**Academic Program Review**

**Review Panel Report**

|  |
| --- |
| **Date of Review: 11/3/14 *AAS of Sports Management***  **Names and positions of reviewers:**  **Member: Kim Bentley Position:** Preceptor Dietetic Education Program  **Member: Linda Buchanan Anderson Position:** Professor of Health Careers  **Member: Derek Shank Position:** Director of Student Affairs  **Member: Susan Tatterson Position:** Professor of Digital Media |
| **Evaluation of Program Mission** |
| The committee was unable to unable to evaluate the Program Mission as one was not provided. |
| **Evaluation of Program Quality** |
| Quality of Curriculum:  The committee would have been better able to assess the quality of the curriculum of the AAS if it had been compared to other programs in the state or nationally. If no other programs exist, it could have been compared to the lower division requirements of Bachelor degree programs (such as the one at Grand Canyon or UA that the reviewer referenced in another portion of the review).  The outcomes of the degree are appropriate and laid out well in what is supplied to the curriculum committee using Bloom’s taxonomy-but as a degree the use of the Curriculum Comparison Charts would have been helpful. |
| Contribution of Program in Meeting Institutional Strategic Goals:  There seems to be some evidence in meeting several of the strategic goals on a small scale. If more evidence had been provided as to the specifics of the program and how it meets its goals there would be more support in how the reviewer feels it assists with Goals #1, 2, 3, 5 and 8. |
| Success of Program in Engaging in Continuous Quality Improvement:  There is evidence that the program is working toward improving it’s the curricular processes and the development of an AA degree in this field. This information wasn’t provided in the self-review, but does exist. The reason we chose to include this as an example is that there was very little evidence of Continuous Quality Improvement supplied in the APR. |
| **Evaluation of Program Effectiveness** |
| Success of Students in Achieving Appropriate Learning Outcomes**:**  The committee was unable to fully evaluate this portion of the review. Assessment of common student learning outcomes and program student learning outcomes were not provided.  There is a reference that CSLO’s have been done for PED 103-but the results were not provided. In addition there was some confusion about assessment versus course/program evaluation. The Course Evaluations that students provide (or fail to provide when asked) are not an assessment of student learning-so they cannot be used as a direct measure of student learning outcomes. They are more indicative of student satisfaction and a self-evaluation as to whether or not learning has occurred. |
| Success of Students in Completing CAC Program:  The committee was unable to evaluate the success of student completion as data was not provided surrounding how many students are enrolled in this program and how many have graduated in the past 3 years-or ever. |
| Success of Students Upon Departure from CAC:  The committee was unable to evaluate the Success of Students Upon Departure from CAC as he stated this information is not tracked or did not provide the information. |
| **Evaluation of Program Viability** |
| Evaluation of Enrollment Trends:  The committee was unable to evaluate the Enrollment Tends as referenced data was not supplied. The reviewer stated that in his opinion this would be a growing field - but did not supply supporting data. |
| Evaluation of Need for Program Based on Economic/Job Market Conditions or Transfer Opportunities:  The evaluation is based upon the opinion of the reviewer rather than any solid data that is provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics or actual transfer numbers.  This does seem to be an increasing field as portrayed by the media and with the increased focus on preventative/proactive health measures supported by the government. The reviewer provided some general transfer degrees and a specific example from Grand Canyon University (which is the focus of one of GCU’s television commercials in their use of a student majoring in Sports Management). |
| Evaluation of Program Viability Based on Adequacy of Resources:  The program feels that it has adequate resources to provide services to students. Committee unclear if the reviewer is referencing computer labs that are specific to his division or used by the institution when he states “labs are adequate, but old and not always functional.”  The reviewer doesn’t reference the adequacy of “academic services”-but feels it is an area that can be improved upon. It was unclear if the reviewer is referencing support within his department or the academic services provided by the college at large. Similarly, with “student services” his focus is upon the recruitment and advising about his program from other departments in a speculative manner. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Panel Reviewers Recommendation for Program:** |
| **The committee:**  **3. Conditionally Continue a Program:** Conditional approval is recommended with identification of specific areas requiring significant improvement. Improvements needed and a reasonable time frame for them to be made will be given. Viability of the program may be in question. |
| **Panel Reviewers Make One of the Following Recommendations Regarding the Program Under Review:**  **3. Conditionally Continue a Program: Conditional approval is recommended with identification of specific areas requiring significant improvement. Improvements needed and a reasonable time frame for them to be made will be given. Viability of the program may be in question.** |
| **Panel Reviewers Recommendation for Program Action Plan:** |
| The reviewers recommend the program address the following **Strengths**/weaknesses in their Academic Program Review Action Plan:   * We ~~might~~ recommend that this program submit another APR Self-Study next year rather than wait for the 3 year cycle based upon the lack of responses in several of the areas. * A potential strength of this program would be that there seems to be very little cost associated with it and it is a growing field. This means as the resources currently exist it would appear to be a very low cost program. It also appears that a large portion of the curriculum comes in collaboration with other departments (only 18 units-6 courses of the current 71 units are listed as PED/PEH courses). * It also appears that there is some Continuous Quality Improvement as there have been recent curricular changes-but none of that was provided in the APR. Please provide evidence in how the program is being improved and why such improvement is being made. * Of the evidence provided much of it seems either speculative, stated as opinion, or presented as if self-evident. Please use data provided by other organizations to show that this is an innovative and up and coming field. This could be done in looking at the Bureau of Labor Statistics or the Occupational Outlook Handbook. This could also be done by looking at some professional organizations that support Sports Management. * The program needs to establish a Mission which can be done by looking at the academic, industry, and CAC missions to guide in its formation. * The main weakness of the APR is that very little concrete evidence to support any of the areas was provided. * The reviewer would be aided by working with Institutional Research in order to obtain data surrounding its past, current, and potential enrollees. * The reviewer would also be assisted in using some of the other voluntary forms to see the strength/weaknesses of the curriculum. This could be done by using the Curriculum Comparison Chart (Career Degree) for the AAS and the Curriculum Comparison Chart (Transfer Degree) for the newly created AA. While the reviewer stated that he felt ENG 102 wasn’t necessary, and his students have difficulty with such, it is not currently a requirement for the AAS and it is universally needed for the AA as a transferable degree. * There should also be some evidence of how the program assesses student learning outcomes. This would be different that students and faculty course evaluations-as those are only indirect self-evaluations.   + A statement about how the program measures it success would be helpful. * Lastly, the questions surrounding Continuous Quality Improvement and Program Alignment with Institutional Goals should be focused upon how the program supports those or what the program does to provide such. In some of the answers it comes across as if the reviewer could be asking the college to provide such resources.   + An example is “Optimize fiscal resources that support the needs and expectations of students and the community”   + The answer “no added fiscal resources needed at this time” does not reflect how the AAS in Sports Management, program, and resources supports the needs and expectations of students and the community. |