



WICHITA STATE  
UNIVERSITY

*COLLEGE OF APPLIED STUDIES*

*Department of Sport Management*

## **PUBLIC DISCLOSURE INFORMATION ANNUAL REPORTING OF SLOs and OEGs: 2019-20**

The sport management degree programs at Wichita State University have received specialized accreditation through the Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA) located in Fort Collins, Colorado, USA. The sport management programs in the following degrees are accredited by COSMA:

- Bachelor of Arts in Sport Management
- Master of Education in Sport Management

In keeping with COSMA's policy of transparency and accountability, the following document lists the most recent statement and assessment of student learning outcomes and operational effectiveness goals. Additionally, the following document also includes a program profile, which details university and program-related information.

### **CONTACT**

If you have any questions about the student learning outcomes, operational effectiveness measures, or program profile information, then please feel free to contact the department's chair and accreditation officer:

Mark Vermillion, PhD  
Chair/Professor, Sport Management  
Director, Workforce Leadership degree program  
Department of Sport Management  
E: [mark.vermillion@wichita.edu](mailto:mark.vermillion@wichita.edu)  
P: 316-978-5444

Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes Matrix: B.A.—Sport Management

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
<b>SLO 1 – Identify and describe foundational concepts relevant to effective professional practice in the sport management field, including knowledge of management, marketing, public relations, financial, psycho-social, and legal concepts.</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 447- Internship reflection report <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	48	47	97.9%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 446- Key concepts exam <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at correct or better on exam	57	50	87.7%	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Student exit survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	20	14-19	80%-100% with the following exceptions: financial management (70%) and budgeting (70%).	**Does not meet expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Alumni survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 5</b> Employer survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	9, 14	8, 14	80%-100% on all subjects measured.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 6</b> SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	36-42	32-42	88.1%-100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 2 – Apply ethical decision-making frameworks in relation to issues facing sport managers</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 475- Ethics writing assignment <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	33	32	96.9%	Exceeds expectations

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
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 447- Internship reflection report <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	48	48	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Student exit survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	20, 20	16, 17	80%, 85%	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Alumni survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 5</b> Employer survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	14	14	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 6</b> SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	39, 39	38, 39	97.4%, 100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 3 – Demonstrate critical thinking skills related to effective decision-making in sport organizations.</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 461- Risk management assignment <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2021
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 447 – Internship reflection report <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	48	48	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Student exit survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	20, 20	18, 18	90%, 90%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Alumni survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022

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
<b>Measure 5</b> Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	13, 13	11, 11	84.6%	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 6</b> SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	42, 42	40, 42	95.2%, 100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 4- Demonstrate understanding of, and appreciation for, diversity in sport.</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 444- Org. diversity reflection paper and presentation (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 447- Internship reflection report (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	48	45	93.8%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Student exit survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	20, 20	19, 19	95%, 95%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 5</b> Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	13, 13	13, 12	100%, 92.3%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 6</b> SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	42, 42	42, 42	100%, 100%	Exceeds expectations

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
<b>SLO 5-</b> Model the oral, written, and interpersonal communication skills necessary for effective sport management practice.					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 112- Instructor interview assignment <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2021
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 447- Internship reflection report <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	48	48	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Student exit survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	20, 20, 20	15, 16, 15	75%, 80%, 75%	**Does not meet expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Alumni survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 5</b> Employer survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	13, 13, 13	13, 13, 12	100%, 100%, 92.3%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 6</b> SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	42, 42, 42	40, 41, 42	95.2%, 97.6%, 100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 6-</b> Demonstrate skills pertaining to the use of technology in sport management.					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 426- Social media project <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 447- Internship reflection report <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	48	48	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Student exit survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	20, 20	16, 16	80%, 80%	Meets expectations

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
<b>Measure 4</b> Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 5</b> Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	13, 13	12, 12	92.3%, 92.3%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 6</b> SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	41, 40	40, 39	97.5%, 97.5%	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 7- Apply the knowledge and skills acquired in their sport management classes in a sport management setting.</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 447- Internship reflection report (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	48	45	93.4%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 447- Resume (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	48	47	97.9%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 90% receiving overall rating of agree or better	42	42	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly valuable or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022

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
--	------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--	---

**Required Narrative:** Address ALL SLO data – both ones that met/exceeded expectations and those that did not. How has this outcomes assessment data driven curricular and other decisions? How have you improved/changed this year based on this data (closed the loop)?

In general, the B.A.—Sport Management SLOs were met for this year’s annual reporting. Particular points of pride include students’ performance in regards to ethical decision-making (SLO 2); critical thinking and effective decision-making (SLO 3); an understanding and appreciation for the complexities of diversity (SLO 4); embracing and promoting a culture of technology useful in our industry and education (SLO 6); and how to connect material learned in SMGT courses and industry best-practices within applied learning experiences (SLO 7). These SLOs all exceeded expectations except for SLO 6, which met expectations. Faculty have reviewed student performances on these measures and will continue to emphasize these learning outcomes and measures in accordance with changes in industry best-practices and academic content. Data driven decision-making is key to our outcomes-assessment plan. Specific measures are evaluated, as well, annually in order to see if they are appropriate measures for each learning objective.

Regarding SLOs 1 and 5, which had measures not meeting expectations, students reported their understanding and preparedness levels for finance and budget management on their exit survey below our 80% benchmark. These two content areas have been low performers on annual reports historically. Recently, these content areas were above the 80% benchmark, but have regressed in this year’s report. Faculty, while cautiously optimistic since these content areas have been performing at or near the required benchmark, are continuing to monitor teaching strategies for these content areas. As identified in Appendix 1 (recent changes), SMGT 428: Sport Finance pivoted its branding (SMGT 428: Revenue Management in Sport) and content, slightly, to be more in alignment with practitioner recommendations. Additionally, academic and professional colleagues noted the anxiety associated with “finance” and “math” and suggested a course name that was not only specific to our discipline and content, but also did not create fear of learning. As a result, students will begin taking SMGT 428: Revenue Management in Sport beginning in fall 2020.

*Covid-19 additional explanation requirements: Discuss what modifications you made to your O/A plan, instruments 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.*

There have been a variety of COVID-19-related impacts to this year's reporting. First and foremost, as it relates to the B.A.—Sport Management SLOs, SMGT 447A: Internship in Sport Management was directly impacted by COVID-19. Wichita State University suspended in-person classes in mid-March with many of students' applied learning sites also suspending operations, closing down, or having students work and satisfy their applied learning hours remotely. In response to these events, we reduced the required number of hours for successful completion of SMGT 447A from 640 documented hours to 480 documented hours. Then, faculty supervisors worked with students to complete their remaining hours through a variety of hybrid assignments and/or experiences.

Additional impacts include all classes going remotely, which impacted some students' ability to perform well academically, especially if they had to relocate their personal residence. Many of these personal, individual impacts, though, did not impact SLO attainment.

Finally, the response rate for this year's Employer Survey, which is an indirect measure for a number of SLOs, was relatively low. The survey is sent out multiple times throughout a year to garner enough responses for impactful assessment. The last time it was sent out was the second week in March, right before the mass cancellations of high-profile sporting leagues and events. While COVID-19 does not explain the Employer Survey response rate prior to mid-March sports cancellations, it could impact response rate afterwards as sport organizations adapted to systemic changes. Faculty will examine strategies for increasing the Employer Survey response rate in future data collection cycles.



Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes Matrix: M.Ed. – Sport Management

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
<b>SLO 1 – Demonstrate foundational concepts relevant to effective professional practice in the sport management field, including knowledge of management, marketing, public relations, financial, psycho-social, and legal concepts.</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> Comprehensive exam (direct)	Minimum of 95% at acceptable or better	31	29	94%	**Does not meet expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 847- Internship reflection/ integration paper (direct)	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	30	30	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 4</b> Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	9, 14	8, 14	80%-100% on all subjects measured.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> SMGT 847- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared, or better, or agree.	18-24	17-24	All content areas (13/13; 100%) met benchmark	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 2 – Evaluate and effectively apply ethical decision-making frameworks in relation to issues facing sport managers</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 812- Ethical dilemma assignment (direct)	Minimum of 90% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2021
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 847- Internship reflection/ integration paper (direct)	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	30	30	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022

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
<b>Measure 4</b> Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	12	11	91.6%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> SMGT 847- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared, or better, or agree.	25, 24	25, 24	100%, 100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 3</b> – Display critical thinking skills related to effective managerial decision-making in sport organizations.					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 801- Organizational evaluation assignment (direct)	Minimum of 90% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2021
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 847- Internship reflection/ integration paper (direct)	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	30	30	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 4</b> Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	13, 13	11, 11	84.6%, 84.6%	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> SMGT 847- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared, or better, or agree.	25, 25	24, 24	96%, 96%	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 4</b> - Examine and model effective research skills in sport management-related settings.					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 800- Research report (direct)	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022

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
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 847- Internship reflection/ integration paper <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	30	29	96.6%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Alumni survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 4</b> Employer survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	13, 12	11, 11	84.6%, 91.6%	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> SMGT 847- Internship site supervisor evaluation <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared, or better, or agree.	24, 23	23, 22	95.8%, 95.6%	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 5- Critically evaluate diversity and its impact on managerial decision-making in sport.</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 847- Internship reflection/ integration paper <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	30	30	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 810- Diversity paper <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better	33	30	90.9%	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Alumni survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 4</b> Employer survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	13, 13	13, 12	100%, 92.3%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> SMGT 847- Internship site supervisor evaluation <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared, or better, or agree.	24, 25	24, 25	100%, 100%	Exceeds expectations

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
<b>SLO 6- Develop advanced oral, written, and interpersonal communication skills necessary for effective sport management practice.</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 847- Internship reflection/ integration paper <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	30	30	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 803- Marketing plan <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 3</b> Alumni survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 4</b> Employer survey <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	13, 13, 13	13, 13, 12	100%, 100%, 92.3%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> SMGT 847- Internship site supervisor evaluation <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared, or better, or agree.	24, 25, 25	24, 25, 25	100%, 100%, 100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>SLO 7- Model the knowledge and skills acquired in their sport management classes in a sport management setting.</b>					
<b>Measure 1</b> SMGT 847- Internship reflection/ integration paper <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	30	30	100%	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> SMGT 847- Resume <b>(direct)</b>	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	30	30	100%	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> SMGT 847- Internship site supervisor evaluation <b>(indirect)</b>	Minimum of 95% agree on performance evaluation items	25	25	100%	Meets expectations

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
<b>Measure 4</b> Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly valuable or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022

**Required Narrative:** Address ALL SLO data – both ones that met/exceeded expectations and those that did not. How has this outcomes assessment data driven curricular and other decisions? How have you improved/changed this year based on this data (closed the loop)?

In general, the M.Ed.—Sport Management SLOs were met for this year’s annual reporting. Particular points of pride include students’ performance in regards to ethical decision-making (SLO 2); critical thinking and effective decision-making (SLO 3); being able to effectively use research for organizational impact (SLO 4); an understanding and appreciation for the complexities of diversity (SLO 5); modelling effective forms of written, oral and interpersonal communication (SLO 6); and how to connect material learned in SMGT courses and industry best-practices within applied learning experiences (SLO 7). These SLOs exceeded or met required benchmarks and expectations. Faculty have reviewed student performances on these measures and will continue to emphasize these learning outcomes and measures in accordance with changes in industry best-practices and academic content. Data riven decision-making is key to our outcomes-assessment plan. Specific measures are evaluated, as well, annually in order to see if they are appropriate measures for each learning objective.

SLO 1 had the only measure that ‘did not meet expectations,’ which involved the cumulative exam. Benchmarks are set at 95% at acceptable or better and this year’s reporting was 94% While this measure performed short of the 95% requirement, faculty are confident that the performance will rebound in subsequent reporting cycles, because this year included students taking both the old curriculum comprehensive exam and the new curriculum comprehensive exam; different curricula were associated with separate exams, questions, content, and question wording. It is hypothesized that the differences in exams, based on individual student plans of study, impacted group study sessions and could have contributed to students not fully addressing some sections of the exam. Faculty will continue to monitor moving forward.

*Covid-19 additional explanation requirements: Discuss what modifications you made to your O/A plan, instruments 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.*

There have been a variety of COVID-19-related impacts to this year's reporting. First and foremost, as it relates to the M.Ed.—Sport Management SLOs, SMGT 847: Internship in Sport Management was directly impacted by COVID-19. Wichita State University suspended in-person classes in mid-March with many of students' applied learning sites also suspending operations, closing down, or having students work and satisfy their applied learning hours remotely. In response to these events, we reduced the required number of hours for successful completion of SMGT 847 from 810 documented hours to 640 documented hours. Then, faculty supervisors worked with students to complete their remaining hours through a variety of hybrid assignments and/or experiences.

Additional impacts include all classes going remotely, which impacted some students' ability to perform well academically, especially if they had to relocate their personal residence. Many of these personal, individual impacts, though, did not impact SLO attainment.

Finally, the response rate for this year's Employer Survey, which is an indirect measure for a number of SLOs, was relatively low. The survey is sent out multiple times throughout a year to garner enough responses for impactful assessment. The last time it was sent out was the second week in March, right before the mass cancellations of high-profile sporting leagues and events. While COVID-19 does not explain the Employer Survey response rate prior to mid-March sports cancellations, it could impact response rate afterwards as sport organizations adapted to systemic changes. Faculty will examine strategies for increasing the Employer Survey response rate in future data collection cycles.

Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix: B.A.—Sport Management

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
<b>OEG 1 – Recruit and/or retain diverse, high quality administrators, faculty and staff.</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> Aggregated SPTE data	Median result for perceived quality index of “good” or better. All other data to be considered.	83.3% of courses were rated at "good" or better.	**Insufficient data
<b>Measure 2</b> Faculty scholarship record	Evidence of achievement based on department scholarship policies.	All faculty members with research responsibilities evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations during annual review	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Exit survey: advising questions (Institutional exit survey)	Average score of 3 or better for each advising question on survey	Mean= 4.93 with 100% being "satisfied or higher" with advising. (Median=5.00)	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Student Exit survey	Minimum of 80% of all responses being mostly prepared or better. All other data to be considered.	Most content areas (10/12; 83.3%) reported over 80% of respondents being "mostly prepared" or better (ranging from 80%-95%; 16/20-19/20) except financial management (14/20; 70%) and budgeting (14/20; 70%).	**Does not meet expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> Alumni survey	Average program satisfaction score of 8 or better. All other data to be considered.	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 6</b> Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied.	Approved/satisfied vote (May 1, 2020)	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 7</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department’s Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations
<b>OEG 2 – Recruit and retain diverse, quality students to meet local and global demands for our graduates.</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> SCH data	Comparison of department SCH with other university data and historical department data	Report approved at June 9, 2020 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations

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
<b>Measure 2</b> Graduation and retention rates	Comparison of department rates with other university data and historical department data	Report approved at June 9, 2020 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Employer survey	Average overall rating of graduates of 8 or better. All other data to be considered	92.3% (12/13) employers rated graduates 8 or above.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved/satisfied vote (May 1, 2020)	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department's Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations
<b>OEG 3 – Achieve professional recognition for programs</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> KBOR approval	Approved status	Programs self-studies were completed and submitted in spring 2020 for evaluation in fall 2020.	**Insufficient data
<b>Measure 2</b> COSMA accreditation	Accredited status	B.A.—Sport Management and M.Ed.—Sport Management received reaffirmation of accreditation through 2027	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department's Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations
<b>OEG 4 – Ensure a technology rich culture in which administrators, students, faculty, and staff work together to (a) pursue innovation and excellence, (b) promote intellectual exploration, and (c) enhance learning</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> SPTE student comments: technology	Minimum of 80% of responses to technology question(s) coded as positive	92% of responses coded as positive	**Insufficient data



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
<b>Measure 2</b> Exit surveys: technology questions	Minimum of 80% of all responses being mostly prepared or better	All related responses meet criterion (80%, 80%) (16/20, 16/20).	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Faculty/staff technology updates	Review of hardware/software updates within the department	Report approved at June 9, 2020 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved/satisfied vote (May 1, 2020)	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress towards objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department's Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations
<b>OEG 5 – Develop and maintain collaborative relationships, local and globally, that enrich the department's mission.</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> Faculty/staff partnership summary	Review of key partnerships established/maintained through the year	Report approved at June 9, 2020 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved/satisfied vote (May 1, 2020)	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress towards objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department's Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations

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
--	------------------------	--------------	---

**Required Narrative: Explain any course action for intended outcomes realized AND not realized.** Provide all explanations of the data included in this table. What is meeting or exceeding expectations and why? What is not meeting expectations and why? Explain why you might have “insufficient data” and how you plan to correct this.

In general, the B.A.—Sport Management OEGs were reasonably met for this year’s annual reporting. Particular points of pride include OEG 2, which focuses on high quality students and OEG 5, which focuses on collaborative partnerships that enrich the department’s mission. For both of those OEGs, all measures were met and supported the associated OEG. OEG 3, which focuses on professional program recognition, had Measure 1 (KBOR approval status) marked as “insufficient data” because both the B.A. and M.Ed.—Sport Management programs are currently in program review. While the programs are optimistic about the outcomes of Program Approval through the Kansas Board of Regents, since that official determination will not be communicated until October of 2020, we could not mark the outcome as “meeting expectations,” yet.

Both OEG 1 and OEG 5 contained measures that did not meet expectations. OEG 1, Measure 4 focused on student exit surveys, which are now required parts of internship experiences, per COSMA Self-Study and Site Visit recommendations. Twenty students responded to the exit survey; all sport management knowledge was reported at or above the 80% benchmarks of ‘mostly prepared’ (or greater) and ranged from 80%-95% for social foundations, psychological foundations, management, leadership venue/event management, governance, ethics, marketing, communication, and sport law. The exceptions, however, were finance (70%), and budgeting (70%). There needs to be more focused attention on these related concepts within a variety of program courses. These content areas have been historically low and have increased recently, but there needs to be more creative and concerted efforts to engage students on these topics so that their content retention and preparedness is higher. Faculty, while cautiously optimistic since these content areas have been performing at or near the required benchmark, are continuing to monitor teaching strategies for these content areas. As identified in Appendix 1 (recent changes), SMGT 428: Sport Finance pivoted its branding (SMGT 428: Revenue Management in Sport) and content, slightly, to be more in alignment with practitioner recommendations. Additionally, academic and professional colleagues noted the anxiety associated with “finance” and “math” and suggested a course name that was not only specific to our discipline and content, but also did not create fear of learning. As a result, students will begin taking SMGT 428: Revenue Management in Sport beginning in fall 2020. Data driven decision-making is key to our outcomes-assessment plan and faculty will continue to monitor both content and to see if the aforementioned changes yield positive returns.

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
<p><b>NOTE on OEG 1, Measure 1:</b> Aggregated SPTE data. While aggregated SPTE data is descriptive, a major limitation involves getting all SPTE data for all courses. A new process for reporting has been instituted within the department requiring all adjunct SPTEs to come to the Department first for tabulation, then sent to adjunct faculty for personal evaluation. Regarding Spring 2020 courses—SPTEs are usually distributed via campus mail, but campus offices have been closed since mid-March. Interpreting results was labeled as ‘insufficient data’ because spring 2020 SPTEs, as of the writing of this report, were still to be determined if ‘in-person’ courses were able to successfully have ‘OSPTEs’ for converted online course. Students at our institution cannot be required to complete SPTEs and response rate for online courses is typically lower; spring 2020 relocation of courses to online will most likely yield few SPTEs to analyze. Only summer and fall 2019 SPTEs were available for reporting. Finally, SPTEs are not generated for any experiential courses. As a result, faculty are exploring options for a new measure.</p>			
<p><b>NOTE on OEG 4, Measure 1:</b> similar to OEG 1, Measure 1, this measure uses SPTE data to measure perceptions of technology within the program. Due to COVID-19 adjustments, our SPTE data are not deep, rich, or cover—at the time of this writing—any spring 2020 courses. As a result, the percentage reported is not indicative of an entire academic year worth of reporting. Also, with recent changes initiated by WSU’s faculty senate, faculty are not required to submit their SPTE comments any longer. As a result, the department was not able to fully evaluate this OEG through the use of the current measure. Faculty are exploring options for a new measure, which is part of the Action Plan moving forward.</p>			

## Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix: M.Ed.-Sport Management

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
<b>OEG 1 – Recruit and/or retain diverse, high quality administrators, faculty, and staff</b>			
<b>**Measure 1</b> Aggregated SPTE data	Median result for perceived quality index of “good” or better. All other data to be considered.	87.5% of courses were rated at "good" or better.	**Insufficient data
<b>Measure 2</b> Faculty scholarship record	Evidence of achievement based on department scholarship policies.	All faculty members with research responsibilities evaluated as meeting or exceeding expectations during annual review	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Exit survey: advising questions (Institutional exit survey)	Average score of 3 or better for advising questions.	Satisfied or higher: Q21=90.6% (mean= 4.53; median=5.00)	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Exit survey (Institutional exit survey)	Minimum of 80% of all responses being 4 or 5 based on 5-point scale for items 4, 10, and 11. All other data to be considered.	Satisfied or higher: Q4= 90.6% (mean= 4.53; median=5.00) Q10=93.8% (mean=4.69; median=5.00) Q11=96.9% (mean=4.63; median=5.00)	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> Alumni survey	Average program satisfaction score of 8 or better. All other data to be considered.	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2022
<b>Measure 6</b> Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied.	Approved/satisfied vote (May 1, 2020)	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 7</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department’s Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations

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
<b>OEG 2 – Recruit and retain diverse, quality students to meet local and global demands for our graduates.</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> SCH data	Comparison of department SCH with other university data and historical department data	Per data from the Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) here at WSU, AY 2019 SCH program for our graduate program was as follows: Fall: 458 SCH; Spring: 465; and Summer: 87 SCH for a total SCH during AY 2019 of 1,010 (-8.6%). This is to be expected since changing the program from 36-CHs to 30-CHs.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> Graduation and retention rates	Comparison of department rates with other university data and historical department data	Data showed 29 degrees conferred, which was an increase of 7.4% from the previous year.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Employer survey	Average overall rating of graduates of 8 or better. All other data to be considered	92.3% (12/13) employers rated graduates 8 or above.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved/satisfied vote (May 1, 2020)	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department's Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations
<b>OEG 3 – Achieve professional recognition for programs</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> KBOR approval	Approved status	Programs self-studies were completed and submitted in spring 2020 for evaluation in fall 2020.	**Insufficient data
<b>Measure 2</b> COSMA accreditation	Accredited status	B.A.—Sport Management and M.Ed.—Sport Management degree program received reaffirmation of accreditation through 2027	Meets expectations

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
<b>Measure 3</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department's Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations
<b>OEG 4 – Strengthen the graduate program to support the University's research and grants/contracts mission components</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> Faculty professional development report	Review data based on Faculty Activity Records	Report approved at June 9, 2020 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> Faculty grant writing report	Review data based on Faculty Activity Records	Report approved at June 9, 2020 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved/satisfied vote (May 1, 2020)	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department's Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations
<b>OEG 5 – Ensure a technology rich culture in which administrators, students, faculty, and staff work together to (a) pursue innovation and excellence, (b) promote intellectual exploration, and (c) enhance learning</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> SPTE student comments: technology	Review of responses to technology question	100% of comments coded as positive	**Insufficient data

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
<b>Measure 2</b> Exit survey: technology question	Minimum of 80% of all responses being 4 or 5 based on 5-point scale for question 27e. All other data considered	95.8% responded satisfied or higher, mean=4.79 (median=5.00). <sup>1</sup>  ( <sup>1</sup> NOTE: Q27e measures satisfaction with technology here at WSU and cannot be interpreted as solely a program responsibility)	Exceeds expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Faculty/staff technology updates	Review of hardware/software updates within the department	Report approved at June 9, 2020 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 4</b> Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved/satisfied vote (May 1, 2020)	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 5</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department's Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations
<b>OEG 6 – Develop and maintain collaborative relationships, local and globally, that enrich the department's mission.</b>			
<b>Measure 1</b> Faculty/staff partnership summary	Review of hardware/software updates within the department	Report approved at June 9, 2020 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 2</b> Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved/satisfied vote (May 1, 2020)	Meets expectations
<b>Measure 3</b> Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2020 Wichita State University continued developing a new university-wide strategic plan. The Department's Strategic Planning Initiatives (SPIs) were developed, entered into the university system, and completed in May 2020. See Appendix 4 for Departmental SPIs as reported to the University.	Meets expectations

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
--	------------------------	--------------	---

**Required Narrative: Explain any course action for intended outcomes realized AND not realized.** Provide all explanations of the data included in this table. What is meeting or exceeding expectations and why? What is not meeting expectations and why? Explain why you might have “insufficient data” and how you plan to correct this.

In general, the M.Ed.—Sport Management OEGs were reasonably met for this year’s annual reporting. Particular points of pride include OEG 2, which focuses on high quality students and OEG 6, which focuses on collaborative partnerships that enrich the department’s mission. For both of those OEGs, all measures were met and supported the associated OEG. OEG 3, which focuses on professional program recognition, had Measure 1 (KBOR approval status) marked as “insufficient data” because both the B.A. and M.Ed.—Sport Management programs are currently in program review. While the programs are optimistic about the outcomes of Program Approval through the Kansas Board of Regents, since that official determination will not be communicated until October of 2020, we could not mark the outcome as “meeting expectations,” yet.

Similarly, to OEG 3, both OEG 1 and OEG 5 contained measures that were interpreted as ‘insufficient data.’ Both of these measures OEG 1 involved SPTE data.

**NOTE on OEG 1, Measure 1:** Aggregated SPTE data. While aggregated SPTE data is descriptive, a major limitation involves getting all SPTE data for all courses. A new process for reporting has been instituted within the department requiring all adjunct SPTEs to come to the Department first for tabulation, then sent to adjunct faculty for personal evaluation. Regarding Spring 2020 courses—SPTEs are usually distributed via campus mail, but campus offices have been closed since mid-March. Interpreting results was labeled as ‘insufficient data’ because spring 2020 SPTEs, as of the writing of this report, were still to be determined if ‘in-person’ courses were able to successfully have ‘OSPTEs’ for converted online course. Students at our institution cannot be required to complete SPTEs and response rate for online courses is typically lower; spring 2020 relocation of courses to online will most likely yield few SPTEs to analyze. Only summer and fall 2019 SPTEs were available for reporting. Finally, SPTEs are not generated for any experiential courses. As a result, faculty are exploring options for a new measure.

**NOTE on OEG 5, Measure 1:** similar to OEG 1, Measure 1, this measure uses SPTE data to measure perceptions of technology within the program. Due to COVID-19 adjustments, our SPTE data are not deep, rich, or cover—at the time of this writing—any spring 2020 courses. As a result, the percentage reported is not indicative of an entire academic year worth of reporting. Also, with recent changes initiated by WSU’s



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
<p>faculty senate, faculty are not required to submit their SPTE comments any longer. As a result, the department was not able to fully evaluate this OEG through the use of the current measure. Faculty are exploring options for a new measure, which is part of the Action Plan moving forward.</p>			

*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.*