Creating a **QUALITY** Program Impact Report
Program Impact Report (PIR)

Covers 3 years of SLAR reporting
- 2016-17
- 2017-18
- 2018-19

New requirement
- Due November 15, 2019

PIR Components
- SLOs
- Direct Measures
- Impact
- Changes
- Teaching
- Additional Information
Suskie’s Five Dimensions of Quality

Focus and Aspiration

Relevance

Evidence

Community

Betterment
## Focus and Aspiration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Know your Program</td>
<td>• What would you like to achieve / accomplish?</td>
<td>• What is possible and how are you going to get there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the future of your program?</td>
<td>• Stakeholder needs</td>
<td>• Who, what, and why are you assessing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the worth of your program?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• What do you want to know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Why does it matter?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>Targets for Success</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Assessment works best when the programs it seeks to improve have clear, explicit, and implementable processes | • Justifiable  
• Appropriately rigorous  
• Able to explain what minimally acceptable is and why | • Sampling – what do you need to make informed decisions  
• Rubrics - helps to make criteria used to assess student work explicit  
• Data – what ‘actions’ could be implemented to benefit students, instructors, and program  
• Resources – consider cost of assessment strategies |
Betterment

Informed by Evidence

- program goals and targets
- teaching and learning
- growth and development of courses
- discovery - what’s missing

Assessment makes a difference when it begins with issues of use and illuminates questions that people really care about.
## Community

### Shared Governance
- Assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from across the educational community are involved.

### Respect
- Have dialogue with colleagues - listen to what they have to say - integrate their ideas.

### Collaboration & Faculty Engagement
- Contribute to the decisions that are being made.
- How can you make assessment meaningful if you are not engaged?
## Relevance

### Integrity
- Put students first
- Keep promises
- Do the right thing

### Stewardship
- Healthy program
- Monitor impact
- Use resources effectively

### Accountability
- If you focus on improvement, compliance will occur naturally
Student Learning and Assessment

What if... learning Improvement was the goal?

- Has it contributed to changes in the student experience?
- Has it helped create a high quality learning experience?
- Does it inspire action and did the action lead to improvements in learning?

- What changes would happen?
- What would this look like?
Question: Are the direct measures and assignment(s)/activities appropriate? Do they need to be revised, tweaked, changed?

- The majority of direct measures that we utilize in our assessment processes are sufficient and we use the findings to improve teaching strategies in core courses. We have decided, however, to revise how we report the findings of the multiple-choice exam. Currently, the multiple-choice exam is based on 120 mastery questions related to content areas (20 questions per six content areas). Over the past three years we have only looked at the overall scores – i.e. 70% of graduates will score 70% or better on the content knowledge exam. Moving forward, faculty have decided to provide scores for each content area so we are aware of student’s strengths and weaknesses in each content area.
Questions:

Are the assessment findings being used to make a positive impact in the program/unit?

How can you tell?
What’s different now compared to before?

What were program faculty especially proud?

- In 15-16 and 16-17, the findings for written communication did not meet the programs expectations. Based on two years' worth of assessment data, faculty choose to add written communication assignments and activities in core courses, specifically all 2000-level courses. In 2017-2018, based on the assessment in KIN 4518, students showed considerable improvement in written communication.

- In 16-17 and 17-18, the findings showed that students consistently demonstrated weakness in outcome 4 (research). Therefore, the courses teaching research methods were reviewed and modified to enforce the skills students were expected to achieve (understand, interpret, critique, and apply research). In addition, opportunities for assistance were enhanced via the development of self-paced modules to reinforce course content. These changes were implemented in fall 2018 and assessed in spring 2019; due to the changes, students have become stronger in developing the skills needed to apply research in the field of sports administration.

- The senior internship direct observation form has been conducted annually over the last five years and provides sound evidence of successful attainment of students using critical thinking skills to solve problems. The data however, seems to come back consistently showing students in our program are average. There have been many faculty discussions relating to the fact that we want our students to be more than merely average. In the summer of 2018 our program sent out a survey to all employers participating in the senior internship program. Questions asked centered around the knowledge and skills they wanted to see in our students. The goal was to search for gaps between what our employers want and what our curriculum is currently teaching. The analysis is still underway; however, we envision revisiting our curriculum based on these findings.
Question: Describe any changes or planned changes to the curriculum?

- There have not been any changes to the curriculum other than implementing new teaching strategies, however we are in the process of analyzing our employer survey. We do anticipate making a few changes to our curriculum based on that analysis.
Question: What types of pedagogies, teaching strategies, or techniques were implemented?

- In KIN 2510 and KIN 2530, written communication intensive assignments (draft, feedback, revise process) were added. For example, in KIN 2510 students were asked to write a 3-page essay on a sports topic of their choice. The student submitted the essay in Week 3, the instructor gave feedback by Week 4, and the student revised the exact same essay and resubmitted in Week 5. Not only has this type of teaching strategy increased student performance on the communication outcome, but instructors are noticing that students are becoming more confident in their writing skills.
- The courses teaching research methods were reviewed and modified to enforce the skills students were expected to achieve (understand, interpret, critique, and apply research). In addition, opportunities for assistance were enhanced via the development of self-paced modules to reinforce course content.
Question:

Please provide any additional information that demonstrates and/or supports the program's assessment efforts.

For example: indirect measures such as employer feedback, advisory boards, focus groups, graduate student and/or alumni satisfaction, teacher effectiveness, etc.

Graduating seniors are asked to complete a survey to gather information concerning their perspectives on their knowledge in the following subject areas: History, Legal/Ethical Issues in Sport, Sport Marketing, Event Management, Facility Management, Financial Issues in Sport, Sport Administration, and Governance. The survey rating scale is as follows: (5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = average, 2 = poor, 1 = extremely poor and NA = not applicable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Issues in Sport</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Issues in Sport</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Marketing</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Management</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Management</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Issues in Sport</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Administration</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We continue to take students' perceptions into consideration and work to address the curricular concerns by making modifications in the appropriate courses.
Questions?
We’d love to hear from you!

- Dr. Sandi Gillilan, Associate Vice Provost (Accreditation and Strategic Planning)
- Dr. Tara Rose, Director of Assessment (Student Learning Assessment and Integrative Learning Core)
- Dr. Josiah Nyangau, Assistant Director of Assessment (Student Learning Assessment and NSSE)
- Ms. Stephenie Franks, Assistant Director of Institutional Effectiveness (Program Review)
- Ms. Tori Clement, Coordinator (Institutional Effectiveness Activities and Taskstream)

8:00 AM - 4:30 PM, Monday – Friday, 336 T. Boyd Hall, 225-578-4935 or www.lsu.edu/oie