Student Learning Outcomes
Assessment Summary
2013-2014

MAJOR: Sport Management

DEPARTMENT: Business

1. List Student Learning and/or General Education Outcomes Assessed

The following Student Learning Outcomes and/or General Education Outcomes were assessed in AY 2013 – 2014:

SLO 1: Demonstrate a working knowledge of basic business theory.
  - Related GeSLO: 4, 5, 6

SLO 4: Demonstrate ability to identify and analyze business problems and opportunities and formulate action plans.
  - Related GeSLO: 2, and 4

SLO 9e: Demonstrate an understanding of core concepts relevant to Sport Management.
  - Related GeSLO: 3, 4, and 6

2. Summary of Assessment Results

SLO 1: GeSLO 5

BUS 101

AY13-14

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 70% of students score a “C” or better on the final exam

Result: Target met – 77% of students earned a “C” or better

75% of the day students scored a “C” or better

100% of the evening students scored a “C” or better
ANALYSIS:
Students are meeting the benchmark assessment criteria for SLO 1 and SLO 7. The final exam continues to be an appropriate measure of their achievement because it is a comprehensive and practical instrument. Their achievement level for the 2013-14 academic year was higher than that of the 2012-13 AY.

PROPOSED CHANGES:
Financial Accounting is part of the core business curriculum because it is relevant to all business majors. It is the language of business, regardless of one’s area of concentration. Increased efforts should be made to demonstrate the relevance of accounting theory and concepts to all business majors.

BUS 206

AY12-13
Course: BUS 206-01/02 Fall 2012
Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 & SLO 3)
Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: Target met--83% of students earned a “C” or better

Course: BUS 206 Fall 2012 Adult Education
Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 & SLO 3)
Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: Target met--91% of students earned a “C” or better

Course: BUS 206 Spring 2013
Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 & 3)
Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: Target met--87% of students earned a “C” or better

Course: BUS 206-30 Spring 2013 Adult Education
Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 & 3)
Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: Target met--93% of students earned a “C” or better

AY12-13 ANALYSIS:
All sections of Management Principles met the benchmark for assessment criteria of SLO 1 & 3 in the BS degree. Traditional students typically do not have the experiential
reference as nontraditional students in this course. Analysis is consistent with this conclusion indicating lower assessment scores in the traditional sections.

**AY12-13 Proposed changes:**
Although the target was met, it is suggested that, in evaluating the assessment tool for SLO 3, the end of the semester/mod presentation is a more appropriate evaluative tool than exams. In the presentation assignment, students apply organizational long-term assessment and direction consistent with the topic selected, which is approved by the professor. Discussion after the presentation is an indicator of their understanding.

Changes to the course in the spring 2013 semester included attendance (as extra credit) at University wide events. Many of the events focused on business related topics that led to class discussions and direct application of classroom theory. This successful pilot attendance option may be considered to be a mandatory subject line in the fall 2013 course syllabus.

**AY13-14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course: BUS 206-01</td>
<td>(Tuesday/Thursday) Fall 2013</td>
<td>Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target not met--69% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
<td>Result:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
<td>Result: Target met--83% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
<td>Result: Target met--95% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
<td>Result: Target met--77% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
<td>Result: No data. Adjunct did not report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course: BUS 206-01</td>
<td>(Tuesday/Thursday) Fall 2013</td>
<td>Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target not met--69% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
<td>Result: Target met--83% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
<td>Result: Target met--95% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
<td>Result: Target met--77% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool: Exam Scores (SLO 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
<td>Result: No data. Adjunct did not report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AY13-14 ANALYSIS:
All sections but one of the Management Principles sections met the benchmark for assessment criteria of SLO 1 and 3 in the BS degree.

Traditional students typically do not have the experiential reference as nontraditional students in this course. This course is a core course for all business majors and usually consists of freshman and sophomore students. Analysis is consistent with this conclusion indicating lower assessment scores in the traditional sections. Review of the classroom learning environment may have been a contributing factor in the lower assessed grades of the undergraduate student. The 01 section was held in Francis Hall. Students frequently were displeased with the sound of the fan in the classroom and well as the classroom temperature.

AY13-14 PROPOSED CHANGES:
Although the target was primarily met, it is suggested that, in evaluating the assessment tool for SLO 1, request for a better learning environment (classroom) be submitted to the registrar’s office during pre-registration of classes. Also, a class of 30 for a freshman/sophomore management class is too large. Propose a cap of 25.

BUS 207

AY12-13

Course: BUS 207 AY12-13
Assessment Tool: Exams
Target: 70% or better
Results: Target met. 75 of 82 students (91%) met the outcome.

AY12-13 ANALYSIS & PROPOSED CHANGES:

No significant changes are planned based on the findings. The program will be reviewing all syllabi to assure that the course description, text and learning outcomes are uniform in each section of the course being taught in AY 2013-14.
AY13-14

Course: BUS 207-01 Fall 2013:
Assessment Tool: Examinations
Target: 70% earn “C” or better.
Result: Target met. 100% of the students achieved greater than a 70% on the final exam (24 of 24).

Course: BUS 207-02 Fall 2013:
Assessment Tool: Examinations
Target: 70% earn “C” or better.
Result: Target met. 95% of the students achieved greater than a 70% on the final exam (15 of 18).

Course: BUS 207-20 Fall 2013:
Assessment Tool: Examinations
Target: 70% earn “C” or better.
Result: Target met. 79% of the students achieved greater than a 70% on the final exam (11 of 14).

Course: BUS 207-01 Spring 2014:
Assessment Tool: Examinations
Target: 70% earn “C” or better.
Result: Target met. 96% of the students achieved greater than a 70% on the final exam (26 of 27).

The examinations were utilized to assess the ability of student understanding of basic business theory and to measure growth during the class.

AY13-14 ANALYSIS:
The goal was to have 70% of students are to earn a “C” (a grade of 73%) or better as an average grade on the examinations. The analysis of the data has indicated that a minimum of 93% of students in sections met or exceeded the assessment grade.

AY13-14 PROPOSED CHANGES:
The performance of the students to the measured outcome must be more uniform between sections of the class taught by full-time faculty as compared to adjunct faculty. The level of assessment and instruction must be more consistent so that the results are more consistent across each section of the course regarding of the instructor.
BUS 426

AY13-14

Course: BUS 426 Fall 2013
Assessment Tool: Case Analysis (SLO 1)
Target: 80% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: **Target met**--88% of students earned a “C” or better

Course: BUS 426 Fall 2013 Adult Education
Assessment Tool: Case Analysis (SLO 1)
Target: 80% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: **No data for SLO 1.**

Course: BUS 426 Spring 2014
Assessment Tool: Case Analysis (SLO 1)
Target: 80% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: **Target not met**--77% of students earned a “C” or better

**AY13-14 ANALYSIS:**

All sections of strategic management met the benchmark for assessment criteria of SLO’s 1, 2, 3, 8 in the BS degree. Students in strategic management typically will meet or exceed the measure. This is a senior level management course which is a compilation of learning up to this point. Prerequisites are always adhered to in both the day and evenings program. Analysis of this course suggests improved advising in the evening program to adhere to the prerequisites produced significant improved results.

A common student complaint is the workload that accompanies this course. Requirements include reading the text, business research and analysis, and significant writing assignments, as well as a group project. While some flexibility was introduced for the 2012-2013 and followed through in the 2013-2014 academic year allowing instructors to eliminate one of the case studies if time constraints exist, the amount of time students spend writing executive summaries, etc. is still considerable. The evening adjunct did not report case analysis scores or semester team project scores.

Spring 2014 scores dropped from those of spring 2013 (87% to 77%). Suggest improved teaching space when teaching a large strategic class.

**AY 13-14 PROPOSED CHANGES:**
The 2012-2013 recommendation to introduce at least one written case analysis be assigned during class time was implemented. This reduces the amount of assignments
outside of class time, but still requires students to analyze, formulate and recommend decisions appropriate within the scope of strategic management. Clear, concise writing is assessed as well as the ability to apply concepts in a timely manner. This exercise reduces access to online materials which restricts the student’s ability to copy the work of others. Students expressed a very positive reaction to this exercise in the 2013-2014 classes. Request to secure a classroom suitable for discussion and group work will be requested.

SLO 4: GeSLO 2, 3, 5 and 7

**BUS 208**

**AY12-13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>BUS 208-01 (Fall 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool:</td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result:</td>
<td><strong>Target met</strong>-77% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>BUS 208-1FE (Fall 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool:</td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result:</td>
<td><strong>Target met</strong>-100% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>BUS 208-01 (Spring 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool:</td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>70% of students earn a “C” or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result:</td>
<td><strong>Target met</strong>-90% of students earned a “C” or better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AY12-13 ANALYSIS:**

All sections of BUS 208 met the benchmark for assessment of SLO4. An adjunct professor taught the fall section and a full-time professor taught the spring section. The Business Department now uses a master syllabus designed by the responsible full-time professor for each course taught in the department. This initiative has created consistency and helps to ensure students receive the same content regardless of instructor, which can partially explain target achievement. The difference between 79% and 100% can partially be explained by the experience and teaching effectiveness between adjunct and full-time faculty. Teaching excellence remains a hallmark at Alvernia University and the teaching skills of adjuncts teaching this course should be investigated.
AY12-13 PROPOSED CHANGES:
The course, assessment tool, and target should remain the same. The adjunct professors should be afforded the opportunity to discuss teaching methods, styles, skills, and techniques with full-time faculty. The teaching quality of Alvernia’s adjunct professors should be analyzed against the full-time faculty to determine if adjunct teaching quality constitutes an area that should be targeted for improvement.

AY13-14
Course: BUS 208-10 (Fall 2013)
Assessment Tool: Final Exam
Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: Target met--79% of students earned a “C” or better

Course: BUS 208-01 (Spring 2014)
Assessment Tool: Final Exam
Target: 70% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: Target met--100% of students earned a “C” or better

AY13-14 ANALYSIS:
All sections of BUS 208 met the benchmark for assessment of SLO4. An adjunct professor taught the fall section and a full-time professor taught the spring section. The Business Department now uses a master syllabus designed by the responsible full-time professor for each course taught in the department. This initiative has created consistency and helps to ensure students receive the same content regardless of instructor, which can partially explain target achievement. The difference between 79% and 100% can partially be explained by the experience and teaching effectiveness between adjunct and full-time faculty. Teaching excellence remains a hallmark at Alvernia University and the teaching skills of adjuncts teaching this course should be investigated.

AY13-14 PROPOSED CHANGES:
The course, assessment tool, and target should remain the same. The adjunct professors should be afforded the opportunity to discuss teaching methods, styles, skills, and techniques with full-time faculty. The teaching quality of Alvernia’s adjunct professors should be analyzed against the full-time faculty to determine if adjunct teaching quality constitutes an area that should be targeted for improvement.
SLO 9: GeSLO 4, 5 and 6

SM 455

AY12-13

Course: SM 455-01 (Fall 2012)
Assessment Tool: Final Project
Target: 80% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: Target met--90% of students earned a “C” or better

AY12-13 ANALYSIS:
SM 455 met the benchmark for assessment of SLO9. This was the first semester that the newly developed capstone course for sport management ran. As with the delivery of any new course, there were some issues and questions concerning the format of content delivery, course expectations, and assignment protocol.

AY12-13 PROPOSED CHANGES:
The instructor for this course should deliver a basic template for the assignment at the beginning of the semester and also provide an example of an “A” quality product. This will provide the students with a concrete format to work from throughout the semester and should facilitate student learning as well as clearly highlight expectations.

AY13-14

Course: SM 455-01 (Fall 2013)
Assessment Tool: Final Project
Target: 80% of students earn a “C” or better
Result: Target met--86% of students earned a “C” or better

AY13-14 ANALYSIS:
SM 455 met the benchmark for assessment of SLO9. This was the second semester delivering the SM capstone course. As with the delivery of any relatively new course, there were improvements to the format of content delivery, course expectations, and assignment protocol.

AY 13-14 PROPOSED CHANGES:
The instructor for this course should deliver a basic template for the assignment at the beginning of the semester and also provide an example of “A” and “C” quality products. The instructor should concentrate equally on new content and also the thinking, analysis, and verbal and written presentation of completed proposal.
OVERALL SPORT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM SUMMARY

In evaluating student learning outcomes 1, 4, and 9e for the sport management program the data indicate that the students are meeting the outcomes. While there are some areas that need to be addressed, the overall improvement in student comprehension is commendable. The proposed changes and alterations will continue to improve the program and strengthen the position of our students in their respective fields. The area for targeted improvement remains consistency of content delivery between full-time and adjunct faculty. The business department changed faculty responsibility and Dr. Woosoon Kim is taking over as the Sport Management Association faculty advisor and he will also be the primary full-time faculty teaching sport management courses.

In May, 2012 adjunct faculty received a letter with their employment contract stating the need to collect grades, etc. as assessment data necessary for analysis by full-time faculty. This comprehensive letter also instructs the adjunct faculty member of the requirements to embed material such as CPC’s, etc. in the course syllabi. Included in the information sent to the adjunct is an assigned full-time faculty member, and their contact information, who is to instruct them with data collection for the determined assessment tool and assistance with creating the course syllabus. This continued in the year 2013-2014. Drena Romberger, the department secretary, was persistent in getting data from adjuncts. The data collection however, was still incomplete and will require continued vigilance.

Plans to present/discuss more thoroughly the requirements for full-time faculty to receive required assessment materials will be presented to adjunct faculty at the adjunct faculty orientation in August and January of each year. This plan was implemented during the 2012-2013 year. Announcements to adjunct faculty had some impact. It is suggested that the delivery method change to a hand out.


In 2014-2015, SLOs 2, 3 and 5 will be evaluated.

The evaluation of SLOs 2, 3 and 5 in this next cycle will look at student learning outcomes specific to the sport management major and the business curriculum. This will provide a focused look at individual program achievement. The Accreditation Council of Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) require all business majors to have a command of basic core competencies, which are dispersed throughout the business courses. The business department formalized the data collection process to provide a pathway for continuous program evaluation and assessment. The approved document is attached so that assessment committee members can see the seriousness with which the business department takes assessment.
Business Department Assessment Steps

Approved by Business Department vote on 5/28/2013.

1. **Spreadsheet** – By the Friday after fall and spring graduation. Give Drena data for each course that is taught. Drena enters the data onto a master spreadsheet. Drena collects data from every professor for every course taught in every location including online. This spreadsheet will be stored on the S Drive under Business Department/Assessment Data/year/Spreadsheet.

2. **Business Department Course Summary Sheets**. By June 1st of each year. Each full time professor utilizes the data from the spreadsheet in step 1 above and completes a Course Summary Sheet for each course that such full time professor has oversight responsibility each year regardless of whether the course includes any SLO being analyzed that year. The Business Department Course Summary Sheets will be saved in the S Drive under Business Department/Assessment Data/year/Summary Sheets/course number (including undergraduate and graduate courses).

3. **Program Assessment**. By June 7th of each year. Each full time professor completes a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary for the current year (located on the S Drive in the Assessment folder) for the major they have oversight for, for each of the SLO's being assessed that year (ie - Dr. Berret completes the Program Assessment Summary for HR for 2012-2013 for SLOs 6, 7 and 8 based on the Business Department Course Summary Sheets saved on the S Drive in step 2 above).

4. **TK20 Program Data**. By June 15th of each year. From the login screen on Alvernia.edu, each full time professor will login to TK20 and enter the Program Assessment data from Step 3 above for the major for which they have oversight.