

POAR Rubric (2021-22)

Program name **MS IN SPORTS ADMINISTRATION**

Notes: The reconciled score of each criterion is listed at the end of the rubric along with the comments offered by the reviewers

1. The program's mission statement is clearly aligned with the overall mission of the institution.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

2. The program has developed a sufficient number of goals (objectives) that clearly address the breadth of the program requirements and expectations.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

3. The program has developed a sufficient number of clear and measurable learning outcomes for each goal (objective).

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

4. The program has developed multiple measures of assessment for each learning outcome; measures may be direct/indirect and/or qualitative/quantitative.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

5. The program has developed benchmarks for each assessment technique that are both reasonable and challenging.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

6. The program has collected meaningful data directly related to each learning outcome.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

7. Assessment data have been explicitly used to identify challenges and/or successes resulting in program modifications or "staying the course", respectively.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

8. The assessment process covers the breadth of the student experience and clearly demonstrates the depth of understanding needed to successfully complete the program.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

9. The program's commitment to continuous improvement is clearly demonstrated by the information contained in the assessment plan, findings, and executive summary.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

10. The assessment process used by the program is feasible and does not overload or overburden faculty either collectively or individually.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

CRITERION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TOTAL
SCORE	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	49

Summary Comments

The program area indicates they "are still designing assessments to meet the program goals and outcomes" which shows a use of data and assessments to inform programmatic decisions. Some learning outcomes have multiple measures.

No data collected as no students completed the program in 2021-2022.

Assessments listed provide solid direct measures of learning outcomes, however only 6 total assessments are listed for 6 goals and 6 learning outcomes. The current assessments are specific and provide both internal measures.

The program mission statement is aligned with the university mission. The program goals reflect the mission of the program as

well as the university. The program provides multiple clearly stated goals. Each goal has at least two clear and measurable learning outcomes.

Many learning outcomes have only one measurement assessment, however each goal has multiple outcomes. The measurement assessments that are used are rigorous and cover the breadth of the program.

All measurements are internal and many are subjective, however many outcomes are assessed with course final exams and KIN 5863 requires 70% or better on a comprehensive final exam, which suggests that the internal direct measures are all rigorous and challenging. Many outcomes are measured with final projects and/or final papers. The volume of research papers used as assessments is a good indication that the assessment instruments measure the learning outcomes for the entire program.

The acknowledgement of a recent redesign of the assessment measures indicates the faculty commitment to continuous improvement. Given the recency of the assessment design, no additional changes are recommended at this time.

Recommend that faculty continue to develop multiple measurements and reasonably attainable benchmarks.