

COSMA Annual Report Submission Instructions Academic Year 2021-22

Due Date: NO LATER THAN July 31.

Use this document; changes are made annually.

Annual Report extension requests (see page 11) and/or adjustments to membership fees will be considered on a case-by-case basis and must be made directly to Heather Alderman (cosma@cosmaweb.org).

Late fees (\$180) will be enforced for the 2021-22 fiscal year.

Not submitting materials or not communicating with COSMA Headquarters will result in AUTOMATIC ADMINISTRATIVE PROBATION on August 1. An email will be sent to your Administrators.

The Annual Report consists of three parts:

Section 1: Programmatic Information (completed by all programs), pages 2-4

Section 2: Outcomes Assessment (completed by programs in Candidacy Status and Accredited Programs) – pages 5-9

Section 3 [This AR only]: Questions pertaining to changes in the Accreditation Principles (completed by programs in Candidacy Status and Accredited Programs) – page 10.

Program Information Profile – This CHEA form has been modified to include basic student outcomes information: Graduation rate, completion rate, transfer rate, graduates going to graduate school and job placement rate. If you collect this data as part of your Operational Effectiveness Goals, refer to that matrix – page 9.

USI Undergraduate COSMA Annual Report 2021-22

U.S. and non-U.S.-based Programs

This annual report should be completed for your academic unit/sport management program and submitted electronically to COSMA by July 31 of each year.

SECTION 1: PROGRAMMATIC INFORMATION (COMPLETED BY ALL PROGRAMS)

Institution's Name:	University of Southern Indiana				
Address:	8600 University Blvd.				
City:	Evansville	State:	IN	ZIP/Postal Code:	47712
Primary COSMA Contact Name:	Dr. Chase ML Smith				
Telephone:	812.461.5496	Email:	Cmsmith1@usi.edu		
Sport Management Degree Program(s):	Bachelor of Science, Sport Management Bachelor of Arts, Sport Management				
Name of College where Sport Management degree(s) is housed:	Pott College of Science, Engineering, and Education				
Academic Unit URL:	https://www.usi.edu/science/kinesiology-and-sport				

A. Check the box to reflect the accreditation status of your academic unit/sport management program:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Accredited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reaffirmation of Accreditation (check if within 2 years/letter received) *
<input type="checkbox"/>	Candidate for Accreditation*
<input type="checkbox"/>	Program Member (has not been granted Candidacy Status)

*Estimate the month and year you want to hold a site visit.

submission of self-study February 2023 and site-visit April 2023

B. Identify any significant changes that have taken place in your sport management degree programs during the reporting period. Indicate the impact of any of these changes, if applicable, in a written statement of explanation.

1. Did you terminate any degree programs during the reporting year?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes. If yes, please identify terminated programs.

1. Were changes (e.g., curricular) made in any of your sport management majors,

concentrations or emphases?

X	No
	Yes. If yes, please identify the changes by adding an additional page to this document.

2. Were any new sport management degree programs established during the reporting year?

X	No (skip to Section C)
	Yes. If yes, please identify the new degree programs and answer B4.

3. Was approval of your regional or national accrediting body required for any of these programs?

X	No (not applicable)
	Yes. Provide a copy/URL of the approval letter from your accrediting body.

4. Do you have an Associate's degree program in sport management to include in the accreditation process?

X	No
	Yes. Provide a copy/URL of the approval letter from your accrediting body.

C. Identify any administrative and other changes that directly affect your academic unit/sport management program and attach an updated organizational chart that shows these relationships. Such changes would include:

- No changes implemented for the 2021-22 year.

Department Chair	Dr. Renee Frimming	Professor and Chair, Kinesiology and Sport
	rfrimming@usi.edu	
COSMA Contact	Dr. Chase ML Smith	Associate Professor
	Cmsmith1@usi.edu	

What impact have these changes had on your program? Comment specifically about faculty changes (faculty leaving, new faculty, other forms of faculty turnover). If you have a new COSMA accreditation primary representative: What are you doing to maintain continuity with the accreditation process? Provide a narrative response to these questions.

n/a

Other Changes/Issues
(Includes COVID-19 impact description)

- D. Briefly comment on other changes or issues pertaining to your academic unit/sport management program (e.g., new partnerships, innovations, campus locations, change in program delivery, etc.). Describe the modifications made to your program delivery, collection of outcomes assessment data and grading/graduation requirements as a result of the disruption of the COVID-19 pandemic. Provide supporting documentation, as needed. Failure to report changes may result in administrative probation.**

There weren't any impacts due to Covid-19 during the 2021-22 academic year.

- E. How has COSMA and the accreditation process benefitted your program, faculty, students, alumni and/or other?**

Accreditation has allowed us to share the similarities and differences more easily in our program vis a vis other area programs with the Pott College and beyond; but as far as the benefits related to enrollment, faculty development, growth in faculty numbers, or other items seem to be minimal.

- F. What can COSMA do to serve you better?**

Advocate for faculty-value and compensation related to the market. Additionally, I believe COSMA should have more communication with the Dean [and administration] of the Pott College rather than only at site visits. We have goals within the institution as it relates to enrollment, recruitment, and retention; this communication can assist in reaching these goals.

SECTION 2: OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT (TO BE COMPLETED BY ACCREDITED PROGRAMS AND PROGRAMS IN CANDIDACY STATUS)

A. Has your outcomes assessment plan changed from initial approval or since last year’s Annual Report?

	No	
X	Yes.	

B. Complete the following chart if you are responding to feedback from the Board of Commissioners as follows:

- Feedback and our response were included in the 2020-21 annual report. Communication of the approval to implement the revised O/A plan was sent in the fall of 2021 (i.e., the issues were resolved). Said plan is implemented into this report, but it is still considered different since last year’s Annual Report.

Copy and paste the note, observation, action item or required response item in Column 1. Indicate your response to the item in the second column. Feel free to include your response as an addendum and attach documentation accordingly. **You have two years to resolve Notes.**

<i>Notes, Observations, Action Items, Required responses</i>	<i>Your Response</i>
1. 09/02/2021	Heather Alderman stated, It all looks good, Chase! Thank you! You are off "the list!" :)

C. Provide the URL(s) for the page on your academic unit/sport management program’s website that makes available to the public the following (pp. 7-10 of this document):

- SLO matrix
- OEG matrix
- Dashboard data
- Program information profile
- Statement of accreditation status (includes Candidacy Status)
- Accreditation seal (accredited programs only)

This information must be updated annually. Failure to comply with this request will result in Administrative Probation.

URL(s): https://www.usi.edu/online-learning/online-programs/master-of-science-in-sport-management/ Webpage Link Name: Graduate Student Learning Outcomes and Operational Effectiveness Goals
--

Complete the following program-level student learning outcomes (SLO) matrix and program-level operational effectiveness goals (OEG) matrix.

Student Learning Outcomes Matrix - Academic Year 2021 – 2022

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify Benchmark	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 effectively investigated, examined, and analyzed the components that make-up the Foundations of Sport (Historical, Sociological, and Psychological).					
Measure 1 (DM) Diversity Case Study SPTM 605	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Social Foundations of Sport) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	14	5	35.71%	1
Measure 2 (DM) DISC Personality Profile MNGT 601	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Psychological Foundations of Sport) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	9	9	100.00%	3
SLO 2 – Students successfully identified, described, and analyzed the concepts related to the Foundations of Sport Management.					
Measure 1 (DM) Participant Liability Issues Assignment SPTM 653	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Policy of Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	16	14	87.50%	3
Measure 2 (DM) Effective Decision Making MNGT 611	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Management Concepts in Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	7	7	100.00%	3
Measure 3 (DM) Sport Management Report SPTM 592	student assessment measuring CPC content area (international foundations of sport management) is for 70%	8	8	100.00%	3

	of the students to score an 80% (i.e., B).				
SLO 3 – Students effectively recognized, described, and assessed the concepts related to the Functions of Sport Management.					
Measure 1 (DM) Final Written Report SPTM 633	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Sport Marketing) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	6	5	83.33%	3
Measure 2 (DM) Research Proposal SPTM 688	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Sport Communication) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	12	5	41.67%	1
Measure 3 (DM) Budget Analysis Project SPTM 652	student assessment measuring content area (Finance) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	13	13	100.00%	3
SLO 4 – Students effectively identified, defined, and assessed the concepts related to the Sport Management Environment.					
Measure 1 (DM) Effective Decision Making MNGT 611	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Ethics in Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	7	7	100.00%	3
Measure 2 (DM) Diversity Case Study SPTM 605	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Diversity Issues in Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	14	5	35.71%	1
Measure 3 (DM) Participant Liability Issues Assignment SPTM 653	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Legal Aspects in Sport Management) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	16	14	87.50%	3

SLO 5 – Students effectively identified, explained, applied, and analyzed the necessary components of a research investigation.					
Measure 1 (DM) Diversity Case Study SPTM 605	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Capstone Experience) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	14	5	35.71%	1
Measure 2 (DM) Research Proposal SPTM 688	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Capstone Experience) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	12	5	41.67%	1
Measure 3 (DM) Research Proposal SPTM 664	student assessment measuring CPC content area (Capstone Experience) is for 70% of students to score at least an 80% (i.e., B).	6	6	100.00%	3

Note: If you are using different direct and indirect measures for different degree programs, please replicate the matrix, using one matrix for each program that has different measures. If different programs use the same measures, only one copy of the matrix is needed.

SLO Narrative

Your outcomes assessment plan must include, at minimum, two direct and two indirect measures of all student learning outcomes. Some measurement tools will be used to measure more than one student learning outcome. Each student learning outcomes must be measured at least once; including more and varied measures is a better practice and is encouraged. Below, narrate how you “**close the loop**” by describing any **changes and improvements you made and plan to make as a result of your assessment activity**:

- Address ALL SLOs – those that meet or exceed expectations and those that do not.
- Explain why you have measures with insufficient data.
- Describe how this outcome assessment data drives curricular and other decisions.
- Describe how have you improved/changed this year based on this data (close the loop).

COVID-19 additional explanation requirements: Discuss what modifications you made to your O/A plan, instrument changes, changes in required hours, if/how you fell short in data collection, what was difficult to measure and include how this circumstance has impacted how you are moving forward with outcomes assessment data collection.

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data	Analysis and Narrative(s)
SLO 1 – Students effectively investigated, examined, and analyzed the components that make-up the Foundations of Sport (Historical, Sociological, and Psychological).		
Measure 1 (DM) Diversity Case Study SPTM 605	1	SLO 1 is considered unmet due to the results of Measure #1. This Case Study assessment is a difficult one (even for graduate students). Moreover, the time that they must collect data is just over six weeks. Many of the students who fell short of the benchmark started too late in the term to reach out to the professor for guidance. The professor plans to implement checkpoints into the schedule to counter the lack of knowledge these students have for planning and completing a study like this one. Additionally, the existing tutorial for creating a Case Study will be improved to give these types of students more guidance outside of office hours. From a skill-development perspective, the professor identified that the students who succeeded in obtaining the benchmark were ones that already completed SPTM-664 Research Methods. SPTM-664 was moved to a fall offering to act as a vital introduction for the USI MSSM program to avoid inexperience for latter courses offered in the academic calendar.
Measure 2 (DM) DISC Personality Profile MNGT 601	3	
SLO 2 – Students successfully identified, described, and analyzed the concepts related to the Foundations of Sport Management.		
Measure 1 (DM) Participant Liability Issues Assignment SPTM 653	3	SLO 2 was met as the USI MSSM program had students exceptionally identify, describe, and analyze the concepts related to the Foundations of Sport Management.
Measure 2 (DM) Effective Decision Making MNGT 611	3	
Measure 3 (DM) Sport Management Report	3	

SPTM 592		
SLO 3 – Students effectively recognized, described, and assessed the concepts related to the Functions of Sport Management.		
Measure 1 (DM) Final Written Report SPTM 633	3	SLO 3 can be argued as met due to the results of Measures #1 and #3 exceeding expectations even after considering the results for Measure #2. The SPTM 688 Research Proposal assessment is not necessarily a difficult one. Data collection is not necessary, but knowledge for Research Methods is vital. This research proposal already contains a check point to help students avoid procrastination. Interestingly, the check point (i.e., Pre-proposal) which still contributes to our benchmark assessment, is what caused Measure #2 to fall short of the expectation. The [full] Proposal showed success with 75% of the students achieving an 80% or higher. The professor plans to re-evaluate the effectiveness of the Pre-proposal in the skill-development of the students. Sidenote: the timing of the 688 offering is the SU-II term that typically starts at the end of June and lasts until mid-August. This causes a delayed adjustment when completing the COSMA Annual Report that is typically due at the end of July (e.g., 2019-2020 report influences SU-21 offering. SU-21 offering is included in the 2021-2022 report).
Measure 2 (DM) Research Proposal SPTM 688	1	
Measure 3 (DM) Budget Analysis Project SPTM 652	3	
SLO 4 – Students effectively identified, defined, and assessed the concepts related to the Sport Management Environment.		
Measure 1 (DM) Effective Decision Making MNGT 611	3	SLO 4 can be considered met after considering the other two measures exceeding expectations and the explanation of results for Measure #2. This Case Study assessment is a difficult one (even for graduate students). Moreover, the time that they must collect data is just over six weeks. Many of the students who fell short of the benchmark started too late in the term to reach out to the professor for
Measure 2 (DM) Diversity Case Study SPTM 605	1	

<p>Measure 3 (DM) Participant Liability Issues Assignment</p> <p>SPTM 653</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>guidance. The professor plans to implement checkpoints into the schedule to counter the lack of knowledge these students have for planning and completing a study like this one. Additionally, the existing tutorial for creating a Case Study will be improved to give these types of students more guidance outside of office hours.</p> <p>From a skill-development perspective, the professor identified that the students who succeeded in obtaining the benchmark were ones that already completed SPTM-664 Research Methods. SPTM-664 was moved to a fall offering to act as a vital introduction for the USI MSSM program to avoid inexperience for latter courses offered in the academic calendar.</p>
<p>SLO 5 – Students effectively identified, explained, applied, and analyzed the necessary components of a research investigation.</p>		
<p>Measure 1 (DM) Diversity Case Study</p> <p>SPTM 605</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>SLO 5 is considered unmet. The USI MSSM program failed to have the students effectively identify, explain, apply, and analyze the necessary components of a research investigation. There is optimism for future assessments as SPTM 664 now acts as an introductory course for our majors.</p>
<p>Measure 2 (DM) Research Proposal</p> <p>SPTM 688</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Measure #1 – Case Study assessment is a difficult one (even for graduate students). Moreover, the time that they must collect data is just over six weeks.</p>
<p>Measure 3 (DM) Research Proposal</p> <p>SPTM 664</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Many of the students who fell short of the benchmark started too late in the term to reach out to the professor for guidance. The professor plans to implement checkpoints into the schedule to counter the lack of knowledge these students have for planning and completing a study like this one. Additionally, the existing tutorial for creating a Case Study will be improved to give these types of students more guidance outside of office hours.</p> <p>From a skill-development perspective, the professor identified that the students who succeeded in obtaining the benchmark were ones that already completed SPTM-664 Research Methods. SPTM-</p>

		<p>664 was moved to a fall offering to act as a vital introduction for the USI MSSM program to avoid inexperience for latter courses offered in the academic calendar.</p> <p>The SPTM 688 Research Proposal assessment is not necessarily a difficult one. Data collection is not necessary, but knowledge for Research Methods is vital. This research proposal already contains a check point to help students avoid procrastination. Interestingly, the check point (i.e., Pre-proposal) which still contributes to our benchmark assessment, is what caused Measure #2 to fall short of the expectation. The [full] Proposal showed success with 75% of the students achieving an 80% or higher. The professor plans to re-evaluate the effectiveness of the Pre-proposal in the skill-development of the students.</p>
--	--	--

Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix Academic Year 2021-22

Identify Each Operational Effectiveness Goal and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark (e.g., 80% will achieve a rating of 5)	Data Summary	Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
OEG 1: The USI Sport Management program will provide students with diverse, high-quality faculty.			
Measure 1: Hiring – we will follow the hiring protocols set forth through our university and advertisement in appropriate outlets – (e.g., The Chronicle, NASSM outlets, NIRSA)	25 applicants will apply for a SM position when there is an opening and there will be 3 viable candidates to bring on campus.	n/a – all faculty tenure lines available are filled	4
Measure 2: College Mentoring Program (Retain) – The purpose of the College Mentoring Program is to create a link between new and junior faculty and respected, tenured faculty.	100% of new faculty will participate in the College Mentoring Program during the first three years of their tenure.	Dr. Kim has a designated mentor with the Pott College as an accessible resource for questions about tenure requirements, approaches in the classroom, scholarship practices, etc....	2
Measure 3: Faculty Teaching Evaluations (Retain – by meeting promotion/tenure requirements)	100% of the faculty teaching evaluations will be at least a 3.5 on a 1-5 scale on all areas of evaluation.	Both full-time faculty members achieved averages above 3.5	2
Measure 4: Faculty Publications and Presentations (Retain – by meeting promotion/tenure requirements)	On average, the Faculty will produce, at least, 1-2 publications and presentations a year.	Five publications achieved between May 2021 to April 2022	3
Measure 5: Faculty development: Faculty will receive information on strategies and tactics to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.	At least, one faculty member will sit on the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee within the Pott College of USI.	Dr. Smith (official member) and Dr. Kim (proxy member) were involved in the Pott College [service] committee covering Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion.	3
OEG 2: The USI Sport Management program will successfully provide students with the training necessary to gain knowledge and skills related to all COSMA Common Professional Component (CPC) content areas.			
Measure 1: SLO1 met that is related to the Foundations of Sport.	80% of the direct measures reached.	50% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations	1

Measure 2: SLO2 met that is related to the Foundations of Sport Management.	80% of the direct measures reached.	100% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations	3
Measure 3: SLO3 met that is related to the Functions of Sport Management.	80% of the direct measures reached.	67% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations	1
Measure 4: SLO4 met that is related to the Environment of Sport Management.	80% of the direct measures reached.	67% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations	1
Measure 5: SLO5 met that is related to the Capstones of Sport Management research.	80% of the direct measures reached.	33% of the direct measures achieved the established expectations	1
OEG 3: The USI Sport Management program will recruit and retain quality students to meet local and global demands for our graduates.			
Measure 1: Enrollment – data reported from institutional research	Criterion: The SM program will admit 15 students per year.	10	1
Measure 2: Degrees Conferred – data reported from institutional research	Criterion: The SM program will graduate 15 students per year.	12	1
Measure 3: Graduation GPA Requirement – data reported from institutional research	Criterion: For sport management students to graduate with a GPA of 3.0 or higher	Requirement is implemented and probation is applied until the MSSM major reaches 3.0 GPA after all curriculum requirements are met.	2
OEG 4: The USI Sport Management program will consistently provide a high-quality, educational experience to SPTM majors.			
Measure 1: Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 1-2)	student assessment on Alumni Survey data for measuring critical thinking/problem solving is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale.	Our Chief Data Officer at USI recently retired (FA21). We already had issues with our database of alumni to contact. Our department needs to revisit the idea of getting alumni feedback via Qualtrics surveys. Our main hurdle is finding resources for an effective means to collect from an alumni sample. The struggles involved up-to-date email and cell phone. A secondary hurdle will be to identify important items as the previous survey needed revamped. Benchmark not applicable for this year's report due to insufficient data.	4
Measure 2: Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 3-6)	student assessment on Alumni Survey data measuring communication is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale.		4
Measure 3: Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 7-9)	student assessment for Alumni Survey Data is for measuring technology is for 70%		4

	of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale.		
Measure 4: Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 10-11)	student assessment for Alumni Survey data measuring diversity is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale.		4
Measure 5: Advisory Board – students are part of the advisory board to assist with making curriculum changes and provide feedback for the program.	To have the advisory board meet twice per year.		4

OEG Narrative

Identify Each Operational Effectiveness Goal and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark (e.g., 80% will achieve a rating of 5)	Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data	Analysis and Narrative(s)
OEG 1: The USI Sport Management program will provide students with diverse, high-quality faculty.			
Measure 1: Hiring – we will follow the hiring protocols set forth through our University and advertisement in appropriate outlets – (e.g., The Chronicle, NASSM outlets, NIRSA)	25 applicants will apply for a SM position when there is an opening and there will be 3 viable candidates to bring on campus.	4	The USI SPTM program can confidently claim that the program provides students with diverse, high-quality faculty.
Measure 2: College Mentoring Program (Retain) – The purpose of the College Mentoring Program is to create a link between new and junior faculty and respected, tenured faculty.	100% of new faculty will participate in the College Mentoring Program during the first three years of their tenure.	2	
Measure 3: Faculty Teaching Evaluations (Retain – by meeting promotion/tenure requirements)	100% of the faculty teaching evaluations will be at least a 3.5 on a 1-5 scale on all areas of evaluation.	2	

Measure 4: Faculty Publications and Presentations (Retain – by meeting promotion/tenure requirements)	On average, the Faculty will produce, at least, 1-2 publications and presentations a year.	3	
Measure 5: Faculty development: Faculty will receive information on strategies and tactics to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.	At least, one faculty member will sit on the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee within the Pott College of USI.	3	
OEG 2: The USI Sport Management program will successfully provide students with the training necessary to gain knowledge and skills related to all COSMA Common Professional Component (CPC) content areas.			
Measure 1: SLO1 met that is related to the Foundations of Sport.	80% of the direct measures reached.	1	<p>The USI SPTM program cannot objectively claim that the program successfully provided students with the training necessary to gain knowledge and skills related to all COSMA Common Professional Component (CPC) content areas.</p> <p>However, the program still considers OEG 2 was close to achieving.</p> <p>The SLO3 and SLO4 should improve over the next year. The USI MSSM program will consider adding measures to SLO 1 and SLO 5 to put students in a better position to succeed. These factors will improve the changes of achieving OEG 2 next year.</p>
Measure 2: SLO2 met that is related to the Foundations of Sport Management.	80% of the direct measures reached.	3	
Measure 3: SLO3 met that is related to the Functions of Sport Management.	80% of the direct measures reached.	1	
Measure 4: SLO4 met that is related to the Environment of Sport Management.	80% of the direct measures reached.	1	
Measure 5: SLO5 met that is related to the Capstones of Sport Management research.	80% of the direct measures reached.	1	
OEG 3: The USI Sport Management program will recruit and retain quality students to meet local and global demands for our graduates.			
Measure 1: Enrollment – data reported from institutional research	Criterion: The SM program will admit 15 students per year.	1	<p>The USI SPTM program failed to achieve the requirements to claim OEG 3. As a whole, our department struggles to receive the necessary resources to market our programs. This essentially influences our MSSM program. We are optimistic about the growth of the program as we have had discussions about adjusting the curriculum to be more attractive. Additionally, we are hopeful that the athletic department’s transition from NCAA II to NCAA I will improve interest in the MSSM degree.</p> <p>With that said, we can [still] confidently claim that to have high quality students.</p>
Measure 2: Degrees Conferred – data reported from institutional research	Criterion: The SM program will graduate 15 students per year.	1	
Measure 3: Graduation GPA Requirement – data reported from institutional research	Criterion: For sport management students to graduate with a GPA of 3.0 or higher	2	
OEG 4: The USI Sport Management program will consistently provide a high-quality, educational experience to SPTM majors.			

Measure 1: Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 1-2)	student assessment on Alumni Survey data for measuring critical thinking/problem solving is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale.	4	See above for explanation of insufficient data.
Measure 2: Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 3-6)	student assessment on Alumni Survey data measuring communication is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale.	4	
Measure 3: Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 7-9)	student assessment for Alumni Survey Data is for measuring technology is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale.	4	
Measure 4: Sport Management Alumni Survey (Items 10-11)	student assessment for Alumni Survey data measuring diversity is for 70% of students to score a 4.0 on a 5-point scale.	4	
Measure 5: Advisory Board – students are part of the advisory board to assist with making curriculum changes and provide feedback for the program.	To have the advisory board meet twice per year.	4	

Program Dashboard Data

Graduate (MSSM) Dashboard Data		
Total Enrollment Majors		16
Enrollment Demographic Statistics	Number	Percentage
Female	4	25.00%
Male	12	75.00%
Black, non-Hispanic	3	18.75%
White, non-Hispanic	13	81.25%
Student: Faculty Advising Ratio		
Students		16
Faculty & Staff		3
Full-time, Tenured or Tenure Track Faculty		
Full-time faculty		2
Tenured faculty		0
Tenured track faculty		2
Adjunct/Part Time Faculty	Number	Percentage
Adjunct	4	100.00%
PT faculty	0	0.00%
Ratio of Male and Female Faculty	Number	Percentage
Female	1	16.67%
Male	5	83.33%
Faculty Demographic Statistics	Number	Percentage
Asian	1	16.67%
Caucasian/White	5	83.33%

Program Information Profile

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

Name of Institution: University of Southern Indiana

Program/Specialized Accreditor(s): **Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA)**

Institutional Accreditor: **Higher Learning Commission (HLC)** – Regional Accreditor

Date of Next Comprehensive Program Accreditation Review: **2023**

Date of Next Comprehensive Institutional Accreditation Review: **2026-2027**

URL where accreditation status is stated: [List of institution's members of accreditation \(click here\)](#)

[Statement of Institution's Accreditation Status \(click here\)](#)

Indicators of Effectiveness with Undergraduates [As Determined by the Program]

1. Graduation Year: **2021-2022** # of Graduates: **12** Graduation Rate: **self-paced**
2. Average Time to Degree: MSSM Degree
3. Annual Transfer Activity (into Program): Year: **2021-2022**
of Transfers: **_1_** Transfer Rate: **_NC_**
4. Graduates Entering MSSM: Year: **_2021-2022_**
of Graduates: **_12_** # Entering MSSM: **_10_**
5. Job Placement (if appropriate): Year: **_2021-2022_**
of Graduates: **_n/a_** # Employed: **_n/a_**

Form developed by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. © updated 2020

SECTION 3: CHANGES TO ACCREDITATION PRINCIPLES

The *Accreditation Principles and Self-Study Preparation* document has been revised and we expect you to review the document and familiarize yourself with the changes. This section in this year's Annual Report informs you about the more significant changes and asks you to show compliance. Changes include:

- A defined set of elements all program-level strategic plans must have (Principle 2)
- Reconfigured Common Professional Component (CPC) areas based on changes in sport industry (Principle 3)
- Institutions must ensure adequate resources to attain and maintain accreditation (Principle 6).

1. Describe your program's strategic planning process by answering the following questions:

a) What is the current time period of your program-level strategic plan? (e.g., 2020-25)

2015-22. The original plan lists 2015-2020. The events of the pandemic, faculty turnover, and a change in the primary COSMA USI contact happening in 2020 and 2021 influenced a decision to extend the plan). We acknowledge the need to revamp it given the additions and adjustments listed in the email on March 30th, 2022.

b) Provide a copy of the strategic planning document OR a tracking matrix that describes the strategic planning goals, timeline for implementation and resources (human and financial) required.

See Appendix A that contains our strategic planning document.

2. Review the adjusted common professional component areas in the new *Accreditation Principles* document. In preparation for the upcoming academic year (2022-23), are there any area(s) your program does not cover? What justification do you have for not addressing these CPC area(s)? (e.g., mission of program, resources, etc.)

Our approach for our Graduate program is one that utilizes the CPC content areas as much as possible. Our limitations on the surface include the amount of curriculum required to achieve the degree. We require 33 credit hours total. We identify the changes to made to the 3.2 CPC areas and believe we cover four of the five areas. The reasoning why we do not cover 3.2 (CPC) D anymore is that we found most of our majors already held occupations within sport. An internship or capstone experience for them proved to be counterproductive for their learning experience. In other words, it was more of a burden then a benefit.

3. What time and resources are provided to the person(s) who manages the COSMA accreditation process?

One-credit hour of release time is given to the primary USI contact (Dr. Chase ML Smith).

Appendix A