

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025

College of Health and Human Services

School of Kinesiology, Recreation & Sport

Recreation, Park & Nonprofit Administration #5010

Dr. Raymond Poff

Is this an online program? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here
☒ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under **Evaluation**)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1

Program Student Learning Outcome

Students shall demonstrate the following entry-level knowledge: techniques and processes used by professionals and workers in these industries. (Council on Accreditation - Parks, Recreation, Tourism and Related Professions)

Evaluation

Yes. This learning outcome is still relevant. It is one of the learning outcomes the program is required to use as part of our national accreditation through the Council on Accreditation - Parks, Recreation, Tourism and Related Professions (COAPRT). The SLO data is reported annually to COAPRT as part of accreditation maintainance. The council determines the wording of the outcome. We do have an appropriate number of SLOs to measure regularly and the faculty have selected the most important one for this process.

Measurement Instruments

Direct measure: The measurement instrument for this SLO is the Community Leadership Project from REC 302: Recreation Leadership. This multiple component project requires student application of content throughout the semester. Here are the primary elements included in the evaluation of the students.

- Initial site visit and interview with staff (individual)
- Program Plan initial draft
- Revised program plan
- Final program plan
- Implementation (group)
- Implementation (individual)
- Peer and Self Evaluation (individual)

1. Yes, the measurement instrument is measuring the outcome.
2. We are unable to change the SLO due to accreditation.
3. It is a direct measure.
4. Yes, the artifact is appropriate and represents professional practice.
5. Due to the experiential nature of the project, AI will have little affect on this measurement instrument.
6. The grading process seems appropriate at this time.

Criteria & Targets	70% of the students completing the assignment will score 70% or higher on the assignment The criteria for success and related targets are in line with accreditation standards. They provide an adequate amount of interpretation of student learning and flexibility in student performance over time. The flexibility is important in the accreditation process.
Results & Conclusion	Results: With the exception of one semester, the results are what program faculty expected. Students demonstrated high levels of achievement on this project. This high achievement is likely a reflection of faculty facilitation and student recognition of how this project applies to preparing them for professional practice. Conclusions: Other than the one ‘anomaly’ there consistency in student performance. Having continuity in the faculty member teaching the course and continuity in the manner the project was facilitated, likely contributed to its success as well. During the first two years of this review period, the course was offered twice per year; it moved to a once per year offering in the third year.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Based on our successes with this and our other student learning outcomes and our continuing alignment with accreditation standards, the program faculty do not feel that adjustment is justified at this time. The faculty plan to carefully monitor this and other student learning outcomes each year with the goal to continue our practice of meeting at least twice annually to review SLOs. As has been the practice, faculty will continue to provide feedback and input regarding SLOs and will adjust them and the measurement instruments as needed. Additional revisions will be addressed as needed in response to curriculum changes, faculty changes, accreditation changes, etc.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students shall be able to demonstrate the ability to design, implement, and evaluate services that facilitate targeted human experiences and that embrace personal and cultural dimensions of diversity. (Council on Accreditation - Parks, Recreation, Tourism and Related Professions)
Evaluation	Yes. This learning outcome is still relevant. It is one of the learning outcomes the program is required to use as part of our national accreditation through the Council on Accreditation - Parks, Recreation, Tourism and Related Professions (COAPRT). The SLO data is reported annually to COAPRT as part of accreditation maintainance. The council determines the wording of the outcome. We do have an appropriate number of SLOs to measure regularly and the faculty have selected the most important one for this process.
Measurement Instruments	Direct measure: The measurement instrument for this SLO is the Program Plan Project from REC 306 Experience Planning and Evaluation. This multiple component project requires student application of content throughout the semester. Here are the primary elements included in the evaluation of the students. •Meeting with the program coordinator to find out their needs for the program and the evaluation. •Designing and creating educational and implementation materials. •Implementation of the program. •Creating an evaluation tool (questionnaire, series of interview or focus group questions, etc.). •Creating an evaluation plan (methods) that works well within the parameters of the event/program series. •Administering the evaluation tool to program participants and/or staff. •Analyzing evaluation data. •Creating three different types of evaluation reports (formal, brief, and oral). •Evaluating your own effort and that of your group members.

	1. Yes, the measurement instrument is measuring the outcome. 2. We are unable to change the SLO due to accreditation. 3. It is a direct measure. 4. Yes, the artifact is appropriate and represents professional practice. 5. Due to the experiential nature of the project, AI will have little affect on this measurement instrument. 6. The grading process seems appropriate at this time.
Criteria & Targets	70% of the students completing the assignment will score 70% or higher on the assignment The criteria for success and related targets are in line with accreditation standards. They provide an adequate amount of interpretation of student learning and flexibility in student performance over time. The flexibility is important in the accreditation process.
Results & Conclusion	Results: The five semesters of data during this cycle each showed high student achievement results. The standard was exceeded in each of the five semesters. The results are consistent with what program faculty expected. This high achievement is most likely a reflection of the student recognition of how this project applies to preparing them for professional practice. This recognition promotes student ‘buy in’ and can raise the performance bar. Conclusions: Two different faculty members taught this course during the assessment review cycle. There was a good hand off of class materials and resources (syllabus, textbook, etc.) between the two faculty which undoubtedly helped. Regular discussion about the course and SLO also likely helped with maintaining high performance levels. The two faculty members personalized their approach to the project while maintaining consistency with the SLO.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Based on our successes with this and our other student learning outcomes and our continuing alignment with accreditation standards, the program faculty do not feel that adjustment is justified at this time. The faculty plan to carefully monitor this and other student learning outcomes each year with the goal to continue our practice of meeting at least twice annually to review SLOs. As has been the practice, faculty will continue to provide feedback and input regarding SLOs and will adjust them and the measurement instruments as needed. Additional revisions will be addressed as needed in response to curriculum changes, faculty changes, accreditation changes, etc.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students shall be able to demonstrate entry-level knowledge about operations and strategic management / administration in parks, recreation, tourism and/or related professions. (Council on Accreditation - Parks, Recreation, Tourism and Related Professions)
Evaluation	Yes. This learning outcome is still relevant. It is one of the learning outcomes the program is required to use as part of our national accreditation through the Council on Accreditation - Parks, Recreation, Tourism and Related Professions (COAPRT). The SLO data is reported annually to COAPRT as part of accreditation maintainance. The council determines the wording of the outcome. We do have an appropriate number of SLOs to measure regularly and the faculty have selected the most important one for this process.
Measurement Instruments	Direct measure: The measurement instrument for this SLO is the Agency Project from REC 406 Recreation Administration. This multiple component project requires student application of content throughout the semester. Here are the primary elements included in the evaluation of the students.

	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? 1. Yes, the measurement instrument is measuring the outcome. 2. We are unable to change the SLO due to accreditation. 3. It is a direct measure. 4. Yes, the artifact is appropriate and represents professional practice. 5. Due to the experiential nature of the project, AI will have little affect on this measurement instrument. 6. The grading process seems appropriate at this time.
Criteria & Targets	70% of the students completing the assignment will score 70% or higher on the assignment The criteria for success and related targets are in line with accreditation standards. They provide an adequate amount of interpretation of student learning and flexibility in student performance over time. The flexibility is important in the accreditation process.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> The three semesters of data during this cycle each showed high student achievement results. The standard was exceeded in each of the five semesters. The results are what program faculty expected. <u>Conclusions:</u> In an unusual course of events, the program had a different faculty members teach this course during each year of the assessment review cycle. This is not our preferred approach, but it was necessitated due to staffing changes. In spite of the changes, program faculty were able to help ensure the course transitioned effectively between faculty and maintained continuity in course content and achievement of the SLO.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Based on our successes with this and our other student learning outcomes and our continuing alignment with accreditation standards, the program faculty do not feel that adjustment is justified at this time. The faculty plan to carefully monitor this and other student learning outcomes each year with the goal to continue our practice of meeting at least twice annually to review SLOs. As has been the practice, faculty will continue to provide feedback and input regarding SLOs and will adjust them and the measurement instruments as needed. Additional revisions will be addressed as needed in response to curriculum changes, faculty changes, accreditation changes, etc.

To add more outcomes, if needed, select the table above and copy & paste below.