Complete the following program-level student learning outcomes (SLO) matrix and program-level operational effectiveness goals (OEG) matrix.

### Student Learning Outcomes Matrix - Academic Year 2021 – 2022

| Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s) | Identify Benchmark | Total Number of Students Observed | Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation | Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation | Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SLO 1** – Students effectively investigated, examined, and analyzed the components that make-up the Foundations of Sport (Historical, Sociological, and Psychological). | | | | | |
| **Measure 1 (DM)** Diversity Case Study  SPTM 605 | student assessment measuring CPC content area (Social Foundations of Sport) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B). | 14 | 5 | 35.71% | 1 |
| **Measure 2 (DM)** DISC Personality Profile  MNGT 601 | student assessment measuring CPC content area (Psychological Foundations of Sport) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B). | 9 | 9 | 100.00% | 3 |
| **SLO 2** – Students successfully identified, described, and analyzed the concepts related to the Foundations of Sport Management. | | | | | |
| **Measure 1 (DM)** Participant Liability Issues Assignment  SPTM 653 | student assessment measuring CPC content area (Policy of Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B). | 16 | 14 | 87.50% | 3 |
| **Measure 2 (DM)** Effective Decision Making  MNGT 611 | student assessment measuring CPC content area (Management Concepts in Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B). | 7 | 7 | 100.00% | 3 |
| **Measure 3 (DM)** Sport Management Report  SPTM 592 | student assessment measuring CPC content area (international foundations of sport management) is for 70% | 8 | 8 | 100.00% | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | of the students to score an 80% (i.e., B). | | | | |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6"><strong>SLO 3</strong> – Students effectively recognized, described, and assessed the concepts related to the Functions of Sport Management.</td></tr>
<tr><td><strong>Measure 1 (DM)</strong><br>Final Written Report<br><br>SPTM 633</td><td>student assessment measuring CPC content area (Sport Marketing) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).</td><td>6</td><td>5</td><td>83.33%</td><td>3</td></tr>
<tr><td><strong>Measure 2 (DM)</strong><br>Research Proposal<br><br>SPTM 688</td><td>student assessment measuring CPC content area (Sport Communication) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).</td><td>12</td><td>5</td><td>41.67%</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td><strong>Measure 3 (DM)</strong><br>Budget Analysis Project<br><br>SPTM 652</td><td>student assessment measuring content area (Finance) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).</td><td>13</td><td>13</td><td>100.00%</td><td>3</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6"><strong>SLO 4</strong> – Students effectively identified, defined, and assessed the concepts related to the Sport Management Environment.</td></tr>
<tr><td><strong>Measure 1 (DM)</strong><br>Effective Decision Making<br><br>MNGT 611</td><td>student assessment measuring CPC content area (Ethics in Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).</td><td>7</td><td>7</td><td>100.00%</td><td>3</td></tr>
<tr><td><strong>Measure 2 (DM)</strong><br>Diversity Case Study<br><br>SPTM 605</td><td>student assessment measuring CPC content area (Diversity Issues in Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).</td><td>14</td><td>5</td><td>35.71%</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td><strong>Measure 3 (DM)</strong><br>Participant Liability Issues Assignment<br><br>SPTM 653</td><td>student assessment measuring CPC content area (Legal Aspects in Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).</td><td>16</td><td>14</td><td>87.50%</td><td>3</td></tr>
</table>

| SLO 5 – Students effectively identified, explained, applied, and analyzed the necessary components of a research investigation. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Measure 1 (DM)** Diversity Case Study SPTM 605 | student assessment measuring CPC content area (Capstone Experience) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B). | 14 | 5 | 35.71% | 1 |
| **Measure 2 (DM)** Research Proposal SPTM 688 | student assessment measuring CPC content area (Capstone Experience) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B). | 12 | 5 | 41.67% | 1 |
| **Measure 3 (DM)** Research Proposal SPTM 664 | student assessment measuring CPC content area (Capstone Experience) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B). | 6 | 6 | 100.00% | 3 |

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


### SLO Narrative

Your outcomes assessment plan must include, at minimum, two direct and two indirect measures of all student learning outcomes. Some measurement tools will be used to measure more than one student learning outcome. Each student learning outcomes must be measured at least once; including more and varied measures is a better practice and is encouraged. Below, narrate how you "**close the loop**" by describing any **changes and improvements you made and plan to make as a result of your assessment activity**:
- Address <u>ALL</u> SLOs – those that meet or exceed expectations and those that do not.
- Explain why you have measures with insufficient data.
- Describe how this outcome assessment data drives curricular and other decisions.
- Describe how have you improved/changed this year based on this data (close the loop).

COVID-19 additional explanation requirements: Discuss what modifications you made to your O/A plan, instrument changes, changes in required hours, if/how you fell short in data collection, what was difficult to measure and include how this circumstance has impacted how you are moving forward with outcomes assessment data collection.

| Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s) | Assessment Results:<br>1. Does not meet expectation<br>2. Meets expectation<br>3. Exceeds expectation<br>4. Insufficient data | Analysis and Narrative(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **SLO 1** – Students effectively investigated, examined, and analyzed the components that make-up the Foundations of Sport (Historical, Sociological, and Psychological). | | |
| **Measure 1 (DM)**<br>Diversity Case Study<br><br>SPTM 605 | 1 | SLO 1 is considered unmet due to the results of Measure #1. This Case Study assessment is a difficult one (even for graduate students). Moreover, the time that they must collect data is just over six weeks. Many of the students who fell short of the benchmark started too late in the term to reach out to the professor for guidance. The professor plans to implement checkpoints into the schedule to counter the lack of knowledge these students have for planning and completing a study like this one. Additionally, the existing tutorial for creating a Case Study will be improved to give these types of students more guidance outside of office hours. From a skill-development perspective, the professor identified that the students who succeeded in obtaining the benchmark were ones that already completed SPTM-664 Research Methods. SPTM-664 was moved to a fall offering to act as a vital introduction for the USI MSSM program to avoid inexperience for latter courses offered in the academic calendar. |
| **Measure 2 (DM)**<br>DISC Personality Profile<br><br>MNGT 601 | 3 | |
| **SLO 2 –** Students successfully identified, described, and analyzed the concepts related to the Foundations of Sport Management. | | |
| **Measure 1 (DM)**<br>Participant Liability Issues Assignment<br><br>SPTM 653 | 3 | SLO 2 was met as the USI MSSM program had students exceptionally identify, describe, and analyze the concepts related to the Foundations of Sport Management. |
| **Measure 2 (DM)**<br>Effective Decision Making<br><br>MNGT 611 | 3 | |
| **Measure 3 (DM)**<br>Sport Management Report | 3 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SPTM 592 | | |

**SLO 3** – Students effectively recognized, described, and assessed the concepts related to the Functions of Sport Management.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Measure 1 (DM)**<br>Final Written Report<br><br>SPTM 633 | 3 | SLO 3 can be argued as met due to the results of Measures #1 and #3 exceeding expectations even after considering the results for Measure #2. The SPTM 688 Research Proposal assessment is not necessarily a difficult one. Data collection is not necessary, but knowledge for Research Methods is vital. This research proposal already contains a check point to help students avoid procrastination. Interestingly, the check point (i.e., Pre-proposal) which still contributes to our benchmark assessment, is what caused Measure #2 to fall short of the expectation. The [full] Proposal showed success with 75% of the students achieving an 80% or higher. The professor plans to re-evaluate the effectiveness of the Pre-proposal in the skill-development of the students. |
| **Measure 2 (DM)**<br>Research Proposal<br><br>SPTM 688 | 1 | |
| **Measure 3 (DM)**<br>Budget Analysis Project<br><br>SPTM 652 | 3 | Sidenote: the timing of the 688 offering is the SU-II term that typically starts at the end of June and lasts until mid-August. This causes a delayed adjustment when completing the COSMA Annual Report that is typically due at the end of July (e.g., 2019-2020 report influences SU-21 offering. SU-21 offering is included in the 2021-2022 report). |

**SLO 4** – Students effectively identified, defined, and assessed the concepts related to the Sport Management Environment.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Measure 1 (DM)**<br>Effective Decision Making<br><br>MNGT 611 | 3 | SLO 4 can be considered met after considering the other two measures exceeding expectations and the explanation of results for Measure #2. This Case Study assessment is a difficult one (even for graduate students). Moreover, the time that they must collect data is just over six weeks. Many of the students who fell short of the benchmark started too late in the term to reach out to the professor for |
| **Measure 2 (DM)**<br>Diversity Case Study<br><br>SPTM 605 | 1 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Measure 3 (DM)**<br>Participant Liability Issues Assignment<br><br>SPTM 653 | 3 | guidance. The professor plans to implement checkpoints into the schedule to counter the lack of knowledge these students have for planning and completing a study like this one. Additionally, the existing tutorial for creating a Case Study will be improved to give these types of students more guidance outside of office hours.<br>From a skill-development perspective, the professor identified that the students who succeeded in obtaining the benchmark were ones that already completed SPTM-664 Research Methods. SPTM-664 was moved to a fall offering to act as a vital introduction for the USI MSSM program to avoid inexperience for latter courses offered in the academic calendar. |

**SLO 5** – Students effectively identified, explained, applied, and analyzed the necessary components of a research investigation.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Measure 1 (DM)**<br>Diversity Case Study<br><br>SPTM 605 | 1 | SLO 5 is considered unmet. The USI MSSM program failed to have the students effectively identify, explain, apply, and analyze the necessary components of a research investigation. There is optimism for future assessments as SPTM 664 now acts as an introductory course for our majors. |
| **Measure 2 (DM)**<br>Research Proposal<br><br>SPTM 688 | 1 | |
| **Measure 3 (DM)**<br>Research Proposal<br><br>SPTM 664 | 3 | Measure #1 – Case Study assessment is a difficult one (even for graduate students). Moreover, the time that they must collect data is just over six weeks. Many of the students who fell short of the benchmark started too late in the term to reach out to the professor for guidance. The professor plans to implement checkpoints into the schedule to counter the lack of knowledge these students have for planning and completing a study like this one. Additionally, the existing tutorial for creating a Case Study will be improved to give these types of students more guidance outside of office hours.<br>From a skill-development perspective, the professor identified that the students who succeeded in obtaining the benchmark were ones that already completed SPTM-664 Research Methods. SPTM- |

| | | 664 was moved to a fall offering to act as a vital introduction for the USI MSSM program to avoid inexperience for latter courses offered in the academic calendar.

The SPTM 688 Research Proposal assessment is not necessarily a difficult one. Data collection is not necessary, but knowledge for Research Methods is vital. This research proposal already contains a check point to help students avoid procrastination. Interestingly, the check point (i.e., Pre-proposal) which still contributes to our benchmark assessment, is what caused Measure #2 to fall short of the expectation. The [full] Proposal showed success with 75% of the students achieving an 80% or higher. The professor plans to re-evaluate the effectiveness of the Pre-proposal in the skill-development of the students. |
|---|---|---|

**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:<br>1. Does not meet expectation<br>2. Meets expectation<br>3. Exceeds expectation<br>4. Insufficient data |
|---|---|---|---|
| **OEG 1: The USI Sport Management program will provide students with diverse, high-quality faculty.** | | | |
| **Measure 1:** Hiring – we will follow the hiring protocols set forth through our university and advertisement in appropriate outlets – (e.g., The Chronicle, NASSM outlets, NIRSA) | 25 applicants will apply for a SM position when there is an opening and there will be 3 viable candidates to bring on campus. | n/a – all faculty tenure lines available are filled | 4 |
| **Measure 2:** College Mentoring Program (Retain) – <br><br>The purpose of the College Mentoring Program is to create a link between new and junior faculty and respected, tenured faculty. | 100% of new faculty will participate in the College Mentoring Program during the first three years of their tenure. | Dr. Kim has a designated mentor with the Pott College as an accessible resource for questions about tenure requirements, approaches in the classroom, scholarship practices, etc.… | 2 |
| **Measure 3:** Faculty Teaching Evaluations (Retain – by meeting promotion/tenure requirements) | 100% of the faculty teaching evaluations will be at least a 3.5 on a 1-5 scale on all areas of evaluation. | Both full-time faculty members achieved averages above 3.5 | 2 |
| **Measure 4:** Faculty Publications and Presentations (Retain – by meeting promotion/tenure requirements) | On average, the Faculty will produce, at least, 1-2 publications and presentations a year. | Five publications achieved between May 2021 to April 2022 | 3 |
| **Measure 5:** Faculty development: Faculty will receive information on strategies and tactics to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. | At least, one faculty member will sit on the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee within the Pott College of USI. | Dr. Smith (official member) and Dr. Kim (proxy member) were involved in the Pott College [service] committee covering Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. | 3 |
| **OEG 2: The USI Sport Management program will successfully provide students with the training necessary to gain knowledge and skills related to all COSMA Common Professional Component (CPC) content areas.** | | | |
| **Measure 1:** SLO1 met that is related to the Foundations of Sport. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 50% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations | 1 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Measure 2:** SLO2 met that is related to the Foundations of Sport Management. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 100% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations | 3 |
| **Measure 3:** SLO3 met that is related to the Functions of Sport Management. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 67% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations | 1 |
| **Measure 4:** SLO4 met that is related to the Environment of Sport Management. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 67% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations | 1 |
| **Measure 5:** SLO5 met that is related to the Capstones of Sport Management research. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 33% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations | 1 |
| **OEG 3: The USI Sport Management program will recruit and retain quality students to meet local and global demands for our graduates.** | | | |
| **Measure 1:** Enrollment – data reported from institutional research | Criterion: The SM program will admit 15 students per year. | 10 | 1 |
| **Measure 2:** Degrees Conferred – data reported from institutional research | Criterion: The SM program will graduate 15 students per year. | 12 | 1 |
| **Measure 3:** Graduation GPA Requirement – data reported from institutional research | Criterion: For sport management students to graduate with a GPA of 3.0 or higher | Requirement is implemented and probation is applied until the MSSM major reaches 3.0 GPA after all curriculum requirements are met. | 2 |
| **OEG 4: The USI Sport Management program will consistently provide a high-quality, educational experience to SPTM majors.** | | | |
| **Measure 1:** Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 1-2) | student assessment on Alumni Survey data for measuring critical thinking/problem solving is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale. | Our Chief Data Officer at USI recently retired (FA21). We already had issues with our database of alumni to contact. Our department needs to revisit the idea of getting alumni feedback via Qualtrics surveys. Our main hurdle is finding resources for an effective means to collect from an alumni sample. The struggles involved up-to-date email and cell phone. A secondary hurdle will be to identify important items as the previous survey needed revamped. | 4 |
| **Measure 2:** Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 3-6) | student assessment on Alumni Survey data measuring communication is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale. | | 4 |
| **Measure 3:** Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 7-9) | student assessment for Alumni Survey Data is for measuring technology is for 70% | Benchmark not applicable for this year's report due to insufficient data. | 4 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale. | | |
| **Measure 4:** Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 10-11) | student assessment for Alumni Survey data measuring diversity is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale. | 4 | |
| **Measure 5:** Advisory Board – students are part of the advisory board to assist with making curriculum changes and provide feedback for the program. | To have the advisory board meet twice per year. | 4 | |

## OEG Narrative

| Identify Each Operational Effectiveness Goal and Measurement Tool(s) | Identify the Benchmark (e.g., 80% will achieve a rating of 5) | Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data | Analysis and Narrative(s) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **OEG 1: The USI Sport Management program will provide students with diverse, high-quality faculty.** | | | |
| **Measure 1:** Hiring – we will follow the hiring protocols set forth through our University and advertisement in appropriate outlets – (e.g., The Chronicle, NASSM outlets, NIRSA) | 25 applicants will apply for a SM position when there is an opening and there will be 3 viable candidates to bring on campus. | 4 | The USI SPTM program can confidently claim that the program provides students with diverse, high-quality faculty. |
| **Measure 2:** College Mentoring Program (Retain) – The purpose of the College Mentoring Program is to create a link between new and junior faculty and respected, tenured faculty. | 100% of new faculty will participate in the College Mentoring Program during the first three years of their tenure. | 2 | |
| **Measure 3:** Faculty Teaching Evaluations (Retain – by meeting promotion/tenure requirements) | 100% of the faculty teaching evaluations will be at least a 3.5 on a 1-5 scale on all areas of evaluation. | 2 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Measure 4:** Faculty Publications and Presentations (Retain – by meeting promotion/tenure requirements) | On average, the Faculty will produce, at least, 1-2 publications and presentations a year. | 3 | |
| **Measure 5:** Faculty development: Faculty will receive information on strategies and tactics to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. | At least, one faculty member will sit on the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee within the Pott College of USI. | 3 | |
| **OEG 2: The USI Sport Management program will successfully provide students with the training necessary to gain knowledge and skills related to all COSMA Common Professional Component (CPC) content areas.** | | | |
| **Measure 1:** SLO1 met that is related to the Foundations of Sport. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 1 | The USI SPTM program cannot objectively claim that the program successfully provided students with the training necessary to gain knowledge and skills related to all COSMA Common Professional Component (CPC) content areas. |
| **Measure 2:** SLO2 met that is related to the Foundations of Sport Management. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 3 | |
| **Measure 3:** SLO3 met that is related to the Functions of Sport Management. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 1 | However, the program still considers OEG 2 was close to achieving. |
| **Measure 4:** SLO4 met that is related to the Environment of Sport Management. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 1 | The SLO3 and SLO4 should improve over the next year. The USI MSSM program will consider adding measures to SLO 1 and SLO 5 to put students in a better position to succeed. These factors will improve the changes of achieving OEG 2 next year. |
| **Measure 5:** SLO5 met that is related to the Capstones of Sport Management research. | 80% of the direct measures reached. | 1 | |
| **OEG 3: The USI Sport Management program will recruit and retain quality students to meet local and global demands for our graduates.** | | | |
| **Measure 1:** Enrollment – data reported from institutional research | Criterion: The SM program will admit 15 students per year. | 1 | The USI SPTM program failed to achieve the requirements to claim OEG 3. As a whole, our department struggles to receive the necessary resources to market our programs. This essentially influences our MSSM program. We are optimistic about the growth of the program as we have had discussions about adjusting the curriculum to be more attractive. Additionally, we are hopeful that the athletic department's transition from NCAA II to NCAA I will improve interest in the MSSM degree. |
| **Measure 2:** Degrees Conferred – data reported from institutional research | Criterion: The SM program will graduate 15 students per year. | 1 | |
| **Measure 3:** Graduation GPA Requirement – data reported from institutional research | Criterion: For sport management students to graduate with a GPA of 3.0 or higher | 2 | With that said, we can [still] confidently claim that to have high quality students. |
| **OEG 4: The USI Sport Management program will consistently provide a high-quality, educational experience to SPTM majors.** | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Measure 1:** Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 1-2) | student assessment on Alumni Survey data for measuring critical thinking/problem solving is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale. | 4 | |
| **Measure 2:** Sport Management Alumni Survey (3-6) | student assessment on Alumni Survey data measuring communication is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale. | 4 | |
| **Measure 3:** Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 7-9) | student assessment for Alumni Survey Data is for measuring technology is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale. | 4 | See above for explanation of insufficient data. |
| **Measure 4:** Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 10-11) | student assessment for Alumni Survey data measuring diversity is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale. | 4 | |
| **Measure 5:** Advisory Board – students are part of the advisory board to assist with making curriculum changes and provide feedback for the program. | To have the advisory board meet twice per year. | 4 | |

**Program Dashboard Data**

| Graduate (MSSM) Dashboard Data | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Total Enrollment Majors** | **16** | |
| **Enrollment Demographic Statistics** | **Number** | **Percentage** |
|     **Female** | 4 | 25.00% |
|     **Male** | 12 | 75.00% |
|     **Black, non-Hispanic** | 3 | 18.75% |
|     **White, non-Hispanic** | 13 | 81.25% |
| **Student: Faculty Advising Ratio** | | |
|     **Students** | 16 | |
|     **Faculty & Staff** | 3 | |
| **Full-time, Tenured or Tenure Track Faculty** | | |
|     **Full-time faculty** | 2 | |
|     **Tenured faculty** | 0 | |
|     **Tenured track faculty** | 2 | |
| **Adjunct/Part Time Faculty** | **Number** | **Percentage** |
|     **Adjunct** | 4 | 100.00% |
|     **PT faculty** | 0 | 0.00% |
| **Ratio of Male and Female Faculty** | **Number** | **Percentage** |
|     **Female** | 1 | 16.67% |
|     **Male** | 5 | 83.33% |
| **Faculty Demographic Statistics** | **Number** | **Percentage** |
|     **Asian** | 1 | 16.67% |
|     **Caucasian/White** | 5 | 83.33% |