

Student Learning Outcomes Matrix - Academic Year 2025 – 2026

Table 2. Student Learning Outcomes Matrix: Bachelor of Science in Sport Management.

This matrix reports direct and indirect evidence for each undergraduate Sport Management student learning outcome, including benchmarks, observed student counts, students meeting expectations, percentage results, and the resulting assessment classification.

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does Not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
SLO 1: Describe the impact of legal principles on sport management processes.					
Direct Measure 1: SPMT440 Week 6 Signature Assignment– Facility Safety	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	140	131	94%	3 – Exceeds Expectations
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT440 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	175	154	88%	2 – Meets Expectations
SLO 2: Apply management concepts associated with the operations of sport facilities.					
Direct Measure 1: SPMT316 Week 1 Signature Assignment– Going Green	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	155	133	86%	2 – Meets Expectations
Direct Measure 2: SPMT200 Week 5 Signature Assignment- Critical Event Management Functions	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	223	129	58%	1 – Does not meet expectations Avg. Grade 79%; 8% 0s
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT316 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	91	76	84%	2 – Meets Expectations
SLO 3: Appraise the socio-historical context of sport as related to contemporary society.					
Direct Measure 1: SPMT279 Week 6 Signature Assignment– Social Issues Research Paper	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	174	122	70%	2 – Meets Expectations Avg grade 82%, 8% 0s
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT279 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	240	216	90%	3 – Exceeds Expectations
SLO 4: Examine the application of ethical solutions in the sport management industry.					
Direct Measure 1: SPMT326 Week 8 Signature Assignment- Code of Ethics	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	167	120	72%	2 – Meets Expectations 13% 0s

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does Not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT326 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	121	96	79%	1 – Does not Meet Expectations
SLO 5: Apply financial management principles to managing a sport organization					
Direct Measure 1: SPMT455 Week 8 Signature Assignment–Comprehensive Sales Video	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	129	83	67%	1 – Does not meet expectations 12% Os
Direct Measure 2: SPMT410 Week 7 Budgeting Case Study	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	109	76	70%	2 – Meets Expectations 11% Os
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT410 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	147	123	84%	2 – Meets Expectations
SLO 6: Analyze the dimensions of a sport marketing plan.					
Direct Measure 1: SPMT213 Week 8 Signature Assignment–Collegiate Sports Marketing Plan	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	180	87	81%	2 – Meets Expectations
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT213 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	264	244	92%	3 – Exceeds Expectations

MASTER'S LEVEL SLOs

Table 3. Student Learning Outcomes Matrix: Master of Science in Sport Management. This matrix reports graduate-level Sport Management student learning outcome results and is used to determine whether students are meeting established expectations across direct and indirect assessment measures.

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does Not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
SLO 1: Apply management theory to contemporary sports industry practices.					
Direct Measure: SPMT612 Week 7 Signature Assignment–Event Critical Assessment	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	97	92	95%	3 – Exceeds Expectations

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does Not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT620 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	32	26	81%	2 – Meets expectations
SLO 2: Analyze the impact of legal and ethical issues in the sporting enterprise.					
Direct Measure: SPMT620 Week 8 Signature Assignment–Analysis of a Sports Management Organization	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	54	53	98%	3 – Exceeds Expectations
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT601 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	100	96	96%	3 – Exceeds Expectations
SLO 3: Evaluate qualitative and quantitative data to assess financial challenges/opportunities in the sport industry					
Direct Measure: SPMT610 Week 8 Signature Assignment–Sports Finance Presentation.	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	55	51	93%	3 – Exceeds Expectations
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT610 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	76	69	91%	3 – Exceeds Expectations
SLO 4: Develop marketing strategies to enhance the viability of sports-related enterprises.					
Direct Measure: SPMT502 Week 8 Signature Assignment–Strategic Plan	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	187	142	76%	2 – Meets Expectations
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT609 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	221	NA	NA	1 – Insufficient data
SLO 5: Examine structural barriers to equity in the sport industry.					
Direct Measure: SPMT608 Week 7 Signature Assignment–Sports Law Research Paper	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	137	130	95%	3 – Exceeds Expectations
Indirect Measure 1: SPMT608 End-of-Course Survey	Better than 90% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	121	111	92%	3 – Exceeds Expectations

Table 4. Student Learning Outcomes Matrix: Bachelor of Science in Esports. This matrix reports Esports student learning outcome results, including course-embedded measures, end-of-course survey evidence, and externship supervisor evaluation data. The narrative that follows interprets both areas of strength and measures requiring continued improvement.

Identify Each Student Learning Outcome and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Total Number of Students Observed	Total Number of Students Meeting Expectation	Percentage of Students Meeting Expectation	Assessment Results: 1. Does Not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
SLO 1: Describe the impact of business principles on esports processes					
Direct Measure 1: ESPT205 (Business of Esport) – Week 7, Sponsorship Pitch	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	24	21	88%	2 – Meets Expectations
Direct Measure 2: ESPT 310 (Policy Regulations and the Esport Ecosystem), Week 6 Assignment, Esport Tournament Policies and Guidelines	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	4	3	75%	2 – Meets Expectations
Indirect Measure 1: ESPT205 (Business of Esports) End-of-Course Survey	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	23	22	96%	3 – Exceeds Expectations Average 4.7
Indirect Measure 2: Externship Supervisor Evaluation	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared in this area	6	5	83%	2 – Meets Expectations 1 did not complete; Average without missing 4.2
SLO 2: Examine the application of ethical solutions in the esports industry					
Direct Measure 1: ESPT201 (Contemporary Issues in Esports) – Week 6, Diversity in Esports	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	13	7	54%	1 – Does not meet expectations 15% 0; Average grade 75%
Indirect Measure 1: ESPT310 (Policy Regulations, and the Esport Industry) End-of-Course Survey	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	17	16	94%	3 – Exceeds Expectations Avg. 4.7
Indirect Measure 2: Externship Supervisor Evaluation	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are	6	5	83%	2 – Meets Expectations

	prepared in this area				1 did not complete; Average without missing 4.1
SLO 3: Apply management concepts associated with the operation of esports events and facilities					
Direct Measure 1: ESPT210 (Esports Events and Facility Management) – Week 5, Final Project Part III – Event Preparation	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	8	7	88%	2 – Meets expectations
Indirect Measure 1: ESPT210 (Esports Events and Facilities) End-of-Course Survey	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	22	22	100%	3 – Exceeds Expectations Avg. 4.8
Indirect Measure 2: Externship Supervisor Evaluation	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared in this area	6	5	83%	2 – Meets Expectations 1 did not complete; Average without missing 4.4
SLO 4: Examine the social and historical influences of esports on contemporary society					
Direct Measure 1: ESPT340 (Esports Media and Production) – Week 2 Assignment, Historical Moments	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	8	7	88%	2 – Meets expectations
Indirect Measure 1: ESPT201 (Contemporary Issues in Esport) End-of-Course Survey	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	31	26	84%	2 – Meets expectations Avg. 4.4
Indirect Measure 2: Externship Supervisor Evaluation	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared in this area	6	5	83%	2 – Meets Expectations 1 did not complete; Average without missing 4.4
SLO 5: Develop a comprehensive understanding of the production of digital content for the esports industry					
Direct Measure 1: ESPT499 (Seminar in Esports) – Week 3, Create Broadcast Assignment	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	5	4	80%	2 – Meets Expectations
Direct Measure 2: ESPT340 (Esports Media and Production) – Week 4 Assignment, Shoutcasting	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	8	8	100%	3 – Exceeds Expectations

Indirect Measure 1: ESPT 340 (Esports Media and Production) End-of-Course Survey	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	17	15	88%	2 – Meets Expectations Avg. 4.1
Indirect Measure 2: Externship Supervisor Evaluation	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared in this area	6	4	66%	1 – Does not meet expectations 1 did not complete; Average without missing 4.3
SLO 6: Implement strategies to support and accelerate the development of esports athletes at all level					
Direct Measure 1: ESPT320 (Esports Player Development) – Week 8, Esport Player Development Program	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	8	8	100%	3 – Exceeds Expectations
Direct Measure 2: ESPT310 (Policy Regulation and the Esports Ecosystem) – Week 3, Esport Governance	More than 70% of students will score better than 85% on the assignment.	4	3	75%	2 – Meets Expectations
Indirect Measure 1: ESPT 320 (Esports Player Development) End-of-Course Survey	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared	20	20	100%	3 – Exceeds Expectations Avg. 4.9
Indirect Measure 2: Externship Supervisor Evaluation	More than 80% agree or strongly agree that they are prepared in this area	6	4	66%	1 – Does not meet expectations 1 did not complete; Average without missing 4.3

Student Learning Outcomes Matrix Narrative and APUS Interpretation:

Your outcomes assessment plan must include, at minimum, two direct and two indirect measures across ALL student learning outcomes (not for each SLO). All SLOs must be measured at least once by a direct measure. Some measurement tools will be used to measure more than one student learning outcome. 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 outcomes assessment data drives curricular and other decisions.
- Describe how have you improved/changed this year based on this data (close the loop).

APUS Response:***Sport Management – Bachelor's***

At the undergraduate level, the Bachelor of Science in Sport Management demonstrates generally sound outcome achievement, with most measures meeting or exceeding established benchmarks. Results for SLO 1, SLO 3, and SLO 6 confirm that students are achieving expected levels of performance in legal principles, the socio-historical context of sport, and sport marketing plan development. These results provide reasonable assurance that the curriculum, instructional design, and assessment structure are aligned with stated program learning outcomes. The program will maintain these areas while continuing to monitor performance for consistency across future cycles.

The program also identified outcomes that require focused intervention. SLO 2, Direct Measure 2 in SPMT200 did not meet expectations, with 58% of students meeting the benchmark compared with the expectation that more than 70% would score above 85%. This decline from the prior year indicates a need for closer monitoring of early-program student readiness, assignment completion, and academic integrity behaviors. Course review indicated that improper or unsupported artificial intelligence use contributed to scores of 0% and negatively affected performance. If the 0% scores are removed, 64% of students would score above the 85% threshold, but the measure would not meet expectations. In response to the high percentage of 0s, the University has implemented AI training modules, and the program will reinforce appropriate AI-use expectations in early coursework. In the next assessment cycle, program leadership will monitor zero-score trends, assignment completion, and average performance in SPMT200 to determine whether additional student support, assignment clarification, or course-level intervention is warranted.

SLO 4 produced a mixed result that warrants monitoring but not immediate curricular redesign. The direct measure in SPMT326 met expectations, confirming that students demonstrated the ability to apply ethical solutions through assessed coursework. The indirect measure was one percentage point below benchmark, with 79% of students indicating preparedness against an 80% expectation. Because the direct evidence met expectations and the indirect result was marginally below benchmark, the program will take a proportionate response. Faculty will reinforce applied ethical decision-making examples and make the connection between course activities and professional ethical practice more explicit. The Department Chair will review direct-measure performance, end-of-course survey results, and student comments in the next cycle. If the indirect measure remains below benchmark or student comments indicate a recurring concern, the program will initiate a focused review of assignment guidance, instructional examples, and related course content.

SLO 5 reflects both progress and continued accountability for improvement. Students met expectations on Direct Measure 2, suggesting that prior attention to budgeting and financial analysis contributed to improved performance. However, Direct Measure 1 remained below benchmark, with 67% of students meeting expectations. The related course was revised in Q1 2025 to clarify assignment instructions and improve alignment among the assignment, course objectives, and program learning outcome. Because the revised course was implemented

recently, the next cycle will serve as the first meaningful opportunity to evaluate whether the revisions are producing the intended improvement. The program will use those results to determine whether additional course design, faculty guidance, or student support changes are needed. Overall, undergraduate results are being used to sustain areas of strength, address underperforming measures, and verify whether recent course revisions are improving student learning outcomes.

Sport Management – Master’s

At the master’s level, the Master of Science in Sport Management demonstrated strong and stable outcome achievement. All direct measures for SLOs 1 through 5 met or exceeded expectations, indicating that graduate students are achieving the intended outcomes in management theory, legal and ethical analysis, financial decision-making, marketing strategy, and equity-related analysis in the sport industry. Indirect measures also met or exceeded expectations where reportable data were available. One indirect measure for SLO 4 was classified as insufficient data because the end-of-course survey item did not meet the University’s minimum response threshold for reporting, which protects student anonymity and supports responsible interpretation of survey results. Because the corresponding direct measure met expectations, the program does not interpret the insufficient indirect data as evidence of an academic performance concern. However, the program will continue monitoring the measure, confirm consistent survey administration, and review future response counts to determine when student preparedness data can be evaluated reliably. The graduate results support continued confidence in the curriculum and assessment framework, while also identifying the need to maintain oversight of the SLO 4 indirect measure until reportable data are available.

Esport – Bachelor’s

For the Bachelor of Science in Esports, results demonstrate areas of strength while also identifying outcomes that require more deliberate management attention. SLO 1, SLO 3, SLO 4, and several measures associated with SLO 6 met or exceeded expectations, indicating satisfactory student achievement in business principles, esports operations, social and historical influences, and athlete development. These findings support continued confidence in the core structure of the program. At the same time, the results indicate that the program must strengthen performance in selected outcome areas and improve the reliability of externship-based assessment evidence.

SLO 2, Direct Measure 1 did not meet expectations, with 54% of students meeting the benchmark and 15% earning a zero. Because this outcome was also below expectations in the prior cycle, the result is being treated as a continuing improvement priority. The finding points to the need for stronger student performance in applying ethical solutions within the esports industry, particularly in assignments related to diversity and contemporary issues. A major course revision was completed in 2025; however, the revised course was launched mid-year, so a full year of post-revision data is not yet available. The next assessment cycle will be used to evaluate the impact of the revised course. In addition, the program is hiring a full-time Esports coordinator with relevant subject-matter expertise. This position is expected to strengthen course review, faculty support, externship coordination, and ongoing monitoring of ethics- and diversity-related outcomes. Program leadership will review first full-year results from the revised

course, monitor zero-score patterns, and determine whether further changes to assignment design, instructional guidance, or student support are required.

Externship supervisor evaluation measures for SLO 5 and SLO 6 also did not meet expectations. These measures evaluate student preparedness in digital content production and esports athlete development. The results were affected by a small number of completed supervisor evaluations and one missing evaluation; however, the program will not discount the findings on that basis. Instead, the results identify a need to improve both student preparedness evidence and the completeness of externship assessment data. During the next cycle, the program will implement a more structured follow-up process for externship supervisor evaluations, monitor completion rates, and reassess SLO 5 and SLO 6 results. Collectively, the Esports findings are driving specific actions related to course revision follow-up, coordinator hiring, faculty and student support, externship evaluation completion, and continued monitoring of outcome achievement. These actions close the loop by using assessment evidence to sustain strengths, address underperformance, improve data reliability, and establish clear accountability points for the next reporting cycle.

Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix Academic Year 2025-26

Table 5. Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix. This matrix presents operational effectiveness evidence for retention, faculty teaching effectiveness, professional development, and student satisfaction. The accompanying narrative explains how results are interpreted and how APUS will use findings to support accountability and continuous improvement.

Identify Each Operational Effectiveness Goal and Measurement Tool(s)	Identify the Benchmark	Data Summary	Assessment Results: 1. Does not meet expectation 2. Meets expectation 3. Exceeds expectation 4. Insufficient data
Goal 1: To optimize student retention.			
B.S. Measure 1: Retention measured by 6–12-month student return (student progression summary)	60%	62.5%	2 – Meets Expectations
B.S. Measure 2: Retention measured by 3 rd month registration	50%	54.4%	2 – Meets Expectations
M.S. Measure 1: Retention measured by 6–12-month student return (student progression summary)	60%	77.2%	2 – Meets Expectations
M.S. Measure 2: Retention measured by 3 rd month registration	50%	52.2%	2 – Meets Expectations

B.S. Esport Measure 1: Retention measured by 3 rd month registration	60%	44%	1 – Does not Meet Expectations
B.S. Esport Measure 2: Retention measured by persistence to 6 th course (student progression – first term)	50%	56.3%	2 – Meets Expectations
Goal 2: Faculty teaching effectiveness.			
B.S. Measure: Faculty Effectiveness Index (FEI)	Index score of at least 85	93.9	3 – Exceeds Expectations 4/23 2025-4/22/2025
M.S. Measure: Faculty Effectiveness Index (FEI)	Index score of at least 85	95.8	3 – Exceeds Expectations 4/23 2025-4/22/2025
B.S. Esport Measure: Faculty Effectiveness Index (FEI)	Index score of at least 85	83.3	1 – Does not meet expectations 4/23 2025-4/22/2025 Q1 2026 up to 93.6 for the Quarter
Goal 3: Faculty professional development.			
B.S. / M.S. Measure/ B.S. Esport: Annual professional development units completed.	100% of full-time faculty must complete 2.0 units annually	All 7 full time-faculty members earned at least 2.0 Professional Development Units	2 - Meets expectations
Goal 4: Student Satisfaction			
B.S. Measure – SSI Index	Index score of at least 85	94.5	3 – Exceeds Expectations 4/23 2025-4/22/2025
MS Measure – SSI Index	Index score of at least 85	95.7	3 – Exceeds Expectations 4/23 2025-4/22/2025
B.S. ESPT Measure – SSI Index	Index score of at least 85	89.91	2 – Meets Expectations 4/23 2025-4/22/2025
B.S Measure – EOP Survey	At least 80% very or completely satisfied (4 or 5) with Program	100% 12/12 responses	3 – Exceeds Expectations
M.S Measure – EOP Survey	At least 80% very or completely satisfied (4 or 5) with Program	88% 15/17 responses	3 – Exceeds Expectations
B.S ESPT Measure – EOP Survey	At least 80% very or completely satisfied (4 or 5) with Program	1 response	4– insufficient data, University requires at least 10 responses to report

OEG Narrative and APUS Response:

Goal 1 – Retention results demonstrate that the Sport Management programs continue to meet established expectations while also identifying a clear early-retention improvement priority within the B.S. in Esports. The B.S. and M.S. Sport Management programs met the established retention benchmarks, indicating that students in these programs are progressing at expected levels and that the current combination of curriculum structure, advising support, faculty engagement, and student services is supporting continued enrollment. These results provide evidence of operational stability and confirm that no immediate program-level corrective action is required for the Sport Management degree programs. Program leadership will continue to monitor retention trends across future assessment cycles to ensure that current performance is sustained and that any emerging pattern is identified early through established academic review processes.

In contrast, the B.S. in Esports did not meet the benchmark for third-month registration, although persistence to the sixth course met expectations. This distinction is important for interpretation. The data suggest that early attrition is most pronounced during the initial enrollment period, while students who persist beyond the early stage are more likely to continue successfully through subsequent coursework. Program leadership has identified several factors that may contribute to this pattern, including student exploration of esports as an area of personal interest, uncertainty about long-term degree intent, limited initial understanding of esports career pathways, and the need for more structured early-program engagement. Because the later persistence measure met expectations, the program does not interpret the data as evidence of broad curricular failure; rather, the findings point to the need for a more deliberate early-retention strategy focused on expectations, program fit, academic momentum, and career alignment during the first three months of enrollment.

To close the loop, the Department Chair for Sport Management and Esports will work with the full-time Esports coordinator to implement a targeted early-engagement and retention plan during the 2026–2027 assessment cycle. Planned actions include reviewing early-course enrollment and progression data, identifying patterns associated with non-registration by the third month, strengthening introductory-course messaging regarding program expectations and career pathways, conducting targeted outreach to students during the first three months of enrollment, and reviewing student feedback related to program fit and persistence barriers. The Department Chair will evaluate third-month registration, persistence to the sixth course, and available student feedback at the end of the next annual assessment cycle. If third-month registration remains below benchmark, the program will escalate improvement actions, which may include revised onboarding communications, enhanced advising referrals, additional early-course student success messaging, or other targeted supports designed to improve early academic momentum.

Goal 2 – Faculty teaching effectiveness was evaluated through the Faculty Effectiveness Index (FEI), which incorporates student success survey results and faculty engagement indicators, including classroom presence and timely grading. The B.S. and M.S. Sport Management programs exceeded the benchmark, demonstrating strong instructional

effectiveness, consistent faculty engagement, and continued alignment between teaching practices and student learning expectations. These results support the conclusion that faculty performance in the Sport Management programs remains a program strength and that the current faculty oversight model is producing reliable evidence of teaching quality. Program leadership will continue to monitor FEI results as part of regular academic quality review to ensure that these results remain stable over time.

The B.S. in Esports FEI did not meet the annual benchmark; however, the result must be interpreted in the context of measurable improvement during the reporting period. The annual score increased by 3.5 points from the prior year, and the Q1 2026 FEI increased to 93.6, which exceeds the benchmark. This positive quarterly movement indicates that recent attention to faculty engagement, course delivery expectations, and instructional oversight is beginning to produce improvement. At the same time, because the annual benchmark was not met, the program recognizes the need for sustained, structured follow-up rather than relying on a single-quarter improvement as evidence of full resolution. The annual result will therefore remain an active operational improvement priority for the next assessment cycle.

To close the loop, the Department Chair for Sport Management and Esports will implement a focused Esports faculty support plan during the 2026–2027 assessment cycle in collaboration with the full-time Esports coordinator. The plan will include review of FEI component data, identification of course-level patterns related to student feedback and faculty engagement, targeted outreach to faculty whose course-level indicators fall below expectations, reinforcement of expectations for classroom presence and timely grading, review of student feedback themes, and onboarding support for faculty teaching newly revised or specialized Esports courses. FEI results will be reviewed quarterly by the Department Chair, with particular attention to whether the Esports FEI remains at or above the benchmark of 85 over time. If quarterly or annual FEI results fall below benchmark, the program will initiate additional interventions, including faculty coaching, course-level review, enhanced monitoring, or supplemental instructional support as appropriate. This approach establishes a clear accountability structure and ensures that teaching effectiveness data are used for continuous instructional improvement.

Goal 3 – Faculty professional development met expectations, with all seven full-time faculty members completing at least 2.0 professional development units during the reporting period. This result demonstrates full compliance with the program’s professional development benchmark and provides evidence of continued faculty engagement in professional learning. From an operational effectiveness perspective, this outcome supports the program’s ability to maintain instructional quality, currency in the discipline, and responsiveness to evolving expectations in sport management, esports, online education, assessment, and student support.

Because the benchmark was fully achieved, no corrective action is required for this goal. Program leadership will continue to monitor annual professional development completion to ensure sustained compliance and will use professional development planning to support priority areas identified through assessment results, including early student retention, faculty engagement, assessment reliability, ethical decision-making, financial

management, and Esports program quality. This connection between faculty development and assessment findings ensures that professional learning remains aligned with program needs and contributes directly to continuous improvement.

Goal 4 – Student satisfaction results demonstrate strong student perceptions across the Sport Management programs and generally positive results for the B.S. in Esports where reportable data were available. SSI results exceeded expectations for the B.S. and M.S. Sport Management programs and met expectations for the B.S. in Esports, indicating favorable student perceptions of course quality, faculty engagement, academic support, and career relevance. End-of-program survey results also exceeded expectations for the Sport Management programs, with 100% of B.S. respondents and 88% of M.S. respondents reporting that they were very or completely satisfied with their program. These results provide evidence that the Sport Management programs are meeting student expectations and that current academic and operational supports are contributing to positive student experiences.

The B.S. in Esports end-of-program survey produced only one response, which is below the University's minimum reporting threshold of 10 responses. As a result, the measure is appropriately classified as insufficient data and is not being used to draw program-level conclusions for this cycle. The program recognizes, however, that insufficient data represents an assessment process issue that must be addressed so that future student satisfaction results can be interpreted reliably. Because the SSI result for the B.S. in Esports met expectations, the available evidence does not indicate an immediate student satisfaction concern; nonetheless, the low end-of-program survey response count limits the program's ability to evaluate graduating-student perceptions and use those results for program-level decision-making.

To close the loop, the Department Chair for Sport Management and Esports will work with the full-time Esports coordinator, once hired, and appropriate student support partners to improve end-of-program survey participation among eligible Esports students during the 2026–2027 assessment cycle. Planned actions include identifying students approaching program completion, reinforcing the purpose and value of the end-of-program survey in graduation and completion communications, sending targeted reminders during the final course and at program completion, and reviewing response counts at least once each term. The program's target is to obtain at least 10 completed B.S. in Esports end-of-program survey responses, consistent with the University's minimum reporting threshold, so that future results can be used reliably for program-level analysis and continuous improvement. If the threshold is not met in the next cycle and a sufficient number of students have completed the program, leadership will review additional outreach options and determine whether supplemental student satisfaction evidence is needed. This approach strengthens the assessment process while preserving the integrity of conclusions drawn from student feedback data.