

Department of Sport Management

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE INFORMATION

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 P: 316-978-5444

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

Idontify Foob	D.A Idontify the	1	Total		Assassmant
Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)		Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds
					expectation 4. Insufficient data
SLO 1 – Students will relations, financial, ps. for careers in the sport	ycho-social, and lega				
Measure 1 SMGT 447- Internship reflection report (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	47	45	95.7%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 2 SMGT 446- Key concepts exam (direct)	Minimum of 80% at correct or bette on exam		64	97%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	d	15-19	80%-100% with the following exceptions: financial management (75%) and budgeting (75%). Marketing was exactly 80%	**Does not meet expectations
Measure 4 Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better		04 73,99	84.6%-95.2% with the following exceptions: finance (72.1%), budgeting (71%), and business/econ analytics (72.1%)	**Does not meet expectations
Measure 5 Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	d	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2020
Measure 6	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better		25-32	92.6%-100%	Exceeds expectations

SMGT 447-					
Internship site					
supervisor evaluation					
(indirect)					
SLO 2 – Students will	be able to apply ethics	decision-m	aking frame	works in relation t	o issues facing
sport managers	be able to apply ennea	ii decision-ii			o issues lacing
Measure 1	Minimum of 80%	NA	NA	NA	Not
SMGT 475- Ethics	at acceptable or	1.1.1			scheduled for
writing assignment	better				reporting
(direct)					until AY
(un cet)					2020
Measure 2	Minimum of 80%	47	47	100%	Exceeds
SMGT 447-	at acceptable or				expectations
Internship reflection	better				1
report					
(direct)					
Measure 3	Minimum of 80%	20, 20	17, 18	85%, 90%	Exceeds
Student exit survey	at mostly prepared				expectations
(indirect)	or better				
Measure 4	Minimum of 80%	102, 102	98, 97	96.1%, 95.1%	Exceeds
Alumni survey	at mostly prepared				expectations
(indirect)	or better				
Measure 5	Minimum of 80%	NA	NA	NA	Not
Employer survey	at mostly prepared				scheduled for
(indirect)	or better				reporting
					until AY
					2020
Measure 6	Minimum of 80%	31, 34	30, 31	96.8%, 91.2%	Exceeds
SMGT 447-	at mostly prepared				expectations
Internship site	or better				
supervisor evaluation					
(indirect)		1.111 1.		· · · _ · ·	
SLO 3 – Students will	display critical thinkin	ng skills relat	ted to effect	ve decision-makin	g in sport
organizations.	M				
Measure 1	Minimum of 80%	NA	NA	NA	Not
SMGT 461- Risk	at mostly prepared or better				scheduled for
management	or better				reporting until AY
assignment					2021
(direct) Measure 2	Minimum of 80%	47	47	100%	Exceeds
		+/	1 + /	10070	
SM(FEZZZ	at accentable or		.,		expectations
SMGT 447 – Internship reflection	at acceptable or				expectations
Internship reflection	at acceptable or better				expectations
Internship reflection report					expectations
Internship reflection report (direct)	better	20 20		90% 90%	
Internship reflection report (direct) Measure 3	better Minimum of 80%	20, 20	18, 18	90%, 90%	Exceeds
Internship reflection report (direct) Measure 3 Student exit survey	better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared	20, 20		90%, 90%	
Internship reflection report (direct) Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect)	better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better		18, 18		Exceeds expectations
Internship reflection report (direct) Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect) Measure 4	better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better Minimum of 80%	20, 20 103, 103		90%, 90% 99%, 98.1%	Exceeds expectations Exceeds
Internship reflection report (direct) Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect) Measure 4 Alumni survey	better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better		18, 18		Exceeds expectations
Internship reflection report (direct) Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect) Measure 4	better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better		18, 18		Exceeds expectations Exceeds
Internship reflection report (direct) Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect) Measure 4 Alumni survey (indirect) Measure 5	better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better Minimum of 80%	103, 103	18, 18 102, 101	99%, 98.1%	Exceeds expectations Exceeds expectations
Internship reflection report (direct) Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect) Measure 4 Alumni survey (indirect) Measure 5 Employer survey	better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	103, 103	18, 18 102, 101	99%, 98.1%	Exceeds expectations Exceeds expectations Not scheduled for
Internship reflection report (direct) Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect) Measure 4 Alumni survey (indirect) Measure 5	better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared	103, 103	18, 18 102, 101	99%, 98.1%	Exceeds expectations Exceeds expectations Not

Measure 6 SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	34, 34	31, 30	91.2%, 88.2%	Exceeds expectations
SLO 4- Students will d	lisplay and understand	ing of and ap	opreciation	for diversity in sport	
Measure 1 SMGT 444- Org. diversity reflection paper and presentation (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	34	34	100%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 2 SMGT 447- Internship reflection report (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	47	45	95.7%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	20, 20	18, 18	90%, 90%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 4 Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	103, 103	99, 97	96.1%, 94.2%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 5 Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2020
Measure 6 SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	32, 33	31, 33	97%, 100%	Exceeds expectations
SLO 5- Students will d	lemonstrate the oral, w	ritten, and ir	terpersonal	communication ski	lls necessary
for effective sport man	agement practice.		-		-
assignment (direct)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2021
Measure 2 SMGT 447- Internship reflection report (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	47	47	100%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	20, 20, 20	16, 17, 17	80%, 85%, 85%	Meets expectations
Measure 4 Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	102, 103, 103	95, 94, 99	93.1%, 91.2%, 96.1%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 5 Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting

					until AY 2020
Measure 6 SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	31, 34, 34	29, 34, 34	93.5%, 100%, 100%	Exceeds expectations
SLO 6- Students will d		-	use of tech	nology in sport mar	nagement.
Measure 1 SMGT 426- Social media project (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	36	35	97%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 2 SMGT 447- Internship reflection report	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	47	46	97.9%	Exceeds expectations
(direct) Measure 3 Student exit survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	20, 20	17, 18	85%, 90%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 4 Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	101, 103	91, 86	90.1%, 93.5%	Meets expectations
Measure 5 Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2020
Measure 6 SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	30, 30	29, 28	96.7%, 93.3%	Exceeds expectations
(indirect) SLO 7- Students will a	cquire more than 600	hours of fiel	d experienc	e in which the know	vledge and skills
acquired in their sport					
Measure 1 SMGT 447- Internship reflection report (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	47	47	100%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 2 SMGT 447- Resume (direct)	Minimum of 80% at acceptable or better	47	47	100%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 3 SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 90% receiving overall rating of agree or better	34	34	100%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 4 Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly valuable or better	81	68	84%	Meets expectations

*******Explanation of course action for intended outcomes not realized:*

SLO 1, Measure 3: Twenty students responded to the exit survey, which was a response rate of almost 38%. All sport management knowledge was reported at or above the 80% benchmarks of mostly prepare (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 (75%), and budgeting (75%). There needs to be more focused attention on these concepts within the appropriate courses. These courses and concepts 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. Additionally, marketing—which is usually fairly highly rated—barely achieved the 80% benchmark. As a result, it too needs a more focused effort on engaging students in order to not only promote retention, but also better prepare students for matriculation into the industry.

SLO 1, Measure 4: all sport management knowledge was reported at or above the 80% benchmark of mostly prepared (or greater) and ranged from 84.6%-95.2% for social foundations, psychological foundations, management, leadership venue/event management, governance, ethics, marketing, communication, and sport law The exceptions, however, were finance (72.1%), budgeting (71%), and business analytics (72.1%). There needs to be more focused attention on these concepts within the appropriate courses. These courses and concepts 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.

*SMGT 447- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect): n=34 on this measure, which is low from previous years. As of the time of this reporting there were a number of "incomplete" internships and not all internships were reported in this report. Next annual report, measures will be put into place in order to account for reporting variability.

Notes: 1) If you are using different direct and indirect measures for different degree programs, please replicate this form, using one form for each program that has different measures. If different programs use the same measures, only one copy of this form is needed. 2) At a minimum, you are required to use two direct and two indirect measures to assess all of your student learning outcomes. You are not required to measure each student learning outcome with more than one measure, though it is encouraged. This matrix offers space to show that you have more than one measure for each SLO, but it is not required.

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

_

		1	t Manage	mont	
Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s) SLO 1 – Students will relations, financial, psy	Identify the Benchmark display knowledg	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	
careers in the sport man		Bar concepts res		- process for a	noos proparing for
Measure 1	Minimum of	26	26	100%	Meets
Comprehensive exam (direct)	95% at acceptable or better	20	20	10070	expectations
Measure 2 SMGT 847- Internship reflection/ integration paper (direct)	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	25	25	100%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 3 Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	129, 130	105, 127	81%, 98.5%	Meets expectations
Measure 4 Employer survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2020
Measure 5 SMGT 847- Internship site supervisor evaluation (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly prepared, or better, or agree.	13-20	12-19	All content areas (13/13; 100%) met criteria.	Exceeds expectations
SLO 2 – Students will	be able to apply e	thical decision-	making framew	orks in relation	to issues facing
sport managers					-
Measure 1 SMGT 812- Ethical dilemma assignment (direct)	Minimum of 90% at mostly prepared or better	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2021
Measure 2 SMGT 847- Internship reflection/ integration paper (direct)	Minimum of 90% at acceptable or better on each section of the report	25	25	100%	Exceeds expectations
Measure 3 Alumni survey (indirect)	Minimum of 80% at mostly	128, 128	125, 127	97.7%, 99.2%	Exceeds expectations

	prepared or				
Measure 4	better Minimum of	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled
Employer survey	80% at mostly	INA	INA	INA	for reporting
(indirect)	prepared or				until AY 2020
(better				
Measure 5	Minimum of	18, 20	18, 20	100%, 100%	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	80% at mostly				expectations
Internship site supervisor evaluation	prepared, or better, or				
(indirect)	agree.				
SLO 3 – Students will		nking skills r	elated to effecti	ve decision-makin	ng in sport
organizations.		e			
Measure 1	Minimum of	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled
SMGT 801-	90% at mostly				for reporting
Organizational	prepared or				until AY 2021
evaluation	better				
assignment					
(direct) Measure 2	Minimum of	25	25	100%	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	90% at	23	23	10070	expectations
Internship reflection/	acceptable or				-np
integration paper	better on each				
(direct)	section of the				
	report				
Measure 3	Minimum of	128, 128	128, 126	100%,	Exceeds
Alumni survey	80% at mostly			98.4%	expectations
(indirect)	prepared or				
Measure 4	better Minimum of	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled
Employer survey	80% at mostly	INA	INA	INA .	for reporting
(indirect)	prepared or				until AY 2020
()	better				
Measure 5	Minimum of	20, 20	19, 20	95%, 100%	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	80% at mostly				expectations
Internship site	prepared, or				
supervisor evaluation	better, or				
(indirect) SLO 4- Students will d	agree.	langton din a of	f the foundation	a of offortive mass	anah in an art
management.	iemonstrate an uno	ierstanding of	the foundation	is of effective rese	aren in sport
Measure 1	Minimum of	26	26	100%	Exceeds
SMGT 800- Research	90% at				expectations
report	acceptable or				1
(direct)	better				
Measure 2	Minimum of	25	25	100%	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	90% at				expectations
Internship reflection/	acceptable or				
integration paper (direct)	better on each section of the				
(direct)	report				
Measure 3	Minimum of	128, 128	120, 113	93.8%,	Exceeds
Alumni survey	80% at mostly		,	88.3%	expectations
(indirect)	prepared or				
	better				

Measure 4	Minimum of	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled
Employer survey	80% at mostly				for reporting
(indirect)	prepared or				until AY 2020
	better				
Measure 5	Minimum of	19, 19	19, 19	100%, 100%	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	80% at mostly				expectations
Internship site	prepared, or				
supervisor evaluation	better, or				
(indirect)	agree.				
SLO 5- Students will d	lemonstrate an und	lerstanding of	and appreciati	on for diversity an	nd its impact on
managerial decision-m					
Measure 1	Minimum of	25	25	100%	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	90% at				expectations
Internship reflection/	acceptable or				
integration paper	better on each				
(direct)	section of the				
	report				
Measure 2	Minimum of	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled
SMGT 810-	90% at				for reporting
Diversity paper	acceptable or				until AY 2020
(direct)	better				
Measure 3	Minimum of	128, 128	124, 122	97%, 95.3%	Exceeds
Alumni survey	80% at mostly				expectations
(indirect)	prepared or				
	better				
Measure 4	Minimum of	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled
Employer survey	80% at mostly				for reporting
(indirect)	prepared or				until AY 2020
	better				
Measure 5	Minimum of	20, 20	18, 19	90%, 95%	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	80% at mostly				expectations
Internship site	prepared, or				
supervisor evaluation	better, or				
(indirect)	agree.				
SLO 6- Students will d			en and interper	sonal communica	tion skills
necessary for effective	sport management	t practice.	-		
Measure 1	Minimum of	25	25	100%	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	90% at				expectations
Internship reflection/	acceptable or				
integration paper	better on each				
(direct)	section of the				
	report				
Measure 2	Minimum of	25	25	100%	Exceeds
SMGT 803-	90% at				expectations
Marketing plan	acceptable or			1	
(direct)	better				
Measure 3	Minimum of	128, 128,	121,125,	94.5%,97.6	Exceeds
Alumni survey	80% at mostly	128	127	%, 99.2%	expectations
(indirect)	prepared or			1	
-	better				
Measure 4	Minimum of	NA	NA	NA	Not scheduled
Employer survey	80% at mostly				for reporting
(indirect)	prepared or				until AY 2020
	· - ·				1

Measure 5	Minimum of	17, 20, 20	17, 20, 20	100%,	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	80% at mostly			100%, 100%	expectations
Internship site	prepared, or			,	1
supervisor evaluation	better, or				
(indirect)	agree.				
SLO 7- Students will a	cquire more than 8	300 hours of fie	eld experience in	n which the kno	wledge and skills
acquired in their sport i					
Measure 1	Minimum of	25	25	100%	Exceeds
SMGT 847-	90% at				expectations
Internship reflection/	acceptable or				1
integration paper	better on each				
(direct)	section of the				
· · ·	report				
Measure 2	Minimum of	25	25	100%	Meets
SMGT 847- Resume	90% at				expectations
(direct)	acceptable or				
	better on each				
	section of the				
	report				
Measure 5	Minimum of	20	20	100%	Meets
SMGT 847-	95% agree on				expectations
Internship site	performance				
supervisor evaluation	evaluation				
(indirect)	items				
Measure 4	Minimum of	130	113	87%	Meets
Alumni survey	80% at mostly				expectations
(indirect)	valuable or				
	better				
**Explanation of cour	se action for inter	nded outcomes	not realized:		

Notes: 1) If you are using different direct and indirect measures for different degree programs, please replicate this form, using one form for each program that has different measures. If different programs use the same measures, only one copy of this form is needed. 2) At a minimum, you are required to use two direct and two indirect measures to assess all of your student learning outcomes. You are not required to measure each student learning outcome with more than one measure, though it is encouraged. This matrix offers space to show that you have more than one measure for each SLO, but it is not required.

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			
OEG 1 – Recru staff	OEG 1 – Recruit, hire, and retain diverse, high quality administrators, faculty, and staff					
** Measure 1 Aggregated SPTE data	Median result for perceived quality index of "good" or better. All other data to be considered.	82.4% of courses were rated at "good" or better.	Meets expectations			
Measure 2 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			
Measure 3 Exit survey: advising questions (Institutional exit survey)	Average score of 3 or better for each advising question on survey	Met; mean= 4.93 with 100% being "satisfied or higher" with advising. (Median=5.00)	Exceeds expectations			
Measure 4 Exit survey	Minimum of 80% of all responses being mostly prepared or better. All other data to be considered.	Most content areas (11/13; 84.6%) reported over 80% of respondents being "mostly prepared" or better (ranging from 80%-95%; 16/20- 19/20) except financial management (15/20; 75%) and budgeting (15/20; 75%).	**Does not meet expectations			
Measure 5 Alumni survey	Average program satisfaction score of 8 or better. All other data to be considered.	82% (78/95) rated their program satisfaction at an 8 or better.	Meets expectations			
Measure 6 Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied.	Approved vote (May 3, 2019)	Meets expectations			
Measure 7 Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2017, a new SMGT strategic plan was developed, authored, and approved by the College of Applied Studies. It is in alignment with the College of Applied Studies and Wichita State University's strategic planning templates and values. Yearly progress on the approved strategic plan is assessed and identified. In AY2020 Wichita State University will continue evaluating its current plan.	Meets expectations			

	L					
Measure 1 SCH data	Comparison of department SCH with other university data and historical department data	Data reviewed June 11, 2019. Regarding AY2018 data, UG SCH were 2,945 (+33.4%) for fall and spring was 2,879 (+21.4%) Degree conferrals declined from AY 2017 to AY 2018 by 8.6% (58 vs. 53 conferrals) and major headcounts were as follows: fall (+1.8%); spring (-0.5%); summer (+6.3%). As a result, the relatively small department produces a sizable number of credit hours for both the college and university.	Meets expectations			
Measure 2 Graduation and retention rates	Comparison of department rates with other university data and historical department data	Data reviewed June 11, 2019. Report indicated department retention rates varied by year but were generally comparable with university levels. Undergraduate majors were slightly up from last year (225 vs. 218 majors), thus indicating a healthy undergraduate program. It should be noted, that between 2012 and 2018, undergraduate major headcount has increased 35.9%, according to the Office of Planning and Analysis.	Meets expectations			
Measure 3 Employer survey	Average overall rating of graduates of 8 or better. All other data to be considered	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2020			
Measure 4 Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved vote (May 3, 2019)	Meets expectations			
Measure 5 Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2017, a new SMGT strategic plan was developed, authored, and approved by the College of Applied Studies. It is in alignment with the College of Applied Studies and Wichita State University's strategic planning templates and values. Yearly progress on the approved strategic plan is assessed and identified. In AY2020 Wichita State University will continue evaluating its current plan.	Meets expectations			
OEG 3 – Achieve	OEG 3 – Achieve professional recognition for programs					
Measure 1 KBOR approval	Approved status	Approved through 2020	Meets expectations			
Measure 2 COSMA accreditation	Accredited status	Review completed. Accredited through 2019; Self-study submitted in May 2019 with site visit in September of 2019.	Insufficient Data			

Measure 3 Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2017, a new SMGT strategic plan was developed, authored, and approved by the College of Applied Studies. It is in alignment with the College of Applied	
		Studies and Wichita State University's strategic planning templates and values. Yearly progress on the approved strategic plan is assessed and identified. In AY2020 Wichita State University will continue evaluating its current plan.	Meets expectations
OEG 4 – Ensure a	technology rich culture in	n which administrators, students, facul	ty, and staff work
	sue innovation and excelle	ence, (b) promote intellectual explorat	
** Measure 1 SPTE student comments: technology	Minimum of 80% of responses to technology question(s) coded as positive	83% of responses coded as positive	Meets expectations
Measure 2 Exit surveys: technology questions	Minimum of 80% of all responses being mostly prepared or better	All related responses meet criterion (85%, 90%) (17/20, 18/20).	Exceeds expectations
Measure 3 Faculty/staff technology updates	Review of hardware/software updates within the department	Report approved at June 11, 2019 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
Measure 4 Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved vote (May 3, 2019)	Meets expectations
Measure 5 Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress towards objectives defined in plan	In AY2017, a new SMGT strategic plan was developed, authored, and approved by the College of Applied Studies. It is in alignment with the College of Applied Studies and Wichita State University's strategic planning templates and values. Yearly progress on the approved strategic plan is assessed and identified. In AY2020 Wichita State University will continue evaluating its current plan.	Meets expectations
OEG 5 – Develop department's missi	ion.	re relationships, local and globally, the	at enrich the
Measure 1 Faculty/staff partnership summary	Review of key partnerships established/maintained through the year	Report approved at June 11, 2019 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
Measure 2 Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved vote (May 3, 2019)	Meets expectations
Measure 3 Annual faculty/staff	Progress towards objectives defined in plan	In AY2017, a new SMGT strategic plan was developed, authored, and approved by the College of Applied Studies. It is in alignment	Meets expectations

review of	with the College of Applied	
strategic plan	Studies and Wichita State	
	University's strategic planning	
	templates and values. Yearly	
	progress on the approved strategic	
	plan is assessed and identified. In	
	AY2020 Wichita State University	
	will continue evaluating its current	
	plan.	

** Explanation of course action for intended outcomes not realized:

OEG 1, Measure 4: Twenty students responded to the exit survey, which was a response rate of almost 38%. All sport management knowledge was reported at or above the 80% benchmarks of mostly prepare (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 (75%), and budgeting (75%). There needs to be more focused attention on these concepts within the appropriate courses. These courses and concepts 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. Additionally, marketing—which is usually highly rated—barely achieved the 80% benchmark. As a result, it too needs a more focused effort on engaging students in order to not only promote retention, but also better prepare students for matriculation into the industry.

OEG 1, Measure 1: Aggregated SPTE data. While aggregated SPTE data is descriptive, a major limitation involves getting all SPTE data for all courses. And, SPTEs are not generated for any experiential courses. As a result, faculty are exploring options for a new measure.

OEG 4, Measure 1: SPTE student comments: technology. 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.

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.

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

	IVI. L/u. –	- 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
OEG 1 – Recruit staff	, hire, and retain diver	se, high quality administrator	rs, faculty, and
**Measure 1 Aggregated SPTE data	Median result for perceived quality index of "good" or better. All other data to be considered.	100% of courses were rated at "good" or better.	Exceeds expectations
Measure 2 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
Measure 3 Exit survey: advising questions (Institutional exit survey)	Average score of 3 or better for advising questions.	Satisfied or higher: Q21=93.1% (mean= 4.59; median=5.00)	Meets expectations
Measure 4 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= 96.6% (mean=4.59; median=5.00) Q10=96.6% (mean=4.69; median=5.00) Q11=93.1% (mean=4.48; median=5.00)	Meets expectations
Measure 5 Alumni survey	Average program satisfaction score of 8 or better. All other data to be considered.	91% (111/122) rated their program satisfaction at an 8 or better.	Meets expectations
Measure 6 Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied.	Approved vote (May 3, 2019)	Meets expectations
Measure 7 Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2017, a new SMGT strategic plan was developed, authored, and approved by the College of Applied Studies. It is in alignment with the College of Applied Studies and Wichita State University's strategic planning templates and values. Yearly progress on the approved strategic plan is assessed and identified. In AY2020 Wichita State	Meets expectations

		University will continue	
OEC 2 Descrit and	evaluating its current plan.		
OEG 2 – Recruit and retain quality students to meet local and global demands for our graduates. Measure 1 Comparison ofPer data from the Office of			
SCH data	department SCH with other university data and historical department data	Planning and Analysis (OPA) here at WSU, AY 2018 SCH for our graduate program were as follows: Fall: 501 SCH (+4.4%); Spring: 508 (+12.6%); and Summer: 92 SCH (+5.4%) for a total SCH during AY 2018 of 1,106 (+8.1%).	Meets expectations
Measure 2 Graduation and retention rates	Comparison of department rates with other university data and historical department data	Data showed 27 degrees conferred, which was an increase of 17.4% from the previous year. However, the previous reporting cycle saw a decrease in conferrals by 37%, thus indicating caution when interpreting this percentage growth.	Meets expectations
Measure 3 Employer survey	Average overall rating of graduates of 8 or better. All other data to be considered	NA	Not scheduled for reporting until AY 2020
Measure 4 Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved vote (May 3, 2019)	Meets expectations
Measure 5 Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2017, a new SMGT strategic plan was developed, authored, and approved by the College of Applied Studies. It is in alignment with the College of Applied Studies and Wichita State University's strategic planning templates and values. Yearly progress on the approved strategic plan is assessed and identified. In AY2020 Wichita State University will continue evaluating its current plan.	Meets expectations
*	ofessional recognition for p		
Measure 1 KBOR approval	Approved status	Approved through 2020	Meets expectations
Measure 2 COSMA accreditation	Accredited status	Review completed. Accredited through 2019; Self-study submitted in May 2019 with site visit in September of 2019.	Insufficient Data
Measure 3 Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2017, a new SMGT strategic plan was developed, authored, and approved by the College of Applied Studies. It is in alignment with the	Meets expectations

mission components		College of Applied Studies and Wichita State University's strategic planning templates and values. Yearly progress on the approved strategic plan is assessed and identified. In AY2020 Wichita State University will continue evaluating its current plan. pport the University's research an	nd grants/contracts
Measure 1 Faculty professional development report	Review data based on Faculty Activity Records	Report approved at June 11, 2019 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
Measure 2 Faculty grant writing report	Review data based on Faculty Activity Records	Report approved at June 11, 2019 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
Measure 3 Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved vote (May 3, 2019)	Meets expectations
Measure 4 Annual faculty/staff review of strategic plan	Progress toward objectives defined in plan	In AY2017, a new SMGT strategic plan was developed, authored, and approved by the College of Applied Studies. It is in alignment with the College of Applied Studies and Wichita State University's strategic planning templates and values. Yearly progress on the approved strategic plan is assessed and identified. In AY2020 Wichita State University will continue evaluating its current plan.	Meets expectations
		hich administrators, students, facu e, (b) promote intellectual explorat	
**Measure 1 SPTE student comments: technology	Review of responses to technology question	98.1% of comments coded as positive	Exceeds expectations
Measure 2 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	82.6% responded satisfied or higher, mean=4.39 (median=5.00). ¹ (¹ NOTE: Q27e measures satisfaction with technology here at WSU and cannot be interpreted as solely a program responsibility)	Meets expectations
Measure 3 Faculty/staff technology updates	Review of hardware/software updates within the department	Report approved at June 11, 2019 faculty meeting.	Meets expectations
Measure 4 Advisory council	Annual vote of satisfied	Approved vote (May 3, 2019)	Meets expectations

*******Explanation of course action for intended outcomes not realized:*

All course outcomes were realized; however, some limitations and suggestions are as follows:

OEG 1, Measure 1: Aggregated SPTE data. While aggregated SPTE data is descriptive, a major limitation involves getting all SPTE data for all courses. And, SPTEs are not generated for any experiential courses. As a result, faculty are exploring options for a new measure.

OEG 5, Measure 1: SPTE student comments: technology. 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.

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.

PROGRAM INFORMATION PROFILE

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

Name of Institution

Institution: Wichita State University

Program Accreditor: Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA)

Institutional Accreditor: Higher Learning Commission (HLC)

Date of Next Comprehensive Program Accreditation Review: September 30/October 1, 2019

Date of Next Comprehensive Institutional Accreditation Review: 2026-27

To learn more about the accredited status of the program, click here:

https://www.wichita.edu/academics/applied_studies/Sport_Management/About/COSMA/COSM A.php

Program Context and Mission

Program Mission:

The Department of Sport Management's mission is to develop students into well-educated, ethical, competent sport management professionals. The department's teaching, research, and service activities will occur in a positive learning environment valuing both theory and practice.

Program goals:

Per the approved annual assessment plan, the Department of Sport Management has both operational and educational student learner goals. The broad-based operational goals for the Department of Sport Management are:

- 1) Recruit and/or retain diverse, high quality administrators, faculty, and staff
- 2) Recruit and retain diverse, quality students to meet local and global demands for our graduates.
- 3) Achieve professional recognition for programs.
- 4) Strengthen the graduate program to support the University's research and grants/contracts mission components.
- 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.
- 6) Develop and maintain collaborative relationships, locally and globally, that enrich the department's mission.

The approved broad-based learning goals for students in the B.A.-Sport Management program are:

- 1) Students will display knowledge and understanding of the management, marketing, public relations, financial, psycho-social, and legal concepts relevant to effective practice for those preparing for careers in the sport management field
- 2) Students will be able to apply ethical decision-making frameworks in relation to issues facing sport managers.
- 3) Students will display critical thinking skills related to effective decision-making in sport organizations.
- 4) Students will display an understanding of and appreciation for diversity in sport.
- 5) Students will demonstrate the oral, written and interpersonal communication skills necessary for effective sport management practice.
- 6) Students will demonstrate skills pertaining to the use of technology in sport management.
- 7) Students will acquire more than 600 hours of field experience in which the knowledge and skills acquired in their sport management classes are successfully applied in a sport management setting.

Brief description of student population:

At Wichita State University, the undergraduate student population is diverse with the average age being 26.1 years old while the graduate student population is, similarly, diverse with the average age being 32.4 years old. The total university population is 54.5% female and the race/ethnicity breakdowns are as follows:

Demographic	% UG	% GR
White, non-	58.3	62.1
Hispanic		
Hispanic	12	7.1
Asian, non-Hispanic	6.5	3.9
Black, non-Hispanic	6.1	5.1
Multiracial, non-	4.2	2.2
Hispanic		
First generation	40	15
International	9	16.9

Particular to the Department of Sport Management, demographic data mined from the official fall 2018 count are as follows:

•	Total UG majors:	230
•	URM (underrepresented minority member):	29.19%
•	Female:	20.4%

The most recent comparative and comprehensive demographic information, from the Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) is from AY2016. While these data are not recent, they are the only demographic comparison data available to university department chairs and can provide some context regarding demographic patterns. Specifically, rolling 5-year averages (2011-2015) of URMs within WSU, College of Applied Studies and the Department of Sport Management is as follows:

Academic classification	University %	College %	Sport Management %
Fr. & Soph	18.7	14.7	16.1
Jr. & Sr.	15.3	13	16.2
Masters	10.2	11	12.8

While Sport Management's URM percentages within the undergraduate population are lower than university percentages for freshmen and sophomores, they are greater than the College of Applied Studies percentages on all levels. Additionally, percentages of URMs for Sport Management juniors and seniors are greater than university percentages. It should be noted, as well, that Sport Management URM percentages for the Master's level are above both the university and college URM percentages.

Admissions requirements:

When you choose to major in Sport Management your academic advisor who will help you plan your course of study and outline specific major requirements. Admission to both the College of Applied and the Department of Sport Management requires a GPA of 2.0 required. A minimum of 120 total hours are required for graduation. You can find more information about the <u>undergraduate program</u> through <u>Undergraduate Admissions</u>.

{The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank}

Indicators of Effectiveness with Undergraduates as Determined by the Program

		• •
1.	Graduation	
	Year:	AY2019
	# of Graduates:	55
	Graduation Rate:	
2.	Completion of Educational (Goal (other than certificate or degree – if data collected)
	# of Students Surveyed:	NA
	# Completing Goal:	NA
3.	Average Time to Certificate	or Degree
	1-Year Certificate:	NA
	2-Year Degree:	NA
	4-Year Degree:	5.1 years
4.	Annual Transfer Activity	
	Year:	AY2018
	# of Transfers:	166/238 (72.8%) have transfer hours
	Transfer Rate:	Unknown
5.	Graduates Entering Gradua	te School
	Year:	AY2018
	# of Graduates:	55
	# Entering Graduate School:	7.3%
6.	Job Placement (if appropriate	
	Year:	AY2018
	# of Graduates:	55
	# Employed:	50.9% reported current employment when applying for graduation
7.	Licensure/Certification Exami	nation Results:

8. Additional Indicators, if any: See narrative below

In regards to undergraduates that applied for graduation¹, 67.3% of our majors worked offcampus with 69.1% receiving forms of financial aid. Almost 80% (78.2%) of this undergraduate graduating class received support from a scholarship (or some kind) and 60% of that graduating class indicating that they would engage in future volunteer service.

¹ OPA data were drawn from UG Student Exit Surveys, which are completed during the application for degree process. This process, typically, occurs in the fall semester before they graduate in the following spring semester.

Students were employed in a variety of industry segments and at various levels. Based on a content analysis done (2017-2018) of our Sport Management Alumni Association and Alumni directory (n=389) graduate and undergraduate students work in selected employment sectors and descriptors:

Employment descriptor	Graduate students	Undergraduate students
Professional sports	10%	25%
College sports	51%	41%
Recreation	9%	17%
High school sports	16%	NA
Other	14%	17%
Outside of Wichita	79%	63%

Additionally, students were asked in our 2018-2019 BA (n=54) and MEd (n=130) alumni surveys to indicate their level of employment and descriptors:

Employment descriptor	² Graduate students	³ Undergraduate students
Entry-level in industry	6.9%	9.8%
Mid-level in industry	44.8%	35.3%
Senior-level in industry	24.2%	25.5%
Working outside of		
industry	24.1%	29.4%

 $^{^{2}}$ 81% of GR students self-reported they were employed while still in school or within 12 months of graduation.

 $^{^{3}}$ 68% of UG students self-reported they were employed while still in school or within 12 months of graduation.