Student Learning Outcomes Matrix - Academic Year 2022 – 2023

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:
SLO 1. Demonstrate a proficiency in basic concepts and issues related to the following sport management content areas: media relations, financial issues, stadium and arena management, marketing and fundraising, legal issues and risk management, administration and management, sales, venue and event management, and social issues					
Post-Tests given to seniors of the SPM major	75% average score across all students	$n = 72$	12	63.7.7%	1. Does not meet expectation
Pre-Post tests gains between seniors and freshmen	Senior class score 20% higher than freshman class	Pre: $n = 150$ Post: $n = 72$	N/A – this measure uses a class mean	Pre-test: $\bar{x} = 40.74\%$ Post-test: $\bar{x} = 63.7\%$ $t(198) = 8.95$, $p<.01$	2. Meets expectation
Internship supervisor evaluations of job knowledge (Appendix A, question 1)	A score equal or greater than 4 out of 5	$n = 272$	250	92% $\bar{x} = 4.48$	3. Exceeds expectation
Student internship exit survey (Appendix B, questions 7 and 11)	A score equal or greater than 4 out of 5	$n = 150$	147	98% $\bar{x} = 6.34$	3. Exceeds expectation
SLO 2. Apply critical thinking and problem-solving skills as they relate to issues faced by sport industry professionals.					
Critical thinking rubric used in SPM491 for group projects	A score equal to or greater than 15 out of 20 on the VALUE critical thinking rubric	$n = 95$	93	98%	3. Exceeds expectations
Internship Supervisor Evaluations of critical thinking (question 8)	A score equal to or greater than 4 out of 5	$n = 272$	264	97.1% $\bar{x} = 4.73$	3. Exceeds expectations
Student internship exit surveys (question 2)	A score equal to or greater than 5 out of 7	$n = 150$	137	91.3% $\bar{x} = 6.11$	3. Exceeds expectations

SLO 3. Demonstrate effective use of verbal and written communication skills					
Student internship exit surveys (questions 3,4,5,6)	Mean score of 5 or greater, out of 7, for each question	$n = 150$	NA – Mean scores were used	Q3: $\bar{x} = 6.26$ Q4: $\bar{x} = 6.49$ Q5: $\bar{x} = 6.01$ Q6: $\bar{x} = 6.31$	3. Exceeds expectations
Internship supervisor evaluations of communication (question 9)	A score equal to or greater than 4 out of 5	$n = 272$	255	94.8% $\bar{x} = 5.95$	3. Exceeds expectations
Oral presentation scores from research project in SPM 491	A score equal to or greater than 15 out of 20 on the VALUE oral communication rubric	$n = 95$	91	96%	3. Exceeds expectations
Written assignment from research project in SPM 491	A score equal to or greater than 15 out of 20 on the VALUE written communication rubric	$n = 95$	91	96%	3. Exceeds expectations
SLO 4. Demonstrate a familiarity with social and ethical issues relevant to the sport industry, while understanding how these issues in sport management relate to diverse populations					
Ethics-focused case study issued in SPM 412	A score equal to or greater than 15 out of 20 on the VALUE written communication rubric	$n = 112$	97	87%	3. Exceeds expectations
Internship supervisor evaluations of ethical behavior (question 7)	A score equal to or greater than 4 out of 5	$n = 272$	8	97% $\bar{x} = 4.73$	3. Exceeds expectations
Student internship exit surveys (questions 8 and 9)	A score equal to or greater than 5 out of 7	$n = 150$	Q8: 146 Q9: 138	Q8: 97.3% Q9: 92% Q8: $\bar{x} = 5.93$ Q9: $\bar{x} = 5.95$	3. Exceeds expectations
SLO 5. Demonstrate an awareness of the various sport industry segments while being prepared for a career in the sport industry.					
Internship supervisor evaluations of student professional development (questions 2,3,4,5,6,10)	A mean score of 4 out of 5 for each question related to professional development	$n = 272$	N/A – Mean scores were used for benchmarking	Q2: $\bar{x} = 4.56$ Q3: $\bar{x} = 4.55$ Q4: $\bar{x} = 4.44$ Q5: $\bar{x} = 4.59$ Q6: $\bar{x} = 4.76$ Q10: $\bar{x} = 4.70$	3. Exceeds expectations

Student internship exit surveys (questions 10 and 12)	A mean score of 5 out of 7 for both questions	$n = 150$	N/A – Mean scores used for benchmarking	Q10: $\bar{x} = 6.63$ Q12: $\bar{x} = 6.61$	3. Exceeds expectations

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.

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 <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 outcomes assessment data drives curricular and other decisions.
- Describe how have you improved/changed this year based on this data (close the loop).

SLO #1 is the one we have been trying to improve the most. Traditionally, the first measurement (mastery expectation for seniors) has not met our expectations. In trying to identify the cause of the shortfall, we revamped the entire comprehensive exam. What was 2-3 questions for each of the content areas is now 10-12 questions, covering a summary of each class. Furthermore, we have coordinated as a department to ensure that important areas are covered in each section of each class, regardless of who is teaching it. This is important because we had some inconsistency in some classes related to new faculty or classes taught by an adjunct. Unfortunately, even after improving the measurement itself, the senior class still did not meet the mastery level we expected. As a department, we feel it is due to a lack of effort on what is now a very long exam, with no "stake" in the outcome. In other words, there is no incentive to do well since the results are not tied to a grade or extra credit. We are going to examine this further, and are considering making the exam a mandatory part of the senior seminar class. Their grade will not matter per se, as long as the senior meets a minimum score (likely 70%). Other ideas to improve this outcome have been to look for pattern responses among seniors (AAA, BBB, CCC, etc.) and ask those students to retake the exam. We have noticed in the past that pattern responses are occurring. Lastly, we have considered abandoning the comprehensive exam entirely and coming up with a new measurement. This will be discussed more during our upcoming reaffirmation. SLO #2 continues to exceed expectations, which we believe is due to a strong emphasis on critical thinking in our classes. We have begun to use more consistent evaluation of critical thinking in our departments by implementing VALUE rubrics which are validated and trusted. Prior, faculty used a variety of rubrics, some validated and some not. For SLO #3 we have experienced improve communication skills, both written and oral, over the past few years. This has been a emphasis in the department, especially after COVID. Notably, we have emphasized communication skills in in Intro class as well as our Practicum class, which both focus on professional development. This appears to have yielded a positive response as we have gotten good feedback from the students themselves, as well as the students' internship supervisors. SLO #4 focuses more on the social issues of sport and how sport can effect the world around us. The addition of a new faculty member specializing in Intro has helped considerably, as this course has lacked a real focus on social issues. Furthermore, several classes have begun integrating current events into the beginning of classes to further reinforce some of these issues. Rather than dedicating more full-length classes to such issues (which we already do) we wanted to dedicate more, smaller moments into class. Even a 5-10 minute conversation on a current topic to open up the class has helped our students stay more mindful. While exceeded expectations in this regard for a few years, we do believe that this is improving the students' ability to understand social and

ethical issues. Lastly, the case study used in SPM 312 is changed and adapted each year to make sure that the students are kept in the loop with our ever-changing industry. SLO #5 is one of the ones we find most important, as it relates to professional development and career readiness. Over the past few years, all of our classes have been implementing additional time in front of sport professionals, professional standards (attire, networking, communication, etc.), and activities around work etiquette, job search and discovery, interview practice, improvements specifically for AI interviews and resume scanning, and professional evaluations from faculty. We take a lot of pride in out students professional development, which starts in Intro with career discovery, continues in practicum with career research and volunteer work, and finalizes in Senior Seminar with internships, alumni networking panels, mock interviews, multiple rounds of resume writing, and ultimately their experiences in the sport industry. We feel like these efforts are reflected in the students' confidence in their professional abilities and the feedback we get from alumni, UT administration, and industry partners who hire our students.

Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix
Academic Year 2022-23

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. Develop and maintain relationships with sport business professionals			
Measure 1 – Student Projects involving co-work with sport business professionals	Ample work alongside sport business professionals	A number of courses in the program involved projects in which students worked alongside sport business professionals, especially including: SPM 298, SPM 312, and SPM 491	3
Measure 2 – Guest Speakers from professional sport organizations	Students allotted ample time to meet and hear from sport business professionals	Over 20 guest speakers throughout the 2022-2023 academic year and utilizing zoom, several Alumni Panels and other professional development activities in courses.	3
Measure 3 – Monthly Meetings	Students allotted ample time to meet and network with sport business professionals	Guest professional sports organizations came and met with students to network and potentially hire UT Sport Management students as part of the Monthly Meetings (held on zoom this year) This became incorporated into classes such as SPM 298 (Practicum) and SPM 419 (Senior Seminar)	3
OEG 2. To retain the majority of declared first year SPM majors to year two of the program			
Measure 1 – Retention rates from University of Tampa	Retain 60% of first year Sport Management students	Over 60% of Sport Management first-year students were retained	3
OEG 3 - To oversee a 80% graduation rate of declared SPM majors			
Measure 1 – Graduation rates from University of Tampa	Graduate 80% of declared SPM seniors	Over 90% of SPM seniors have graduated	3
OEG 4 – Ensure Sport Management faculty are actively involved in University affairs			
Measure 1 – Looking upon core professors in the SPM department and evaluating presence within the University outside of mandatory practices	Ample work inside of the University of Tampa that is not considered mandatory, and is outside of the Sport Management realm	Faculty is actively involved in a number of activities which are not mandated by the University of Tampa, and are outside of the Sport Management realm.	3

OEG 5. Demonstrate adequate teaching skills as they relate to student satisfaction			
Measure 1 – Student evaluation of Sport Management Courses	A score equal to or above the scores of the Sport Management program's affiliated college within the University of Tampa	Fall 2022 Sport Management average course rating = 4.35 Fall 2022 CNHS average course rating = 4.19 Spring 2023 Sport Management average course rating = 4.12 Spring 2023 CNHS average course rating = 4.23	2
Measure 2 – Student evaluation of Sport Management Professors	A score equal to or above the scores of the Sport Management program's affiliated college within the University of Tampa	Fall 2022 Sport Management average professor rating = 4.46 Fall 2022 CNHS average professor rating = 4.28 Spring 2023 Sport Management average professor rating = 4.23 Spring 2023 CNHS average professor rating = 4.33	2

Narrative:
There will be some overlap in the narratives between SLOs and OEGs, though I suppose this may be good since the overlap is mostly around the goals of the department. OEG 1 relates to the prevalence of sprot industry professionals in our classes. While we do still maintain a high volume of interaction between such professionals and our students, we are striving to improve on the communication and efficiency of these interactions. First the department is planning to use a cohort system for some of the classes, allowing our typical small class sizes most of the time, but allowing for flexibility to have a larger group at the same class time for guest speakers. This means that when a truly valuable guest speaker comes to campus, we can get as many as 100 students in attendance for the experience. Furthermore, we are creating a spreadsheet of guest speakers and which classes they attend, so that we may better coordinate amongst ourselves and the speakers. Lastly, we have continued to host networking meetings with 3-5 sport professionals each month, which are heavily attended. The second OEG relates to retaining first-year students. We have made concerted efforts to get all of our first-year students into SPM 290 – Intro to Sport Management, even though it is a 200-level class because we have seen the value in engaging the students with our faculty early. Additionally, we have had speakers from our student group, the Sport and Entertainment Management Society (SEMS) who recruit the first-year students into the club. Lastly, Dr. Flynn has created the SPM Senior Mentorship Program where our highest

achieving seniors are invited to work alongside an SPM 290 faculty member in class to help students and provide student leadership. This has been a tremendous success, and the student mentors have been able to provide assistance on things that the faculty are unaware of, or things that the students are simply more comfortable talking with another student about. OEG 3 relates to graduation rates, and while we still maintain over 90%, we are focusing efforts this year on maintaining the systems and processes which allow us to have a high graduation rate. Notably, we do a lot of one-on-one advising with each students, especially seniors. This is becoming more difficult as our enrollment grows, and some faculty members now have over 130 advisees to oversee. Our reaffirmation will focus on ways to be more efficient in this regard, until we are able to get properly staffed. OEG 4 relates to faculty involvement in university affairs, which has been difficult because we have had a decent amount of turnover, so it has been hard for faculty to really take on larger leadership roles. However, we have had two faculty members chair university committees, and our two most senior members sit on the Promotion and Tenure committee, as well as the faculty senate. Lastly OEG 5 relates to adequate teaching skills, and we have been using student evaluations to measure this OEG. While all of the others have exceeded our standards, this one lagged behind a little bit this year. We are evaluating why the student evaluation scores were slightly lower than previous years, though it may be due to some of the faculty turnover, as well as an increased emphasis on rigor in a few of the classes. A more thorough analysis of each faculty member's aggregate evaluations may provide more insight and help raise scores. Regardless, SPM faculty still score highly on student evaluations, just not as highly as we used to.

PROGRAM INFORMATION PROFILE

This profile offers information about the program in the context of its mission, basic purpose and key features.

Name of Institution: The University of Tampa

Program/Specialized Accreditor(s): COSMA

Institutional Accreditor: SACSCOC

Date of Next Comprehensive Program Accreditation Review: 2024

Date of Next Comprehensive Institutional Accreditation Review: 2024-2025

URL where accreditation status is stated: https://www.ut.edu/academics/college-of-natural-and-health-sciences/sport-management-major

Indicators of Effectiveness with Undergraduates [As Determined by the Program]

1. Graduation Year: 2021-2022   # of Graduates: 81   Graduation Rate: 3.4% (81 SPM grads/2388 Total)

2. Average Time to Degree: 4-Year Degree: __3.8 years___ 5-year Degree __N/A_____

3. Annual Transfer Activity (into Program): Year: Fall 2022_____
   # of Transfers: __32___   Transfer Rate: 24.2% (SPM Transfers/Students Enrolled)_____

4. Graduates Entering Graduate School: Year: __2021___
   # of Graduates: __49___ # Entering Graduate School: __7___

5. Job Placement (if appropriate): Year: _2021____
   # of Graduates: __49___   # Employed: _39____

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