|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DEGREE PROGRAM**  **STUDENT LEARNING REPORT**  (Rev. August 2013) | **ROGERS STATE UNIVERSITY**  **Department of Sport Management**  **For Academic Year 2012-2013** |

Effectively assessing a degree program should address a number of factors:

1. Valid student learning outcomes should be clearly articulated;
2. Valid assessment measures should be used, consistent with the standards of professional practice;
3. There should be evidence that assessment data are being used by faculty to make necessary instructional or assessment changes; and

there should be evidence that instructional or assessment changes are being implemented to improve student learning.

**Relationship of Degree Program (or Major) Learning Outcomes to Departmental and University Missions**

|  |
| --- |
| **Name of Degree, including Level and Major: Sport Management** |

1. **A.**  Insert and clearly state the school, department and degree program missions in the spaces below.

| **University Mission** | **School Mission** | **Department Mission** | **Degree Program Mission** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities. | The mission of the SBT is to support RSU in its mission to prepare students to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities | The Sport Management degree is designed to assist students to meet their primary professional and personal goals, including graduating with sufficient competitive skills and knowledge to obtain meaningful employment and facilitate reasonable career advancement in the area of sport management. | The Sport Management degree is designed to assist students to meet their primary professional and personal goals, including graduating with sufficient competitive skills and knowledge to obtain meaningful employment and facilitate reasonable career advancement in the area of sport management. |

**B.**  Insert and clearly state school purposes, department purposes and degree program student learning outcomes in the spaces below, making sure to align the degree program student learning outcomes with their appropriate school and department purposes, and these outcomes and purposes with their appropriate university commitments.

| **University Commitments** | **School Purposes** | **Department Purposes** | **Student Learning Outcomes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning and critical and creative thinking. | The SBT provides this support by providing two-year and four-year educational opportunities in business, sport management, and technology. | Offer a baccalaureate program that promotes lifelong learning and prepares the student for graduate education in sport management, business, or law. | The student will demonstrate appropriate management and leadership skills in the industry in a variety of events and venues and for varying populations. |
| To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning. | The SBT accomplishes its mission through traditional and innovative learning opportunities including six bachelor’s programs and four associate degrees. | Provide the graduate with an educational foundation containing the crucial body of knowledge necessary for employment in sport management. | The student will apply the ethical, legal, marketing and communication principles to sport management scenarios. |
| To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic program sand prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society. | The baccalaureate degrees are taught using a large array of innovative methods. | Facilitate student ability to expand their knowledge base from the Arts and Sciences including competence in multiple methods of communication. | The student will demonstrate mastery of current knowledge, theory and research. |
| To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs. |  | Provide an environment which fosters a tolerance of diverse perspectives of culture and society. | The student will demonstrate mastery of current knowledge, theory and research. |
| To provide university-wide student services, activities and resources that complement academic programs. |  | Provide sport management graduates to meet the needs of the area, state, region and nation. | The student will assess the sport management educational experience. |
| To support and strengthen student, faculty and administrative structures that promote shared governance of the institution. |  |  |  |
| To promote and encourage student, faculty, staff and community interaction in a positive academic climate that creates opportunities for cultural, intellectual and personal enrichment for the University and the communities it serves. |  |  |  |

**Discussion of Instructional Changes Resulting from 2011-2012 Sport Management Degree Program Student Learning Report**

1. List and discuss all instructional or assessment changes proposed in Part 5 of last year’s Degree Program Student Learning Report, whether implemented or not. Any other changes or assessment activities from last year, but not mentioned in last year’s report, should be discussed here as well. Emphasis should be placed on student learning and considerations such as course improvements, the assessment process, and the budget. If no changes were planned or implemented, simply state “No changes were planned or implemented.”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional or Assessment Changes** | **Changes Implemented (Y/N)** | **Impact of Changes on Degree Program Curriculum or Budget** |
| The survey instrument needs further revision to determine if SO 5 can really reflect a learning outcome when the word “satisfied” is included in the scale. | Y | Improved terminology was used in SO 5 so that satisfaction was not assumed. |
| There are proposed degree program changes which will result in adding a Sport Ethics class and an Excel class along with more business support classes. | Y | The degree program was modified and an Ethics and Excel class was added to the program core requirements. Two options were added and the required minor was deleted. The Sport Business option requires more business classes to strengthen the degree. These changes go into effect for those beginning the program in Fall 2013. There will be a need for another instructor within two years. |

1. The University Assessment Committee in its Degree Program Peer Review Report provided feedback and recommendations for improvement in assessment. List or accurately summarize all feedback and recommendations from the committee, and state whether they were implemented or will be implemented at a future date. If they were not or will not be implemented, please explain why. If no changes were recommended last year, simply state “No changes were recommended.”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Feedback and Recommended Changes from the University Assessment Committee** | **Suggestions Implemented**  **(Y/N)** | **Changes that Were or Will Be Implemented, or**  **Rationale for Changes that Were Not Implemented** |
| B. Consider switching Student Learning Outcome 1 for Student Outcome 3. Outcome 1 appears to be aligned more with competence in multiple methods of innovative learning, and Outcome 3 appears to be aligned with scientific reasoning, communication, and critical thinking. | N | The outcomes were re-worded and the change is not necessary. |
| The new option was not submitted. The limited number of faculty creates a burden on the existing faculty to implement curriculum and program changes. | Y | The program changes and new option was submitted and approved through RSU academic channels and the Board of Regents and went into effect in Fall 2013. |
| Outcome 5, consider rewriting and including Bloom’s revised taxonomy, such as “students will evaluate sport management educational experience.” | Y | Student outcomes were revised to include Bloom’s revised taxonomy. |
| It is not necessary to restate the learning outcome in the measurement section. Describe the assignments which measure student learning, include all assignment components. | Y | These sections were rewritten to accomplish this recommendation. |
| Separate online and on-ground samples. This will provide a clearer overview of student learning in different learning formats. Provide explanations when learning changes from one academic year to the next. | Y | Online and on-ground samples were presented separately in this report. |
| Provide explanations when learning changes from one academic year to the next, provide specific examples. Emphasize learning differences for teaching formats, including online and on-ground. Be specific describing different levels of learning, such as did students apply legal and marketing concepts the same or did they perform better in one area than the other. | Y | Tables were used in this report to allow a better examination of grade distribution. More explanation was focused on possible reasons for the changes. |

**Analysis of Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes**

1. For all student learning outcomes (as listed in Part 1 B above), describe the assessment measures and performance standards used, as well as the sampling methods and sample sizes. For each measure, document the results of the activity measured and draw any relevant conclusions related to strengths and weaknesses of their performance.

| **A.**  **Student Learning Outcomes** | **B.**  **Assessment Measures** | **C.**  **Performance Standards** | **D.**  **Sampling Methods** | **E.**  **Sample Size**  **(N)** | **F.**  **Results** | **G.**  **Conclusions** | **H.**  **Performance Standards Met**  **(Y/N)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.The student will demonstrate appropriate management and leadership skills in the industry in a variety of events and venues and for varying populations. | 1.A On-site supervisor evaluation of SPMT 4116 Event Management field experience.  1.B. On-site supervisor and student evaluations of SPMT 4426 Sport Management Internship. | Eighty percent of students will receive a 5 or better (7 point scale) on the internship evaluation. | 1.A. Required of all majors enrolled in SPMT 4116.  1.B. Required of all majors enrolled in SPMT 4426. | 1. A. N=30  1.B. N=26 | 1.A. 27 of 30 (90%) of interns received 5 or above on the internship evaluation.  Table 1   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | n | 3 | 4 | 10 | 13 | | % | 10 | 13 | 33 | 44 |   1.B. 24 of 26 (92%) of interns received 5 or above on the final internship evaluation report.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | n | 2 | 0 | 8 | 7 | | % | 7 | 0 | 31 | 62 | | Supervisors in the field are satisfied with the overall performance of interns from the program. This year’s results were evaluated separately by the two intern ship experiences and found to be consistent. Both internships are performed during the senior year so students are prepared and perform at a high level in the field. | Yes |
| 2. The student will apply the ethical, legal, marketing and communication principles to sport management scenarios. | 2.A. Rubric-graded paper in SPMT 3213 Legal and Ethical Aspects of Sport Management.  2.B. Rubric-graded marketing plan in SPMT 3013 Marketing Sports. | 2.A. Eighty percent of students will score 70% or above.  2.B. Eighty percent of students will score 70% or above. | 2.A. Required of all majors enrolled in SPMT 3213.  2.B. Required of all majors enrolled in SPMT 3013. | 2.A. N=32  2.B. N=31 | 2.A. 28 of 32 students (88%) scored 70% or higher on the project.  Table 1   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | A | B | C | D/F | | OG | 5 | 7 | 5 | 1 | | OL | 7 | 4 | 0 | 3 | | TOT | 12 | 11 | 5 | 4 |   Table 2   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | A | B | C | D/F | | OG | 28 | 39 | 28 | 5 | | OL | 50 | 29 | 0 | 21 |   KEY: Table 1 reflects numbers of students. Table 2 reflects the percentage of students..  OG = on ground  OL = online  TOT = Total  2.B. 27 of 31 students (87%) scored 70% or higher on the project.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | A | B | C | D/F | | n | 4 | 18 | 5 | 4 | | % | 13 | 58 | 16 | 13 | | 2A. Previous years’ data was not broken into OG and OL results. This year’s analysis shows OG students performed better than OL students. Instructors commented that more students (3) did not turn in this assignment in the OL class which contributed to the lower average. Instructors are unsure of the reason for the difference between the two courses. This is the first year to separate the data from OL and OG courses so results in the future may show if this trend holds. Overall, the results show that students are able to examine various legal issues associated with their area of career interest.  2.B. This year’s scores are consistent with what has been reported in previous years, with a small drop in student performance. The difference could be attributable to a major shift in the way the class was presented. The marketing plan was written in conjunction with a student sales project for the Tulsa Shock, and the timing of the project required that the marketing plan be written earlier in the semester. Perhaps students weren’t as familiar with the material. We plan on implementing the project again this year, and we will see if this trend continues. | Yes |
| 3. The student will demonstrate mastery of current knowledge, theory and research. | A case study-based capstone project in SPMT 4323 Seminar in Sport Management. | Eighty percent of students will score 70% or above. | Required of all majors enrolled in SPMT 4323. | N=28 | 22 of 28 students (79%) made 70% or higher on the capstone project as measured by rubric.  11 students scored 90 or above, 6 scored between 80 and 89, 5 scored between 70 and 79, and 6 scored 69 or lower   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | A | B | C | D/F | | n | 11 | 6 | 5 | 6 | | % | 40 | 21 | 18 | 21 | | Although these results were only one percentage point from the criterion, last year’s results were very similar at 80%. These scores reflect the rigorous nature of four case studies. SPMT 4323 is a blended class and this assignment was done in the online portion. Not much time was spent discussing it in class and 4 students received significant reductions for turning it in late. In the future more emphasis will be placed on the assignment during class and more points will be given for the assignment to give it more importance to the final grade. Also, the name of the course was changed to Senior Capstone as a more accurate name for the expectations of the course. | No |
| 4. The student will evaluate the quality of the internship experience. | An evaluation will be completed by each student intern over the internship experience. | Eighty percent of the students will rate the quality of the experience as 5 or better on a 7 point scale. | Required of all majors enrolled in SPMT 4426 Sport Management Internship. | 26 | 12 of 12 (100%) students rated themselves with a 5 or better on the internship self-evaluation.  11 students rated their internship performance with 6 and 15 rated it 7. | The evaluation instrument is similar to the supervisor’s. Student responses show a confidence in their preparation and quality of their own performance which shows they believe they possess the knowledge and skills to perform their internships in the business world. | Yes |
| 5. The student will assess the sport management educational experience. | A 5-point Likert satisfaction scale is used for the survey evaluating the educational experience in the SPMT major. | Eighty percent of students will respond “satisfied” or “very satisfied.” | The survey will be given in SPMT 4426 Sport Management Internship. | 26 | 100% of students rated their overall educational experience in the major at RSU with “satisfied” or “very satisfied.”  4 students (15%) rated their satisfaction level with 4 (satisfied) and 22 (85%) rated it 5 (very satisfied). | Students are satisfied with the educational experience received in the sport management degree. | Yes |


1. State any proposed instructional or assessment changes to be implemented for the next academic year. They should be based on conclusions reported in Part 4 (above) or on informal activities, such as faculty meetings and discussions, conferences, pilot projects, textbook adoption, new course proposals, curriculum modifications, etc. Explain the rationale for these changes and how they will impact student learning and other considerations, such as curriculum, degree plan, assessment process, or budget. If no changes are planned, simply state “No changes are planned.”

| **Student Learning Outcomes** | **Instructional or Assessment Changes** | **Rationale for Changes** | **Impact of Planned Changes on Student Learning and Other Considerations.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NA | With the change in the degree program, a determination will need to be made whether new or adjusted SO’s should be written and assessed. | The new program has now been implemented with only minor revisions in the core. Two new classes were added. Although there are now two options in the degree program, students in both will take the same core and all of the current assessment is done in these core classes. | Unknown at this time. |

1. (OPTIONAL) If your department or an individual faculty member has developed a teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom, please share it below. Examples can be seen at <http://www.rsu.edu/committees/assessment/docs/FacultyInsights.pdf> . Please briefly describe the instructional practice. More detail can be communicated during the face to face peer review session. The Peer Review Report does not rate this part, but it does note whether or not any contribution has been made.

| **Description** |
| --- |
| Every Sport Management major is required to do a 300 hour senior internship. In the field of sport management, most employers hire from their interns. The internship provides professional training, networking, and resume-building experiences that prepare students for entry level jobs in the field. It is also he basis for excellent assessments used for program evaluation. As a result of the university intern supervisor making two on-site visits, one of which is a formal evaluation visit with the on-site supervisor, strong relationships are formed resulting in more opportunities for interns and graduates from the program. |

1. Assessment Measures:
2. How many different assessment measures were used? five
3. List the direct measures (see rubric): Ratings of student skills by their field experience/intern supervisors, Capstone project scored by a rubric, Paper over sport law scored by a rubric, Marketing Plan scored using a rubric, Written Work or Performances scored using a rubric.
4. List the indirect measures (see rubric): Student ratings of their knowledge and skills in the internship self-evaluation, reflections on what they have learned over the course of the program, and student satisfaction with their learning collected through surveys.



|  |
| --- |
| **RUBRIC FOR STUDENT LEARNING STUDENT LEARNING REPORT** |

1. **A. Are the school, department and program missions clearly stated?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| The program, department, and school missions are clearly stated. | The program, department, and school missions are stated, yet exhibit some deficiency (e.g., are partial or brief). | The program, department, and school missions are incomplete and exhibit some deficiency (e.g., are partial or brief). | The program, department, and school missions are not stated. |

1. **Are student learning outcomes and department purposes aligned with university commitments and school purposes?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Student learning outcomes and department purposes are aligned with university commitments and school purposes. | Student learning outcomes and department purposes demonstrate some alignment with university commitments and school purposes. | Student learning outcomes and department purposes demonstrate limited alignment with university commitment and school purposes. | Student learning outcomes and department purposes do not demonstrate alignment with university commitment and school purposes. |

1. **How well did the department incorporate instructional or assessment changes from last year’s report or from other assessment activities?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All planned changes were listed, whether they were implemented or not, and their impact on curriculum or program budget was discussed thoroughly. | Most planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was discussed. | Some planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was not clearly discussed. | No planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was not discussed. |

1. **Did the department include peer review feedback and provide rationale for implementing or not implementing suggestions?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All reviewer feedback was listed, and for each suggestion a clear rationale was given for its being implemented or not. | Most reviewer feedback was listed, and for most suggestions a rationale was given for their being implemented or not. | Some reviewer feedback was listed, and for some suggestions a rationale was given for their being implemented or not. | Feedback from reviewers was not included. |

1. **A. Are the student learning outcomes listed and measurable?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom’s Taxonomy). | Most student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom’s Taxonomy). | Some student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom’s Taxonomy). | Student learning outcomes are either not listed or not measurable. |

1. **Are the assessment measures appropriate for the student learning outcomes?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Allassessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. | Mostassessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. | Someassessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. | None of theassessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. |

1. **Do the performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. | Most performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. | Some of the performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. | No performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. |

1. **Is the sampling method appropriate for all assessment measures?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| The sampling methodology is appropriate for all assessment measures. | The sampling methodology is appropriate for most assessment measures. | The sampling methodology is appropriate for some assessment measures. | The sampling methodology is appropriate for none of the assessment measures. |

1. **Is the sample size listed for each assessment measure?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Sample size was listed for all assessment measures. | Sample size was listed for most assessment measures. | Sample size was listed for some assessment measures. | Sample size was not listed for any assessment measures. |

1. **How well do the data provide clear and meaningful overview of the results?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| For all student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year’s results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. | For most student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year’s results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. | For some student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year’s results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. | For none of the student learning outcomes were the results clear, more than a single year’s results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. |

1. **Are the conclusions reasonably drawn and significantly related to student learning** **outcomes?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. | Most conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. | Some conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. | No conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results or related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. |

1. **Does the report indicate whether the performance standards were met?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Stated for all performance standards. | Stated for most performance standards. | Stated for some performance standards. | Not stated for any performance standard. |

1. **How well supported is the rationale for making assessment or instructional changes? The justification can be based on conclusions reported in Part 4 or on informal activities, such as faculty meetings and discussions, conferences, pilot projects, textbook adoption, new course proposals, curriculum modifications, etc. Explain the rationale for these changes and how they will impact student learning and other considerations, such as curriculum degree plan, assessment process, or budget.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is well grounded and convincingly explained. | Most planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is mostly well grounded and convincingly explained. | Some planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is lacking or is not convincingly explained. | No planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. There is no rationale. |

1. **Did the faculty include at least one teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **No** |  |  |
| The faculty has included at least one teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom. | The faculty has not included any teaching techniques they believe improve student learning or student engagement in the classroom. |  |  |

1. **How well did the faculty vary the assessment measures?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Assessment measures vary and include multiple direct measures and at least one indirect measure. The number of measures is consistent with those listed. | Assessment measures vary, but they are all direct. The number of measures is consistent with those listed. | Assessment measures do not vary or are all indirect. There is some inconsistency in the number of measures recorded and the total listed. | Assessment measures are not all listed or are listed in the wrong category. The total number of measures is not consistent with those listed. |

1. **Does the list of faculty participants indicate a majority of those teaching in the program and clearly describe their role in the assessment process?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| The faculty role is clearly identified and it is apparent that the majority of the faculty participated in the process. The roles are varied. | The faculty role is identified and it is apparent that the majority of the faculty participated in the process. The roles are not varied. | The faculty roles are not identified. Few faculty participated. | The faculty roles are not identified. Faculty participation is not sufficiently described to make a determination about who participated. |

**DIRECT EVIDENCE of student learning is tangible, visible, self-explanatory evidence of exactly what students have and haven’t learned. Examples include:**

**EXPLANATION & EXAMPLES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT EVIDENCE OF LEARNING**

1. Ratings of student skills by their field experience supervisors.
2. Scores and pass rates on licensure/certification exams or other published tests (e.g. Major Field Tests) that assess key learning outcomes.
3. Capstone experiences such as research projects, presentations, oral defenses, exhibitions, or performances that are scored using a rubric.
4. Written work or performances scored using a rubric.
5. Portfolios of student work.
6. Scores on locally-designed tests such as final examinations in key courses, qualifying examinations, and comprehensive examinations that are accompanied by test blueprints describing what the tests assess.
7. Score gains between entry and exit on published or local tests or writing samples.
8. Employer ratings of the skills of recent graduates.
9. Summaries and analyses of electronic class discussion threads.
10. Student reflections on their values, attitudes, and beliefs, if developing those are intended outcomes of the program.

**INDIRECT EVIDENCE provides signs that students are probably learning, but the evidence of exactly what they are leaning is less clear and less convincing. Examples include:**

1. Course grades.
2. Assignment grades, if not accompanied by a rubric or scoring guide.
3. For four year programs, admission rates into graduate programs and graduation rates from those programs.
4. For two year programs, admission rates into four-year institutions and graduation rates from those programs.
5. Placement rates of graduates into appropriate career positions and starting salaries.
6. Alumni perceptions of their career responsibilities and satisfaction.
7. Student ratings of their knowledge and skills and reflections on what they have learning over the course of the program.
8. Those questions on end-of-course student evaluations forms that ask about the course rather than the instructor.
9. Student/alumni satisfaction with their learning, collected through surveys, exit interviews, or focus groups
10. Honors, awards, and scholarships earned by students and alumni.

Suskie, L. (2004). *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide*. Anker Publishing Company: Bolton, MA

These examples “Discussion of Instructional Changes” in Part 2 of the Student Learning Report illustrate how an instructional or assessment change, even though not listed or discussed in the previous year’s Student Learning Report, was nevertheless included in the current year’s report. Important changes cannot always be anticipated, yet they are significant and should not be left out of the report.