

## The Design and Implementation of Undergraduate and Graduate Sport Management Assessment Systems: A Worthy (yet Painful) Process

Lori Miller, Wichita State University  
G. Clayton Stoldt, Wichita State University  
Jeffrey Noble, Wichita State University  
Mark Vermillioin, Wichita State University

### Session 3: Professional Preparation Presentation (25-minute)

Thursday, May 31, 2007

10:30 AM - 10:55 AM

Institutions of higher education (IHE) are encountering varied questions and expressions of intense concern regarding instructional quality and its direct relationship to student learning. The national, ongoing publicity given to the 2003 No Child Left Behind act (20 USCA 6311; Henry, 2004) and a continued concern regarding accountability to tax payers pose legitimate threats to the long standing tradition of institutional self-regulation and independence (Eaton, 2004). Allegations of educational malpractice breach of contract, misrepresentation, and a failure to uphold fiduciary responsibilities reflect only a few of the increasingly legitimate legal threats to institutional autonomy (Emerick, 1997; Ross v. Creighton University, 1992; Scharffs & Welch, 2005; Truax, 1997). The design, implementation, and continued refinement of degree program assessment systems can effectively minimize the threat of legal allegations while better maintaining the current IHE environment of self-regulation. The purpose of this presentation is to provide guidance, insights, and recommendations regarding the design and implementation of a comprehensive assessment system for a sport management program. The presentation combines relevant theory regarding assessment, legal theory, accreditation, and federal statutes enacted with the intent of increasing academic accountability and providing for an informed public. The experiential component of the presentation focuses on how a Midwestern university with two NASPE/NASSM-approved sport management programs (BA and MEd) designed, implemented, and continues to evaluate and refine an assessment system that integrates the NASPE/NASSM standards while also improving accountability and minimizing legal threats.

The experiential component evolved in 2003 when the authors' College of Education underwent a comprehensive assessment overhaul in preparation for a 2004 NCATE accreditation review. The assessment system designed at that time is now in its third year of operation, with refinements and upgrades being made continually in an effort to best gauge instructional effectiveness and the successful attainment of defined learner outcomes.

The proposed presentation is organized into four parts. Part I includes a brief elaboration on an assessment system's fundamental components. Discussion will also include the internal and external assessment-related partners that contribute to the assessment system's success or failure.

Part II of the presentation will illustrate the assessment system and related components designed and implemented for both undergraduate and graduate sport management programs at a Midwestern university. Part III contains information regarding the assessment system's critical evaluation components and how best to sustain the assessment system for purposes of continued program improvement. Part IV will provide some concluding comments, including both positive and negative experiences encountered and a summary of lessons learned.

The need for program accountability is directly related to the merit and utility of a well-defined and efficient sport management assessment system. Sport management faculty can benefit from the presenters' own experiences regarding the assessment system development process for undergraduate and graduate sport management programs.

Eaton, J.S. (Jan. 5, 2004). Is the Era of Self-Regulation Over? [www.chea.org](http://www.chea.org)  
Emerick, M.L. (1997). The University/Student-Athlete Relationship, 44, 865-902.  
No Child Left Behind, 20 USCA 6311.  
Henry, M. N. (2004). No Child Left Behind? Educational Malpractice Litigation for the 21st Century. 92, 1117-1140.  
Ross v. Creighton University, 957 F.2d 410 (7th Cir. 1992).  
Scharffs and Welch, 2005; An Analytic Framework for Understanding and Evaluating the Fiduciary Duties of Educators. Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal, 159, 1-56.  
Truax, C. (1997). Why Can't the Football Team Read? 4, 301-317.