Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes Matrix – Academic Year 2017 – 2018

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 1 -** Critical thinking and reasoning skills to solve sport-related problems  ***SM 3900 – Legal Aspects of Sport and Recreation*** | | | | | |
| Direct: Prospectus (Written) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 70 | 61 | 87% | 2: Meets expectation |
| Direct: Memorandum (Written) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 70 | 70 | 100% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| Direct: Oral Argument (Verbal) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 70 | 70 | 100% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Peer Midpoint Analysis (Written) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 95 | 81 | 85% | 2: Meets expectation |
| **SLO 2 -** Communicate information clearly, concisely, and accurately in written and verbal form  ***SM 4250 – Sport and Gender*** | | | | | |
| Direct: Blog Entries (5) (Written) – SM 4250 | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 100 | 76 | 76% | 1: Does not meet expectation |
| Direct: Individual Comments (7) Written | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 100 | 72 | 72% | 1: Does not meet expectation |
| **SLO 3 -** Collaborate with others in diverse group settings  ***SM 4250 – Sport and Gender*** | | | | | |
| Direct: Collaborative Blog entries (Written) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 100 | 85 | 85% | 2: Meets expectation |
| Direct: Final Group Presentations (Verbal) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 100 | 100 | 100% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| **SLO 4 -** Quality solutions to complex sport industry problems  ***SM 4500 – Managing Revenues and Expenditures in Sport Enterprise*** | | | | | |
| Direct: Chapter Review Assignments (Written) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 69 | 55 | 80% | 2: Meets expectation |
| Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: College of EDHD online survey | 80% positive responses of "Strongly Agree" to "Agree" | 69 | 64 | 93% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Student Self-Assessment: College of EDHD online survey | 80% positive responses of "Strongly Agree" to "Agree" | 69 | 59 | 86% | 2: Meets expectation |
| **SLO 5 -** Locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources  ***SM 4500 – Managing Revenues and Expenditures in Sport Enterprise*** | | | | | |
| Direct: PTI Presentation Script (Written) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 69 | 63 | 91% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| Direct: PTI Presentation Performance (Verbal) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 69 | 66 | 95% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Locate information | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 69 | 65 | 94% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Organize information | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 69 | 65 | 94% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Evaluate information | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 69 | 65 | 94% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Analyze data | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 69 | 61 | 88% | 2: Meets expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Communicate (Written) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 69 | 66 | 95% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| Indirect: Survey - Communicate (Verbal) | 80% of students meet score range from C+ to A+ | 69 | 63 | 91% | 3: Exceeds expectation |
| ***\*\*Explanation of course action for intended outcomes not realized:***  **Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 3900: AY 2017-18**  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. 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.  In addition, 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 CBA. The jury must complete the midpoint analysis for each arbitration case that they do not participate as advocates. Since the flow of the analysis basically reflected the logical steps to make the final decisions for the arbitration cases, the extent to which the jury correctly completed the mid-point analysis was an indirect assessment tool for the students’ performance.  Interpretation of the Results  The Student Assessment Results Summary Table shows that students performed better (100%; exceed expectations) on the memorandum and oral argument than the prospectus (87%; meets expectations) and peer midpoint analysis (85%; meets expectations). The prospectus required students to explore many possible comparable players in the league and come up with the arguable market values of the arbitrated players in consideration of the CBA provisions that the real world MLB Arbitration implements. While many students in the class seemingly understood how MLB players would become eligible for the arbitration (relatively simple concept), the result suggests that a fair number of students could not establish the plausible market values of the arbitrated players based on the comparable players in accordance with the CBA provisions (more critical thinking and reasoning process required). Only after did the instructor provide specific feedbacks and detailed guidelines in response to the submitted prospectus, they could perform better on the full memoranda and oral arguments. It is presumed that a majority of the students were comfortable with the presentation format and group project environment since all of them were either juniors or seniors with a plenty of such activities previously. Nevertheless, working on the project in light of the governing CBA provisions would have been more challenging to some.  On the other hand, the indirect measure, i.e., the peer midpoint analysis, revealed that some students failed to demonstrate their command of knowledge on the relevant CBA procedure despite the fact that they had completed the prospectus as well as memorandum prior to the decision-maker role playing. Again, the CBA provisions might still be demanding to some students even after they actively participated in the semester project. The indirect measure basically reveals the extent to which the jury had reached decisions based on the right analytic methods proscribed in the CBA. Thus, the interpretation and full synthesis of the complicated CBA rules to make the final decisions would have been harder tasks than just presenting and arguing their cases within groups.  Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course  According to the data, some students need to improve on their critical thinking and reasoning skills in terms of the full understanding, synthesis, and application of the CBA provisions in relation to the semester project. Although they performed relatively well in the second phase of the semester project, i.e., memorandum and oral argument, they should have demonstrated more command on the first advocative paper, i.e., prospectus. In addition, the indirect measure (peer midpoint analysis) also suggests that the students would need to develop more coherent understanding and rule synthesis skills. Given the problem, the following changes will be implemented for AY 2018-19 in pursuit of better learning outcomes:   * More closely supervised group discussion sessions for prospectus. 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 discussion so that more linear development would become achievable. * More class sessions and time covering the basic concept of MLB Arbitration. Previously, the instructor assigned the reading materials for the process and explained the relevant provisions throughout the semester. Additional explanation of the process possibly using more recent real world cases might be helpful. * 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 questions about the dispute resolution procedure will be included in the exam so that the students would be engaged with the concept more. * Grading the peer midpoint analysis. This assignment was counted toward attendance credits only. The instructor will grade the decision making document in the future.   **Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 4250: AY 2017-18**  Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools  Students enrolled in *SM 4250 – Sport and Gender* are required to complete a Blog Project that consists of two parts. Part I entails **Writing** an Individual Introduction and Conclusion as well as doing 12 weekly Entries and/or Comments during the first 14 weeks of the semester. In the *Introductory Blog Entry*, students are asked to write about their sports’ backgrounds and interests, in addition to naming the male and female athlete they would pay to see, and why. The latter question relates to discussion we have in class about an article entitled “Who the pros would pay to see” (McCallum, 2004). In the *Concluding Blog Entry*, students write about what they learned, based upon the readings, discussion, blog entries and/or comments. In addition, they are asked to indicate how they might apply what they learned in potential future jobs. Part II entails doing a 20-minute *Final Group Presentation* on a topic that demonstrates and analyzes the relationship between Sport and Gender. This presentation is done verbally and meets the **Participation** Program SLO. A maximum of 4 or 5 students in each Group are required to submit their power point and/or an outline of references (in proper APA format) to the professor at least two days prior to their in-class Final Presentation. The Final Group Presentations are completed during the last two weeks of class. These Presentations are worth a maximum of 15 points, and are calculated by adding 5 points for each of 3 components: 1. The Overall Group Presentation was evaluated by other students in class (on a scale of 1-5, where 5 = excellent); 2. Individual Evaluations – each student was evaluated by other students in class (on a scale of 1-5, where 5 = excellent); 3. Power point was evaluated by the professor (on a scale of 1-5, where 5 = excellent). The three scores were added for a maximum score of 15.  Students receive feedback (written and points) from the Professor and Teaching Assistant on their written (weekly) Blog Entries and/or Comments. Based upon that feedback, students are able to revise and resubmit one entry (or comments) during the first 3 weeks. Each written Blog Entry is worth a maximum of 10 points per week. Points are assigned on the basis of the following criteria: length of entry (minimum of 250 words); clarity in writing (absence of grammatical and spelling errors); originality of ideas; critical thinking; relationship to Sport and Gender. Students are required to submit full-length entries (250 words) for the Introduction, Conclusion, and 3 more individual entries throughout the semester (on a rotating basis). The rotation of assignments is made by the Professor and Teaching Assistant and is posted on the Blog Page on Canvas. During the weeks that a student does not write a main entry, s/he is required to write a maximum of 2 comments in response to two different blog entries by other students. Each comment is worth a maximum of 5 points and is evaluated on the basis of the following criteria: length of comment (minimum of 125 words); clarity in writing (absence of grammatical and spelling errors); originality of ideas (not just echoing what other students have written); critical thinking; relationship to Sport and Gender.  Another way that I assessed students’ **Participation** was to analyze an assignment that required small groups to **write** two collaborative blog entries (Budgeting Assignment and “Sex sells”). Each group worked in class on reports that they posted on the Class Blog. The entries were evaluated based upon the criteria for regular blog entries and each person in the group received the same number of points (maximum = 10 points) based on those criteria.  Interpretation of the Results  As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students did better at completing collaborative assignments (Group Blog entries = 85%; Final Group Presentations = 100%) compared to the individual written reports (5 Blog entries = 76%; Comments = 72%). Many students indicated in their final Blog entries that they enjoyed doing small group work, and many Final Group Presentations reflected that preference through the groups’ originality and enthusiasm. Since most students taking this course are at least juniors, they have likely worked together in groups in their previous classes. In addition, since each group received feedback on their presentations before doing them in-class, this ensured that they were better-prepared for doing this assignment.  The assignments on which students did more poorly were the *Comments* on blog entries, which may be explained in several ways. Although I emphasized in class that students were to do two comments each week that they did not write individual blog entries, some students did not understand that they were required to do *two* comments instead of one. Unfortunately, I did not realize this until late in the semester when I noticed that pattern. It would help to reinforce that aspect of the assignment earlier in the semester by notifying students who only posted one comment each week. Even though I repeated in each class when written comments were due (each Thursday before class), several students said that they were accustomed to seeing reminders of due dates for all assignments on Canvas. I am not sure why the percentage who did not complete 80% or more on comments was highest in the final class that I taught (18/33 = 54%). Perhaps it was the time of the class; perhaps I did not reiterate the dates that assignments were due; perhaps the lower completion rate was due to a greater number of absences in that class.  Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course  Based upon my observations and analysis of the assessment data for SM 4250, it is clear that students need to have a better understanding of when written assignments for blog entries and comments are due. The following changes will be implemented for AY 2018-19 to help achieve the benchmark for this course:   * The most important thing that I can do for students in their written assignments is to provide prompt and relevant feedback. Doing that on a weekly basis is challenging. For that reason, I tried to provide weekly feedback on blog entries while the TA provided feedback on comments. Often, it felt like I was providing the same feedback week after week, which led me to believe that students were not reading the feedback that we provided. It would be helpful to use indirect measures (e.g., a survey) at several points in the semester to ensure that they understand the feedback I have provided. * Even though I reiterated in class when the comments were due and the number of comments that were to be submitted, some students did not realize until the end of the semester that they were required to write two comments each week that they did not do blog entries. While that is ultimately their responsibility, it may be necessary to reinforce that reminder by calling students in to remind them personally what they are assigned to do. That would also provide an opportunity to connect with students who might otherwise not engage fully in class. * As one student suggested, it would be helpful to post due date reminders on Canvas to notify students when their comments are due. Thus, I will implement that change on Canvas. * One thing that I learned from the last two semesters’ final presentations is that students tend to listen more attentively when they are quizzed using a format such as ‘Kahoot’ at the end of class. While I do not want to make it an expectation of every class, it would be good to experiment with some form of immediate feedback that reinforces the importance of listening attentively in class. I have come to realize that simply being present in class does not guarantee that students comprehend what was said.   **Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for SM 4500: AY 2017-18**  Brief Explanation of Assessment Tools  Students enrolled in *SM 4500 – Managing Revenues and Expenditures in Sport Enterprise* are required to complete three Chapter Review Assignments and one presentation. Assignments are intended to increase students’ proficiency in analyzing real and hypothetical financial cases. The purpose of the Assignments is to apply basic financial concepts and discuss sport and entertainment business practices based on the financial and statistical data and findings. • Assignment 1: Chapter 2. Analyzing Financial Statement and Ratios  • Assignment 2: Calculation Problems (Chapter 3, Chapter 4, Chapter 5)  • Assignment 3: Conduct and Analyze Chapter 8. Capital Budgeting The purposes of the Assignments 1 & 2 is to analyze financial data and interpret statistical findings commonly found in management research reports. The purposes of Assignment 3 are to effectively apply basic business concepts to a sport entertainment settings and to exhibit the ability to produce a computer generated financial report in a format common to the business world.  Students are also required to complete one group presentation, Pardon the Interruption (PTI). Each group prepares a rundown to perform for the classes based on the ESPN television show, Pardon the Interruption. The rundown is projected on a power point slide and the performance is timed (1:30 minutes for each topic \* 5 topics; at least one topic should be FINANCE-related issue). This is prepared and rehearsed.  Interpretation of the Results  As shown on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students did a decent job at meeting expectation (Written: 80%) for Chapter Review Assignments. In these assignments, students are required a. to fully understand the financial concepts; b. to solve complex problems and c. apply knowledge and skills to realistic settings based upon all financial findings. The Chapter Review Assignments are about meeting expectations of 80% of the class receiving a grade of C+ or higher, but this may be attributed to the difficulty that many students have with statistical and financial analyses and interpretation of these results. Unfortunately, one student did not meet the expectation. Based on the student self-Assessment, indirect assessment of the student’s perceived ability was much higher than the direct assessment of their work on the Assignments. A majority of students (93% and 86% respectively) selected *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* regarding “I learned to apply course material to improve thinking, problem solving, decisions, etc.” and “I learned how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems.”  In addition, as illustrated on the Student Assessment Results Summary Table, students did better at meeting expectations for the presentations (PTI Presentation Performance: 95%) compared to the written scripts (PTI Presentation Script: 91%). The presentations should be prepared and rehearsed based on the script, and students seem better prepared for verbal presentations. In this presentation, students are required to locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources. In this way, they will have an opportunity to search and apply what we cover in the classroom to real example in real world. The scripts are not scholarly articles but, overall, students were well prepared. There was no student who does not meet expectation on the written script and verbal presentation performance.  Action Plan: Assessment-based Changes to the Course  As revealed in the assessment data, students need to be better assistance on the Assignments and Practices despite their perceived ability to accomplish the required tasks. The following changes will be implemented for AY 2018-19 to help achieve the benchmark for this course:   * In collaboration with the Sport Management Program Coordinator, enrollment in each class section of SM 4500 for fall 2019 should be restricted to 20 students. This classroom size should be consistently reduced with the enrollment of 30 from spring 2019 as opposed to spring and fall 2017 which were around 40 students per class. * With the change in classroom size noted above, more time will be devoted to providing individual feedback and assistance during class and outside of classroom. Specifically, in each 50-minute course section, the last 10-15 minutes will be dedicated for students to work on their reviews and/or class assignments. This will allow the professor time to provide an assistance and feedback. * Consistent with current time allocation to spend lecturing on financial terminology and concepts, more time will be devoted to practical applications of such concepts allocating Practices and Assignments Preparation period. When introducing new financial concepts and principles, the professor will spend the first week of class to clarify terminology and concepts. Then, the next week will be allocated to spend on an illustrative classroom Practices that will show students step by step procedure on how to compute, apply and interpret financial data analyses. This Practices and Assignments Preparation period should help students be better prepared to fully complete their assignments. * Some students are apprehensive to ask questions during class, even if time is allotted for such assistance. Thus, students will be required to meet with the professor at least once prior to each Assignments due date. This will allow for an indirect, individual assessment of student learning. * The professor will be 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 on a monthly basis. | | | | | |

*Notes: 1) If you are using different direct and indirect measures for different degree programs, please replicate this form, using one form for each program that has different measures. If different programs use the same measures, only one copy of this form is needed.* 2) *At a minimum, you are required to use two direct and two indirect measures to assess all of your student learning outcomes. You are not required to measure each student learning outcome with more than one measure, though it is encouraged. This matrix offers space to show that you have more than one measure for each SLO, but it is not required.*

Sport Administration (Master's) Student Learning Outcomes Matrix – Academic Year 2017-18

**INTENDED OUTCOME ASSESSMENT TOOL RESULTS**

**# Observed # Meeting % Meeting Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MEASURE 1: Interpret, synthesize, and evaluate literature appropriate to Sport Administration | Direct: Written Project/Thesis/Comps  Direct: Presentation/Defense  Indirect: Self-Assessment  Indirect: Faculty/Course Evals | 9  9  9  21 | 8  9  8  19 | 100  100  89  90 | 3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEASURE 2: Integrate learning from courses taken in Sport Administration | Direct: Written Project/Thesis/Comps  Direct: Presentation/Defense  Indirect: Self-Assessment  Indirect: Faculty/Course Evals | 9  9  9  21 | 11  11  11  18 | 100  100  100  86 | 3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation  2 Meets expectation |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEASURE 3: Write clearly, demonstrating grammatical precision and avoiding unnecessary jargon | Direct: Written Project/Thesis/Comps  Direct: Presentation/Defense  Indirect: Self-Assessment  Indirect: Faculty/Course Evals | 9  9  9  21 | 8  9  8  21 | 89  100  89  100 | 3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEASURE 4: Demonstrate critical thinking skills encompassing different perspectives | Direct: Written Project/Thesis/Comps  Direct: Presentation/Defense  Indirect: Self-Assessment  Indirect: Faculty/Course Evals | 9  9  9  21 | 9  9  8  19 | 100  100  89  90 | 3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation  3 Exceeds expectation |

This is the fourth year that we have collected data for our Sport Administration Program, and based on the data and feedback, our graduate faculty members are continuing to revise the program. A change in wording was made for the learning outcome associated with Measure 4. Originally written as “Articulate reasoned beliefs in a civil manner,” it now states, “Demonstrate critical thinking skills encompassing different perspectives.” This change was made to be more consistent with the outcomes associated with the College of EDHD and BGSU. Also, this year was the 2nd year for the comprehensive exams. The comprehensive exam procedure was modified to clarify the timeline of exam administration and the appellate process. No issues or problems were reported regarding the new procedure.

Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identify Each Operational Effectiveness Goal and Measurement Tool(s)** | **Identify the Benchmark** | **Data Summary** | **Assessment Results:**  **1. Does not meet expectation**  **2. Meets expectation**  **3. Exceeds expectation**  **4. Insufficient data** |
| **OEG 1: Keep up to date with the changing sport industry and mirror those practices within our program** | | | |
| 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 | 3 – Exceeds Expectation |
| **OEG 2: Provide professional development opportunities to prepare students for the transition to the Sport Industry.** | | | |
| Measure 1: Senior graduation Interview - Direct | 85% of students will  agree that the professional development opportunities we provide are instrumental in preparing them for transition into the sport industry. | 96% agreed | 3- Exceeds expectations |
| **OEG 3: All faculty are engaged in the sport management industry and/or academia** | | | |
| Measure 1: Faculty  activity - Direct | Each faculty member will attend one sport management conference or serve as an industry consultant at least once per academic year | 9 of 9 | 3- Exceeds expectations |
| **OEG 4: Increase communication with Advisory Board** | | | |
| Measure 1: Actual Communication - Direct | We will communicate email/phone/Skype with Board more than 1x per semester | We communicated with multiple Board members each semester. | 3 – Exceeds expectation |
| ***\*\*Explanation of course action for intended outcomes not realized:***  ***All goals were achieved but I would expound on OEG 4. The sport management faculty contacted each Advisory Board member to solicit feedback. As a result of this effort, one member is now assisting in the supervision of our interns. Two other members are also actively contributing to the growth of the program. They have shared their time and expertise and donated funds for professional development opportunities and a room renovation that directly benefit the students. We will continue to strive to increase our communication with multiple members each semester.*** | | | |

*Notes: 1) Provide all explanations of this table that follows. 2) If you are using different operational outcomes measures for different degree programs, please replicate this form, using one form for each program that has different measures. 3) If different programs use the same measures, only one copy of this form is needed.*