

Student Learning Outcomes Matrix - Academic Year 2023 – 2024

		Assessment Results				
	Tool	Benchmark	Total # of students observed	Total # of students meeting expectation	% of students meeting expectation	1. DNM 2. ME 3. EE 4. Insuff. Data
SLO 1: Students will demonstrate accurate knowledge of the foundational principles required for the sport management profession						
	Foundational Knowledge Coverage and Performance Rubric (direct)	1.1 7 CPC areas covered	96	96	100%	EE
		1.2 80% of students will score 70% on exams	96	91	94%	EE
	Students who have earned 105 credit or above (indirect)	90% of eligible students will have achieved a major GPA of 2.75	44	43	97%	EE
SLO 2: Students will demonstrate information literacy						
SPST 399	Information Literacy Rubric (direct)	SPST 3XX or SPST 4XX: each row of the rubric will average 3 or higher	33	32	97%	EE
SPST 421	Information Literacy Rubric (direct)	SPST 3XX or SPST 4XX: each row of the rubric will average 3 or higher	40	28	70%	DNM
SLO 3: Students will exhibit college-level writing and correctly utilize industry appropriate formatting.						
SPST 399	Writing Rubric (direct)	Each row of the rubric will average 3 or higher	33	33	100%	EE
SPST 420	Writing Rubric (direct)	Each row of the rubric will average 3 or higher	39	35	90%	ME

SPST 390	Site Supervisor Evaluation - Writing rubric (indirect)	80% of students score 3	14	4	28%	DNM
SPST 490	Site Supervisor Evaluation - Writing rubric (indirect)	80% of students score 3	15	7	46%	DNM
SLO 4: Students will perform oral communication practices that facilitate effective communication with others						
SPST 421	Presentation Rubric (direct)	Each row of the rubric will average 3 or higher	40	36	90%	ME
SPST 390	Site Supervisor Evaluation - comm. rubric (indirect)	80% of students score 3 in all categories	4	1	25%	DNM
SPST 490	Site Supervisor Evaluation - comm. rubric (indirect)	80% of students score 3 in all categories	2	1	50%	DNM
SLO 5: Students will accurately apply their learning in assignments by practicing the role of industry professionals.						
SPST 215	Applied Learning Rubric (direct)	80% of students score 2< in all categories	19	19	100%	EE
SPST 320	Applied Learning Rubric (direct)	80% of students score 3< in all categories	42	37	88%	ME
SLO 6: Students will demonstrate an understanding of how the sport industry may privilege some and disadvantage others.						
SPST 240	DEI rubric (direct)	1XX & 2XX - 80% of students at level 2	48	48	100%	EE
SPST 420	DEI rubric (direct)	3XX & 4XX - 80% of students at level 3	36	10	28%	DNM

Student Learning Outcomes Matrix Narrative:

Your outcomes assessment plan must include, at minimum, two direct and two indirect measures across 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 ALL SLOs – those that meet or exceed expectations and those that do not.
- Explain why you have measures with insufficient data.
- Describe how this outcomes assessment data drives curricular and other decisions.
- Describe how you have improved/changed this year based on this data (close the loop).

SLO 1, Measure 1 - The Introduction to Sport Management courses had a new instructor for the 2023-2024 academic year. For both the fall and spring semesters, all CPC areas were covered. Students in the Intro course performed well on this measure and could be attributed to several factors. Three non-cumulative exams were administered during each semester. Classes were provided with study guides at least one week prior to the exam date and allowed to use their notes during the exam. Additionally, in each class session preceding the exam, students engaged in a case study to reinforce and apply information on the upcoming exam. Question and answer opportunities with the instructor were also provided.

SLO 1, Measure 2 - since reimplementing the GPA letters last year, we have made sure that students and others who advise students are more aware of their current major GPA. Students that are below 2.75 and those who are too near to that number are issued a letter by the department chair at the end of each semester. This letter (content specific to their GPA status) is uploaded into FisherLink which hosts the most widely accessible student data to all those across campus. This means that anyone who logs into that system to advise a student, raise a flag about their conduct, or to see other information will have access to this letter. By making this available, conversations about the importance and status of GPA are likely occurring more regularly and students are more aware. We plan to continue this practice moving forward.

SLO 2, Measure 1 - Students in SPST 399 exceeded expectations with respect to this SLO. The instructor of this course structured in-class time to help support students in locating relevant background information (literature review) for their research projects. Also, the instructor designed the research project assignments so that all students in the course had a topic in common, even though group projects had slightly differing research questions. This allowed students to work collaboratively in finding, interpreting, and applying the sources. Students thrived with this type of support.

SLO 2, Measure 2 - Students underperformed in this area this year. It is most likely due to the changing nature of the capstone project and its design. During this academic year, students selected an RFP and worked through creating the best possible bid package to host that event. As such, many students had trouble reconciling the practical work with academic standards. They do not see citations for work in their field experiences and some therefore felt that they were not necessary for this type of project. Additionally, many students had trouble locating relevant sources to support their ideas as an RFP was outside the scope of knowledge foundations that they had been taught to explore. Moving forward, the instructor should have been more explicit about information literacy needs, options, and requirements of the project.

SLO 3, Measure 1 - Students in SPST 399 performed well with respect to SLO 3. The instructor worked to clarify expectations for individual assignments, an improvement over the last time the course was taught by this instructor. This helped build students’ confidence. Additionally, students performed well with respect to information literacy tasks (see SLO 2, measure 1) which aided in their writing

SLO 3, Measure 2 - Students performed well this past academic year in this area. The task of completing a case study was familiar to them and therefore they were more certain of expectations of performance. Additionally, the instructor provided time in class for students to engage in discussions about clarity of ideas prior to final submission. This process helped some students identify areas that needed work and make needed corrections. This extra time in

class appeared to make a big difference compared to prior terms, and the instructor plans to continue this practice moving forward.

SLO 3, Measure 3 - Written communication continues to be a hit or miss learning outcome for our Practicum students. They often receive “average” feedback from our site supervisors with an emphasis on continued improvement. In addition, many students are not put into situations where they are provided the opportunities to write profusely during their experience. A critical component of our learning outcomes, more emphasis on context, audience and purpose is still needed to prepare our students sufficiently for these work experiences.

SLO 3, Measure 4 - Written communication continues to be a hit or miss learning outcome for our Internship students. They often receive “average” feedback from our site supervisors with an emphasis on continued improvement. In addition, many students are not put into situations where they are provided the opportunities to write profusely during their experience. A critical component of our learning outcomes, more emphasis on context, audience and purpose is still needed to prepare our students sufficiently for these work experiences.

SLO 4, Measure 1 - Because of the structure of the RFP this year, namely working in smaller groups, presentation cohorts were much more cohesive and prepared. The additional familiarity with all aspects of the project and having to work so closely together all semester increased the preparedness of all students and it was demonstrated in their presentation evaluation. Moving forward, instructors will continue to consider how task design and other activities can keep students performing well with regards to their presentation skills.

SLO 4, Measure 2 - This small sample size makes the feedback difficult to analyze. Practicum students typically perform well in this area this year which is a testament to the preparation and preparedness done across our major prior to their required experiential learning opportunities. Having the opportunity to connect with many of the internship site supervisors prior to student placements, we are able to anticipate what level of professional verbal communications they expect. Being able to connect one-on-one with all of our students prior to their internships, I am able to reinforce these expectations.

SLO 4, Measure 3 - This small sample size makes the feedback difficult to analyze. As our Internship students are generally more involved in the organization they are working for, and have greater responsibilities than our Practicum students, we find that these site supervisors often acknowledge the need for a more refined form of oral communication from many of them. Presenting clear thoughts with awareness of context, audience and purpose is critical to their success in this environment. Continued preparation across our major, specifically with relation to oral presentations that are appropriately structured, logical, coherent are needed.

SLO 5, Measure 1 - Students were well prepared for this task because of course design and opportunities for collaboration and assistance. All tasks were modeled by the instructor and built into homeworks which made it more likely for students to perform well on this assignment. Despite some challenges with software compatibility, students were able to perform this task successfully.

SLO 5, Measure 2 - Overall, students performed well on this measure. The projects were developed well and demonstrated growth as the various elements were phased in as the semester progressed. Written reports were compiled and formatted in an appropriate manner. To increase student opportunities to be successful in future semesters, the instructor is developing ways to bring more “real world” scenarios into the project to increase student accountability and attachment to the project as a whole.

SLO 6, Measure 1 - Overall, students excelled in choosing appropriate sites to evaluate, compiling meaningful information about the Americans With Disabilities Act and how the law impacted the chosen facilities, and did a strong job suggesting additional elements that would minimize accessibility issues and improve the experiences of all who enter them. In future semesters, the instructor plans to require photographic evidence from the selected sites instead of merely suggesting that they be included in submissions.

SLO 6, Measure 2 - Student poor performance this past year had more to do with instructor error rather than students’ lack of learning. For one semester, the instructor did not select an appropriate case study that allowed for students to demonstrate the level of learning exemplified asked for in the rubric. While it was possible for students to meet the standard both semesters, the more abstract approach to diversity in the case for one semester contributed

to poor performance. Additionally, the timing of the case in one semester was too close to other major projects that had a more significant impact on a student's overall course grade. This likely meant students spent less time on the case than they would have otherwise. Moving forward, the instructor will more carefully select a case that makes it easier for students to see and approach DEI issues and better select a due date.

Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix Academic Year 2023-24

OEG and Measurement Tool	Identify the Benchmark	Data Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DNM 2. ME 3. EE 4. Inuff. Data
OEG 1: Provide opportunities for students to engage with a diversity of sport practitioners			
Measure 1: Guest speakers, alumni, practitioner, consultant involvement in classrooms	30 times per academic year, current students will have a chance to engage with industry practitioners	Across all instructors, current students were provided 50 opportunities to engage with industry practitioners. Some of these were strictly in a guest speaker capacity while other practitioners served as judges or community partners for specific events.	EE
OEG 2: Have faculty that are engaged in the sport management industry and/or academia.			
Measure 1: Faculty activity	All faculty will attend at least one sport conference or engage as an industry consultant at least once per academic year	6 of 6 in a variety of capacities	ME
OEG 3: Provide mechanisms for students to graduate in a timely manner.			
Measure 1: 5-year graduation rate	First-year entry students will graduate at 60% or higher rate Transfer entry students will graduate at 65% or higher rate	First-year entry (5 year) - 45% Transfer entry (5 year) - 55%	DNM
Measure 2: Course scheduling	All required courses are offered at least once per year. Ten separate electives (seven that are distinct) are offered through an academic year.	Fall semester - 6 Spring semester - 8 Only SPST 212 repeated	EE
OEG 4: Partner with students in the content and development of their educational experience.			
Measure 1: Student opportunities for engagement	Provide students at least two opportunities per academic year to provide feedback and engage in various aspects of their education.	Each student has two formal advising appointments with their primary advisor over the AY. Additional advising occurs as needed throughout the academic year. During our capstone	EE

		course, graduating seniors are also invited to share reflections, feedback, and provide suggestions about their educational experiences.	
--	--	--	--

PROGRAM INFORMATION PROFILE

Name of Institution:

Program/Specialized Accreditor(s): COSMA

Institutional Accreditor: Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Date of Next Comprehensive Program Accreditation Review: February 2031

Date of Next Comprehensive Institutional Accreditation Review: Spring 2025

URL where accreditation status is stated:

Institution:

<https://www.sjf.edu/about/institutional-initiatives/accreditation-and-assessment/middle-states-accreditation/>

Department: <https://www.sjf.edu/major-minors/sport-management/>

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

Indicators of Effectiveness with Undergraduates [as determined by the program]			
	Year: 2023-24	# of graduates: 33	Graduation Rates Freshman Entry: 39% (4 years), 45% (5 years) Transfer Entry: 45% (3 years), 55% (4 years)
Average time to Degree			
	Year: 2023-24	4 year degree Freshman entry: 9.3 terms Transfer entry: 7.3 terms	5 year degree: N/A
Annual Transfer Activity (into program)			
	Year: 2023-24	# of transfers: 13	Transfer rate: not calculated by college Transfer retention rate: 92%
Graduates Entering Graduate School			
	Year: 2023-24	# of graduates: 33	# entering graduate school: 4
Job Placement			
	Year: 2023-24	# of graduates: 33	Sport industry employment: 20 Non-sport industry employment: 5 Unknown: 4