the sport industry. Each assignment emphasizes a different component, with the final group presentations weaving in numerous skills acquired during the semester. These final presentations allow students to collect and present information on current events happening in the financial sector of the sport industry. Groups must work together, arranging times to put together materials and practice presenting in an engaging manner. Group case studies introduced in Spring 22 also allowed students to work in diverse groups with their peers, with groups changing for each case study. Topics varied based on the most recent materials covered in the course text. Discussion boards introduced in Spring 22 allowed students to practice communicating in a written capacity their thoughts, views, and suggestions as related to current issues/events in the financial sector of the sport industry.

Interpretation of the Results

**Program SLO:**

**Collaborate with others in diverse group settings  
(Assignment: Pardon the Interruption Group Presentation)**

Direct Measure

As shown in the results table, students did very well with this expectation. 73 out of 77 earned a C+ or higher on their Pardon the Interruption Presentations. This indicates the group exceeded the benchmark at 95%.

Indirect Measure

Based on the student self-assessment, indirect measure of the student’s perceived experiences of diversity and inclusion in the classroom resulted in exceeding the benchmark. Of the 36 respondents, 36 (100%) indicated a 4 or 5 (agree/strongly agree) with regards to “The instructor fosters an environment of diversity and inclusion”.

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

As revealed in the assessment, students exceeded expectation in meeting the benchmark for SLO *Collaborate with others in diverse group settings*. Of the 77 students who took *Sport Revenues and Expenditures* in Fall 21 and Spring 22, 73 received a C+ or higher for their Pardon the Interruption Group Presentations. These presentations required teamwork, research, practice, and an in-depth knowledge of the 5 topics selected to be covered in the presentation. Of these 5 topics, one was required to strictly be financially focused. 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 2022-2023 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.
- Beyond the SLO addressed above, students indicated a need for more in-depth review of course terminology and application to real world scenarios they may face beyond graduation. Future students may benefit from decreased class sizes or a longer course period, as opposed to the current MWF 50-minute format. This longer structured class may provide a less truncated introduction to new materials, with entire chapters being covered in one session, with time allotted at the end for discussion and examples.
- Further integrate teaching assistants into the classroom, making them accessible for students to engage with when the professor may be with other students/groups.
- Provide students more opportunities during class to engage with their peers, specifically in discussion. One way of doing this may be pulling news articles for the day to discuss in small groups as to how they relate to the financial sector of the sport industry.

Sport Administration (Master's) Student Learning Outcomes Matrix –  
Academic Year 2021-22

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for HMSL 6330 Marketing Strategies in Sport &  
Leisure Services: AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 4 - Speak clearly at a level appropriate for listeners.</b>					
<b>Direct: Oral Presentation (Verbal)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	13	13	100%	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Direct: Marketing Consultant's Feedback (Verbal and/or Script)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	13	10	77%	1: Does not meet expectation
<b>Indirect: Self-Assessment Survey (Group Performance)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	12	11	92%	2: Meets expectation
<b>Indirect: Self-Assessment Survey (Peer Evaluation)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	13	12	92%	2: Meets expectation

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *HMSL 6330 – Marketing Strategies in Sport and Leisure Services* are required to complete a group semester project: sport marketing (oral) presentation. Since the course delivery method was 100% asynchronous online, student groups had to upload 30-minute audio-visual presentations by using online digital platforms such as Studio, Camtasia, YouTube, etc. The presentations summarized the groups' marketing memoranda, which examined relevant market profiles of selected sport entities, analyzed organizational marketing variables, formulated marketing mix, and suggested implementation and control process. The memorandum was a semester-long project which students collectively worked on. Thus, the presentations covered a series of predetermined items as following: (1) introduction of sport organization; (2) internal and external contingencies; (3) mission statement & marketing

objectives/goals; (4) market segmentation, targeting, and positioning; (5) product development and promotion; (6) sponsorship and pricing mix; (7) distribution; and (8) implementation and control system. Given the extensive amount of the information covered by the presentations, groups were advised to be efficient and succinct in the audio-visual communication. Students also individually completed “marketing consultant’s feedback” to the group presentations that they did not participate (verbal and/or script).

Initially, students in the class were assigned to multiple groups representing four (4) sport organizations, i.e., LPGA, Adidas, the Cleveland Browns, and the U.S. Tennis Association. The organizations were chosen to encompass different types of sport product and services (women’s professional sport, merchandising, men’s professional sport, and amateur participation sport). The groups sequentially completed different chapters of the marketing memoranda throughout the semester. The oral presentations and feedbacks were designed to epitomize their work products as groups and individuals. At the end of the semester, students conducted self-assessment of group performance and peer evaluation. The presentations and consultant’s feedback were used as direct assessment tools for the student learning outcome while the students’ self-assessment of group performance and peer evaluation provided indirect assessments tools for the course.

#### Interpretation of the Results

The Student Assessment Results Summary Table shows that students performed better on the oral presentation (100%; exceed expectation) than the marketing consultant’s feedback (77%; does not meet expectation), self-assessments of group performance (92%; meets expectation) and peer evaluation (92%; meets expectation). The marketing consultant’s feedback required individual students to express more elaborated reasoning based on foundational knowledge about overall marketing process with respect to the group presentations. Thus, the assignment was more demanding than the oral presentations which would basically be the reiteration of what groups had done throughout the semester. The self-assessment of group performance and peer evaluation also revealed that some students faced challenging issues in dealing with group collaboration settings, presumably, mainly related to the asynchronous online course format.

#### Action Plan: Assessment-Based Changes to the Course

Given the result, some students would need to supplement their substantive knowledge about sport marketing. It was revealed especially through the marketing consultant’s feedbacks that call for more specific prescriptive suggestions for give marketing plans. In addition to the room for improvement identified in terms of substantive knowledge, a few students struggled in using digital technology to produce their audio-visual presentations. Lastly, group collaboration seemed to be challenging probably due to the lack of personal interactions relating to the course delivery format (100% asynchronous online). Given the identified problems, the following changes will be implemented for the upcoming academic year to pursue better student learning outcome:

- More coverage on the basic concept of strategic marketing management. Specifically, more emphasis will be placed on the big-picture view of sport marketing practices. Every session would be initiated with reminders of the conceptual relevant of the covered topics in the context of the birds-eye view of strategic sport marketing.

- A series of small session activities will require students to produce mini audio-visual marketing materials so that they can individually learn how to use some digital production technology in marketing communication.
- Assuming that the course will be delivered 100% online again, the instructor would hold more virtual office hours during which students may review any missing concepts based on synchronous interactions with the instructor. In addition, student groups may submit session activity logs whenever they arrange online discussion/work sessions for course activities.

## Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for HMSL 6350 Sport and Society: AY 2021-22

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
SLO 3 - Write clearly, demonstrating grammatical precision and avoiding unnecessary jargon					
SLO 5 - Articulate reasoned beliefs in a civil manner					
<b>Direct: Olympic Bid Project - Final Paper</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	20	20	100%	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Direct: Final Presentation for Olympic Bid Presentation</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	20	20	100%	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Assessment of Final Group Presentations</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	20	20	100%	3: Exceeds expectation

### Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *HMSL 6350 – Sport and Society* (a graduate course) were assessed in SLOs #3 (“Write clearly, demonstrating grammatical precision and avoiding unnecessary jargon”) and #4 (“Articulate reasoned beliefs in a civil manner”). All assessments were based upon the culminating Olympic Bid Project that students worked on throughout the semester. For that project, five students signed up for one of four groups at the beginning of the semester and created a Bid for the 2030 Winter Olympics, the next Olympic site to be chosen. Cities in the running for the 2030 Olympics include: Barcelona/Pyrenees (SPAIN); Salt Lake City (USA); Sapporo (JAPAN); and Vancouver (CAN). Since this class is about the relationship between Sport & Society, each group was asked to evaluate the city’s sociocultural climate in relationship to the following six factors: 1. disability; 2. environment; 3. gender; 4. national identity; 5. race; and 6. sexuality. Three assessments were completed to evaluate the students’ performances in presenting their Olympic Bids: (1) Olympic Bid Final Paper: addressed the 6 elements listed above, with suggestions for how to make the city more inclusive and/or environmentally-friendly for participants and fans (written assignment worth maximum of 120 points); (2) Olympic Bid Presentation: took place on the date that the final exam was scheduled and consisted of each team doing a 20-25 minute presentation in which they made their case for the bid. Five faculty members served as judges who provided feedback and voted after all presentations had been made; once the votes were tallied, the winning team received 30 points, 2<sup>nd</sup> place received 29 points, 3<sup>rd</sup> place received 28 points, and the 4<sup>th</sup> place team received 27 points. (3) Self-

assessment of Olympic Bid Project: Students completed forms using a scale of 1-5 (where 1 = contributed least, to 5 = contributed most) to evaluate their individual participation as well as their assessment of each group member. Students could include qualitative comments about what each team member contributed. The self-assessments and qualitative comments provide an indirect assessment of how effectively students participated in groups and contributed to the group's efforts on the written and oral presentation.

### Interpretation of the Results

For the Olympic Bid Project Final Paper, all students obtained scores that were no lower than 86.7%, which is a high standard, and reflects how excellent the presentations were compared to previous Sport and Society classes. The group that scored highest and won the Bid Presentation (Salt Lake City) also received the highest percentage on their Olympic Bid Final Paper (i.e., 97.9%). Throughout the semester, groups had to complete preliminary assignments – 1. Meeting with me; 2. Submitting an Annotated Bibliography; and 3. Submitting a rough draft. The group that won the bid also received the highest scores on the preliminary assignments, suggesting that they kept up with the work as they went along. For the Olympic Bid presentation, the fixed range of scores (i.e., 27-30) meant that all groups received 90% or above. Based upon the judges' ratings, the team that scored the most judges' points received 30 points, the team that scored the second-most points received 29 points and so on. My rationale for using that fixed range was to acknowledge that all groups worked diligently throughout the semester and deserved to have the highest score possible. However, this semester, the top three groups were very close in the judges' scores as well as in my evaluations. The fourth group did not receive such high scores from the judges, which reflected the lack of effort they appeared to make compared to the other groups. I need to rethink whether to use a fixed scale in the future if it does not adequately reflect each team's efforts. The Self-Assessment of the Olympic Bid Project was interesting for several reasons. The top two teams in their bid presentation and final papers had the most divergent scores in their self-assessments of team members. In both cases, there appeared to be two people who put in more effort than the others. By contrast, the 3<sup>rd</sup> team appeared to be most cohesive and almost every person on that team wrote how much they enjoyed working on their team and acknowledged that each member of the team respected one another. In retrospect, I believe that team operated most effectively and was most inclusive, and yet the results were not borne out by their efforts (when it came to winning the bid). My impression of the group that finished last was that they overinflated how much each member contributed to the group effort, which paled in comparison to the other groups. That group had more student absences and I'm not sure they met outside of class as I know other groups did. Overall, they did not seem to be as invested in this project as the other three groups.

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

Based upon my observations and analysis of the assessment data for HMSL 6350, and from reviewing student course evaluations, I believe that I can do more to address the Olympic Bid Project from the beginning of the semester so that students are clear about what they need to do to complete it successfully. These are my suggestions for assessment-based changes:

- As mentioned above, the team that won the final bid for the 2030 Olympics also did the best on preliminary assignments. One thing that may have reduced the motivation of other groups when doing their initial assignments was knowing that I would (retroactively) pro-rate their scores on the preliminary assignments based upon their final

submission. Because I provided feedback on what they needed to address in their preliminary assignments, they knew what corrections needed to be made. That brought scores up considerably for the groups that didn't do the work on the preliminary assignments. I need to rethink how to make each team more accountable for their preliminary assignments.

- When assessing the Final Bid Presentations, I may also need to rethink using a fixed scale that automatically puts everyone at 90% or above. It was clear to me that the first three groups worked extremely hard and were fully engaged in the process. It does not seem fair to them that other students get to slide by when they do not work as diligently. I might need to consider how to combine the judges' scores with a fixed scale. One reason I could not do that this year is that not all judges' feedback was returned to me. I need to make sure that I get that in the future.
- As discussed previously, it was interesting to note that members of the top two teams did not appear to view the distribution of the workload the same as the lower two teams. Having worked in group scenarios, I know what it feels like to be one who puts the project together and/or edits for others. It doesn't seem fair, but it may be a drawback, especially with Type A individuals in Grad School. I wish that every team could have been as cohesive as the #3 team was. Perhaps it would help to have more frequent assessments of the group dynamics.
- Several students wrote in course evaluations that they were not clear about what they needed to do to complete the Olympic Bid Project and it sometimes seemed overwhelming. My sense was that I had started to introduce the project earlier in the semester than usual and had given preliminary assignments that would build up to the final project. In future semesters, I would articulate the entire assignment in the syllabus and post it on Canvas at the beginning of the semester.
- One student wrote in the course evaluation that it would help to have rubrics so that they knew what to include when doing the assignment. Again, my thought was that I had provided clarity and, at times, provided rubrics. However, it would be helpful to provide those materials earlier in the semester, so the students did not feel like they had to scramble at the last minute to finish their assignments.
- Several students commented both in evaluations and on their final Discussion Board entry that they wished they had been able to spend more time working together in class on their Bid Projects. I didn't want to spend too much time doing that and assumed that they had time outside of class, but for groups that had multiple absences, they obviously missed out on time that could have helped them in preparing.
- In their Conclusions on the Discussion Board, several students commented about feeling more comfortable sharing in a small group as opposed to the overall classroom setting. That is one of the reasons I include small group discussions. But I think it sometimes helps to change up the groups rather than keep the same people all the time.
- The final thing I want to think about is how to assess successful group work – is it when it seems to produce the best product or when people really grow to respect each other? I loved watching the group that was so cohesive and wrote about how much they enjoyed working together. I wondered if the people who 'carried' their groups felt resentment

toward the members who did not do as much work. Likewise, did those who were rated lower by other group members realize they were not pulling their part of the load? Group dynamics are interesting to observe. I wonder how important they are in the final grade.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for HMSL 6360 Social Psychology of Sport:  
AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 1 - Analyze, interpret, synthesize, and evaluate literature appropriate to the area of study</b>					
<b>SLO 4 - Speak clearly at a level appropriate for listeners.</b>					
<b>Direct: Article Critique Report</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	18	16	89%	2: Meets expectation
<b>Indirect: Survey of perceived ability to critically analyze and interpret scholarly articles</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	15	15	100%	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Direct: Classroom Discussion Lead</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	18	18	100%	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Survey of perceived ability to speak clearly</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	15	15	100%	3: Exceeds expectation

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *HMSL 6360 – Social Psychology of Sport* completed assignments related to the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) of: a) Analyze, interpret, synthesize, and evaluate literature appropriate to the area of study, and b) Speak clearly at a level appropriate for listeners. For the direct assessment of the first SLO, the Article Critique Report required students to locate several scholarly, empirical articles related to a course topic. The professor would let the student know whether articles were appropriate or not for the critique and then the student selected one from the approved articles to critically analyze and interpret for the report. For the direct assessment of the second SLO, students paired up and selected a topic to lead an entire class discussion on (i.e., at least one hour). This was a two-fold task. First, each student independently led a discussion on the article that they critiqued. Second, the pair of students conducted an interview of an athlete or coach related to the selected sport psychology topic and then led a

discussion of the interviewee's responses. Students were required to facilitate the discussion to connect the interviewee's responses with the sport psychology concepts and/or theory. For the indirect assessment of the SLOs, students were asked questions related to perceptions about their ability a) to critically analyze and interpret a scholarly article on the social psychology of sport and b) to speak clearly at a level appropriate for listeners. 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 the benchmark expectation for the SLOs being measured in this course. That is, 16 out of 18 students, or 89%, earned a grade of B- or higher on one measurement tool (i.e., article critique report) and 100% on the other measurement tool (i.e., Class Discussion Lead) based on the direct assessment of the SLOs. As this is a graduate course, it is not surprising that most students were able to analyze and interpret scholarly literature related to sport psychology or being able to facilitate a classroom discussion with their peers on the topic. Students did quite well in locating appropriate articles, identifying strengths and weakness in their article, and facilitating a discussion. In fact, many students were quite comfortable taking a lead position, speaking clearly to the class, and responding to questions in a professional manner.

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., 15 out of 15) selected *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* regarding their ability a) to critically analyze and interpret a scholarly article on the social psychology of sport and b) to speak clearly at a level appropriate for listeners. 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.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for HMSL 6370 Sport and Higher Education:  
AY 2021-22**

<b>Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)</b>	<b>Identify the Benchmark</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Observed</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data</b>
<b>SLO 3 - Write clearly, demonstrating grammatical precision and avoiding unnecessary jargon.</b>					
<b>SLO 4 - Speak clearly at a level appropriate for listeners.</b>					
<b>Direct: Book Review (Written)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	21	20	95%	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Direct: Current Event Presentation (Verbal)</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	21	21	100%	3: Exceeds expectation
<b>Indirect: Student Self-Assessment Survey</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	21	21	100%	3: Exceeds expectation

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *HMSL 6370 – Sport in Higher Education* were required to complete two book reviews that each examined different facets of collegiate sports. The students were to reflect and analyze the books they read. For instance, they had to address what are the main take away points, what did they agree/disagree with, what are practical implications for various stakeholder groups (coaches, administrators, athletes, etc.).

Students also had to work in groups of three and lead a discussion on a current event topic that is impacting college athletics. The students had their topics approved prior to the presentation and were required to provide the class with empirical articles to read prior to the presentation.

The indirect measure was a brief survey given to students asking them how they perceived their ability to write and analyze the information from their chosen books. This survey was given to the graduate students to understand their familiarity with graduate research and writing. The students' belief was that they performed at a level that was consistent with their scores. Each paper was worth 25 points, and while a student may not have earned the 20/25 necessary for the benchmark on the first paper, they were able to integrate comments and feedback that they were provided and 20/21 of the students achieved at least 40/50 on the two papers combined.

### Interpretation of the Results

As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students exceeded expectations on the current event presentation (100% of the class receiving a B- or higher). During the presentations, each of the students spoke at an appropriate level, flow, and used inflection when conveying information. This is most likely due to the fact that as graduate students, half of whom were second-year graduate students, they had given many presentations previously and have learned the appropriate manner to convey information in this setting.

The indirect assessment of the students' perceived ability for several tasks was high. I believe this is due to thoroughly explaining the directions for the assignment and giving the students to the freedom to choose the topics for the books that were either the most interesting to them and/or relevant to their career aspiration. Additionally, as stated earlier, the students at this point in their college career have had a variety of opportunities to write papers in an academic setting.

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

Overall, I was very happy with how this assignment, and the overall course, went. The students were engaged in all aspects of the class and their performance reflected this. Nevertheless, I do believe that it is important to reflect upon what can be done to continue to improve the course. Based on the learning outcomes used to assess this course, I will add an additional written component where students need to synthesize all the literature used to provide the background information for their presentation. The breakdown will need to include the article cited in APA format, major findings, theory and methods used, and the results.

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for HMSL 6510 Interpretation of Quantitative Research in HMSL: AY 2021-22**

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
<b>SLO 3 - Write clearly, demonstrating grammatical precision and avoiding unnecessary jargon.</b>					
<b>Direct: Research Report</b>	80% of students meet score range from B- to A+	21	20	95%	3: Exceeds expectation

Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools

Students enrolled in *HMSL 65100 – Interpretation of Quantitative Research in HMSL* completed an assignment related to the Student Learning Outcome (SLO): *Write clearly, demonstrating grammatical precision and avoiding unnecessary jargon*. For the direct assessment of this SLO, students were required to write a research report that consisted of writing the results of their analysis of a set of data and then provided a discussion section that summarizes the findings and integrates it with existing research.

Interpretation of the Results

As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students met the benchmark expectation for the SLO being measured in this course. That is, 11 out of 13 students, or 85%, earned a grade of B- or higher on the measurement tool (i.e., research report). The benchmark is 80%. The two students who did not meet the benchmark fell just shy of expectation by earning a 78%, or C+. Instructions were clear and examples were provided on how to write the results and discussion sections in a concise manner. While the writing was technical in nature (i.e., writing and interpreting statistical results), the students achieved the SLO of writing clearly with precision and avoided unnecessary jargon.

Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course

As revealed in the assessment data, students did well with meeting the benchmark for the SLO measured in this course. Although changes may not appear to be needed, one change will be implemented for AY 2022-23 related to the measurement of the benchmark for this course. Specifically, an indirect assessment of students' perceived ability to write clearly, demonstrating grammatical precision and avoiding unnecessary jargon will be included in the future. Since this was an online course, interactions were through email or Zoom interactions and most questions related to performing statistical analyses and not on the writing component. However, an indirect assessment will provide an opportunity to assess potential concerns and address them prior to final submission of the research report.

## Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix Academic Year 2021-22

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
<b>OEG 1: Keep up to date with the changing sport industry and mirror those practices within our program</b>			
Practicum and Internship Site Supervisor 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
<b>OEG 2: Provide professional development opportunities to prepare students for the transition to the Sport Industry.</b>			
Measure 1: Senior graduation Interview - Direct	85% of students will agree that the professional development opportunities we provide are instrumental in preparing them for transition into the sport industry.	90% agreed	Exceeds expectations
<b>OEG 3: All faculty are engaged in the sport management industry and/or academia</b>			
Measure 1: Faculty activity - Direct	Each faculty member will attend one sport management-related conference or serve as an industry consultant at least once per academic year	5 of 5 full-time faculty	Exceeds expectations
<b>OEG 4: Increase communication with Advisory Board</b>			
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
<p><i>All goals were achieved. Nonetheless and based on feedback from students, faculty, and industry professionals, we revised the Sport Management curriculum (undergraduate) to integrate new Sport Management course options for students and updated the check sheet. The changes were approved by the university in spring 2021 and were available for students in fall 2021.</i></p>			

## 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 Accrator(s): Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA)  
Institutional Accrator: Higher Learning Commission (HLC)  
Date of Next Comprehensive Program Accreditation Review: 2023  
Date of Next Comprehensive Institutional Accreditation Review: 2022  
URL where accreditation status is stated: <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 2021-22 # of Graduates: \_\_\_\_\_ 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 2021-22  
# of Transfers: 21 (transferred in); 11 transferred out Transfer Rate: N/A
4. Graduates Entering Graduate School: Year: AY 2021-22  
# of Graduates: 67 # Entering Graduate School: Data not collected
5. Job Placement (if appropriate): Year: AY 2021-22  
# of Graduates: 67 # Employed: Data not collected

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

**SECTION 3: CHANGES TO ACCREDITATION PRINCIPLES  
(COMPLETED BY ACCREDITED PROGRAMS  
AND PROGRAMS IN CANDIDACY STATUS)  
ONLY FOR THE 2021-22 ANNUAL REPORT**

The *Accreditation Principles and Self-Study Preparation* document has been revised and we expect you to review the document and familiarize yourself with the changes. This section in this year's Annual Report informs you about the more significant changes and asks you to show compliance. Changes include: A defined set of elements all program-level strategic plans must have (Principle 2), reconfigured Common Professional Component (CPC) areas based on changes in sport industry (Principle 3) and ensuring adequate resources to attain and maintain accreditation (Principle 6).

1. Describe your program's strategic planning process by answering the following questions:
  - a) What is the current time period of your program-level strategic plan? (e.g., 2020-25)
  - b) Provide a copy of the strategic planning document OR a tracking matrix that describes the strategic planning goals, timeline for implementation and resources (human and financial) required.

The time period of our strategic plan is from 2014-2021. We were granted an extension to conduct our self-study for reaccreditation due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Review the adjusted common professional component areas in the new *Accreditation Principles* document. In preparation for the upcoming academic year (2022-23), are there any area(s) your program does not cover? What justification do you have for not addressing these CPC area(s)? (e.g., mission of program, resources, etc.)

We are covering each of the common professional component areas within our curriculum.

3. What time and resources are provided to the person(s) who manages the COSMA accreditation process?

Dr. Sungho Cho is coordinating the Reaffirmation of Accreditation process. All faculty are helping him write the final document. We are not given release time for this endeavor.