Lumpkin College of Business and Technology
Office of the Dean

Lumpkin Hall Room 4800
600 Lincoln Avenue, Charleston, Illinois 61920-3099

Office: (217) 581-3526 | eiu.edu/lumpkin

April 9, 2021

Dr. Rick Wilkinson
Program Coordinator, Hospitality and Tourism

RE: Year 2 Program Assessment Review

Documents (all Microsoft Word format) submitted and reviewed:
1) HTM Assessment Plan October 15 2020
2) HTM Exit Survey
3) HTM Internship Supervisor Survey Assessment
4) HTM Rubrics (5 total): Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, Social Responsibility and Ethical Responsibility, Written Communication

Evaluated Aspects of Program Assessment	**Stage of Maturity** (Beginning, Developing, Acceptable, Exemplary)
A. Student Learning Outcomes	Developing
B. Measurement Tools and Assignments	Developing
C. Data Collection and Integrity	Developing
D. Expectations and Results	Developing
E. Discussion and Analysis	Not Applicable
F. Use of Assessment Results for Program Improvement	Not Applicable
G. Faculty Engagement in Assessment	Developing

Summary of Assessment Evaluation:

The HTM faculty have thoughtfully and rigorously created Student Learning Outcomes aligned with peer accredited programs, identified where data can be collected, and are in the process of beginning that data collection. With a few refinements suggested in the following analysis, they are well positioned to continue the assessment cycle in their new academic program. Well done!

Melody L Wollan, PhD, SHRM-SCP
Associate Dean, Lumpkin College of Business and Technology
mlwollan@eiu.edu

Melody L. Wollan

Academic Program	Hospitality and Tourism
Evaluation Point	Year 2 (AY 2020) of 4
Program-level Accreditation	None
Academic Years in Reporting Cycle	AY19 - AY23
Reviewer Name, Title	Melody Wollan, LCBT Associate Dean

A. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)
Specific statements that articulate the discipline-specific content, skills, and/or dispositions students should gain or improve through engagement in the program

BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☒	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐
• SLO does not specify what group of students will achieve mastery of it, and/or at what point(s) in their progression through the program they will do so. • SLO contains only imprecise verbs (e.g., "know," "understand"), and thus is difficult to measure. • SLO is too broad or vague to guide the assessment process.	• SLO is clear about what group of students will achieve mastery of it (e.g., majors, students in the program), but not at what point in their progression through the program they will do so. • SLO contains action verbs that reflect an inadequate depth of knowledge for the program. • SLO contains a general description of the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions to be measured, but the description is not discipline-specific.	• SLO is clear about what group of students will achieve mastery of it, and at what point in their progression through the program they will do so (e.g., "seniors," "graduates"). • SLO contains precise, measurable, and observable verbs that reflect an appropriate depth of knowledge for the program. • SLO contains a discipline-specific description of the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions that students will demonstrate.	• A reasonable number of SLOs are identified — enough to adequately accomplish the mission of the program while still being manageable to assess on an annual basis. • Overall SLOs reflect appropriate level of expectation for the program type/level. • Overall SLOs stated in student-centered terms, reflecting what students should know, do, and/or think as they engage in the program of study.

Comments: The HTM program has 4 concise and appropriate learning objectives that can be abbreviated as: 1. Effective communication, 2. Problem-solving and critical thinking, 3. Ethics and social responsibility awareness, and 4. Functional and operational skills within the industry. I would encourage numbering of the SLOs so that they can be more easily referred in analysis as data is received.

Specifics regarding the timing and audience of the objectives and desired results can be inferred from the items assessed within the measures but grouping and developing outcome/results at each timing point would provide you with more clarity and likely will be the way you organize your analysis and discussion. Thus, one organizing approach to consider would be to reorganize your assessment within each of the four SLO so that you identify at least

	two critical points to which measures relate (suggested: early program 1000 – 2000 level coursework, versus capstone measures taken at senior, internship and exit points; this would not address HTM 3000-level items so you might consider adding a "mid-program" point for your discussion of data and progression through the program). Alternatively, you may be collecting too much data at too many points. However, for your early efforts, I believe more is better, and you can refine your assessment once you have a few cycles of feedback and it has matured.

B. Measurement Tools and Assignments Description of the measurement tool and the associated assignment, how they align with the SLO, and their validity			
• SLO is assessed with only indirect measure(s) (i.e., surveys). • No information is provided about how the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) relate to the SLO.	• SLO is assessed with direct measure(s) (i.e., objective tests, rubrics). • General description is provided of the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s). • General information is provided about how the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) relate to the SLO.	• Detailed description of measurement tool(s) and its alignment with the SLO is provided. This includes: ○ for an objective test measurement tool, individual questions are identified and valid to the SLO (or element of the SLO), and expected levels of mastery are indicated; ○ for an analytic rubric measurement tool, each trait is mapped to the SLO (or element of the SLO) and each level details expectations. • Detailed description of the assignment(s) and alignment with the SLO is provided. This includes: ○ for an objective test assignment, representative test items are described to indicate relevance to the SLO and the expected level of mastery; ○ for a performance-based assignment evaluated with an analytic rubric, the assignment prompt is described to indicate relevance to the SLO and the expected level of mastery. • Measurement tool(s) will provide a direct/observable result and are appropriate to the SLO and the level of mastery expected. • Assignment(s) are appropriate to the SLO and the level of mastery expected.	• Direct measures may be supplemented with indirect measures. • Includes both formative and summative measures. • A description of the development process for the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) is included to illustrate their appropriateness to the SLO.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☒	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐

Assessment Methods: What type of assessment methods does the program use?	☒ **Direct Measures** Measures that require students to demonstrate knowledge and skills. Provide tangible, visible, and self-explanatory evidence of what students have and have not learned. Actual student behavior or work is measured or assessed	☒ **Indirect Measures** Assessments that measure opinions or thoughts about student's knowledge, skills, attitudes, learning experiences, perceptions of services received or employers' opinions. Do not measure students' performance directly

Measurement Tools: What type of measurement tools does the program use?	☐ **Objective Test** Measure that has right or wrong answers and can be quickly and unambiguously scored by anyone with an answer key.	☒ **Analytic Rubrics** Measures that are subjective for performance-based assignments. Resembles a grid with criteria for student project listed in the leftmost column and with all levels of performance listed across the top row. The cells within the center contain descriptions of what specified criteria look like for each level of performance. Each of the criteria is scored individually	☒ **Surveys** Measures for collecting data from a pre-defined group of respondents to gain information and insights on a topic of interest	☐ **Other** Could include a holistic rubric (single scale with all criteria being considered together), or a checklist (only two performance levels possible and no descriptions included).

Comments:	Measures are well-crafted and link clearly to the SLO. They include both direct (62%) and indirect (38%) measures. Critical Thinking rubric has 5 item measures with 4 levels: Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Beginning described in detail. The Oral Communication and Quantitative Rubrics is similarly designed (5 x 4); Written Communication (6 x 4), based on EIU's version for General Education coursework. The HTM Social Responsibility and Ethical Reasoning Rubric has 4 item measures and 4 levels with adequate descriptions that seem general enough to be applicable even beyond an HTM environment. You may find during use of these rubrics that you would benefit from revising the language or criteria to more closely describe desired outcomes specific to your program's context. Indirect measures are carefully aligned to include specific items for evaluation that are clearly linked to SLOs, as well as other data being collected for categorization and analytical needs. A mix of formative (24%) and summative (76%) items are being used for each SLO. I look forward to seeing the Year 4 data and assignments to further evaluate the use of these measures for assessment.

C. Data Collection and Integrity

When measurement tools are applied, to whom, at what point in the program, and how the program ensures consistency across multiple administrations of the tools and assignments (reliability)

• It is unclear how the information provided relates to this assessment cycle.	• Information is provided about the data collection process in this cycle, but not enough to generate confidence in the findings (e.g., sample size is too small, student motivation conditions are	• Enough information is provided about administration of the measurement tool and data collection process to generate confidence in the findings. This includes: ○ adequate student population targeted with an assignment and measurement tool; ○ sufficient sample size for statistically significant results (especially if different than the student population), with a rationale for representative sampling (if appropriate);	• Information provided demonstrates that data collection occurs throughout the curriculum and involves multiple faculty members. • Information is included about how data are collected and responsibility is shared among faculty members.

	inconsistent, rubric is not normed with raters, etc.) • Process will provide limited information for guiding instruction and curriculum.	○ consistent student motivation conditions across multiple administrations of the assignment and measurement tool; • Process will provide useful information for guiding instruction and curriculum.	• An ongoing, inclusive, systematic process is in place for collecting data to make decisions and improve learning within the program, appropriate to the program's internal and external constituencies.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☒	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐
Comments:	It is recognized that any data collected at this point is very limited and not interpretable. However, you will want to include sample size and labeling of semester and year (F20, SP21). Additionally, the EIU template asks that in both Years 2 and 4, that the report include 4 columns: SLOs, ULG, Measures/Instruments (with description of instrument [or inclusion of instrument], when and where it is administered), and How Information is Used (target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument). This format may or may not require all of the columns in your overall assessment plan or those labels which may be desirable in the formation of your plan.		

D. Expectations and Results SLO have clearly identified expectations that reflect size and maturity of the program. Clear and concise illustration/presentation of data collected. Includes narrative or table/figure with sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges as appropriate to the assessment tool			
• No expectations are presented, or it is unclear how the expected results relate to the SLO. • No results are presented, or it is unclear how the results relate to the SLO.	• Expectations and results are presented and relate to the SLO, but a lack of specificity does not allow useful conclusions to be drawn. • Presentation is insufficiently detailed; only overall student scores or averages are presented.	• Expectations and results are presented by SLO. • Tables and graphs effectively communicate results, including sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges, as appropriate to the measurement tool. • For objective tests, results are presented according to items or groups of items connected to a SLO. • For rubrics, results are presented according to rubric trait and level, including counts and percentages. • Results include all applicable locations and/or delivery modes.	• Expectations and results are easily understood, as well as their implications. • Results are presented for all locations and/or delivery modes showing an equivalent level of rigor and detail.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☒	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐

Comments:	Rationale for expectations would be helpful in your discussion of assessment activities; however, expectations are identified in this developing assessment plan. Results should be a count of, not the overall average of the item(s) measured in most cases (EIU EWP and Speaking Ratings may only be provided as a total score). That is, your expectation [and therefore results] should reflect statements like “80% of students at this level will demonstrate a score of at least 3 (out of 4) on each criterion listed on the rubric”. You would then report ‘6/7 (86%) obtained scores of 3 or above on (list of criteria) thus meeting expectations’; and perhaps ‘4/7 (57%) obtained scores of 3 or above on (criterion) thus in this factor they did not meet expectations.’ As mentioned in Section C above, you’ll want to label results with semester and provide a sample size with your data to assist you with assessing interventions and program events that influence results over time.

E. Discussion and Analysis Explains the meaningfulness of the data presented (interpretation of results) with a clear, complete, and succinct analysis focusing on the interpretation of and reflection on the assessment data			
• No interpretation is attempted, or the interpretation does not relate to the SLO and/or the results.	• Interpretation is attempted, relates to the SLO and/or results, but the interpretation is either: ○ insufficient to support programmatic decisions, ○ not aligned with the program's previous action plans, ○ offering excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretations leading to improvements in student learning.	• Interpretation is aligned with the program's SLOs. • Interpretation is explained in terms of the desired levels of student performance and is based on student achievement of those levels. • Interpretation is justified through current disciplinary standards, previous results and/or benchmarks. • Interpretation includes how courses, experiences, and/or the assessment process might have affected results. • Interpretation indicates the appropriate collaboration and consensus of multiple internal stakeholders (e.g., program faculty, committees, staff, and/or students). • Interpretation is detailed enough to justify programmatic decisions concerning changes in instruction and/or curriculum.	• Interpretation directly addresses the program's SLOs and action plans. • Interpretation addresses past trends in student performance, as appropriate. • Strengths and weaknesses in student learning are easily identified. • New findings are compared to past trends, as appropriate. • Interpretation identifies possible areas of improvement, thus initiating future actions.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☐	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐

Comments:	The faculty and program coordinator's leadership is to be commended for the continuous discussion and efforts made towards the assessment plan as evidenced by 5 spring 2020 meetings and 2 Fall 2020 discussions. Further, SLOs have been developed with accredited programs and accreditation standards as a benchmark since this currently non-accredited program desires eventual accreditation and needs a substantial assessment reporting period to apply for accreditation. At this time, there is no discussion or analysis available such that evaluation ta this time is really characterized as Not Applicable.

F. Use of Assessment Results for Program Improvement Strategies planned and/or in progress for program improvement; actions designed to improve instruction and curriculum; rationale for action is based on data and analysis of results			
• No actions proposed for the next cycle. • Proposed actions are not based on the data captured through the assessment process. • Proposed actions are unrelated to the improvement of the educational program, and therefore student learning.	• The connection between proposed actions, results/discussion, and/or SLOs is not clear. • Proposed actions are too broad or vague to guide the improvement of the educational program and student learning. • Proposed actions do not demonstrate evidence of input from more than one person. • Proposed actions pertain only to assessment plan changes (process/measure only).	• Proposed actions are directly connected to the SLOs. • Proposed actions are data-driven, directly related to the results/discussion. • Proposed actions focus on the improvement of the educational program and student learning. If modifications are made to the assessment process, they are data-driven. • Proposed actions contain a process for evaluating their effectiveness. • Proposed actions demonstrate evidence of input from multiple internal stakeholders. • Carryover actions from the previous cycle are noted. • If a SLO is not addressed by any proposed actions, justification is given for maintenance of ongoing curriculum and instruction.	• Proposed actions are specifically detailed, including who will be responsible for implementation, approximate dates of implementation, and notes about where in the curriculum and in what specific classes they will occur.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☐	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐
Comments:	Not applicable at this time		

G. Faculty Engagement in Assessment Faculty engagement individually and collectively in the assessment process such as review of the outcomes data, revisions and updates to assessment plan, and reaffirmation of SLOs.			
• Assessment is done primarily by program coordinator/assistant chair. • Data is primarily collected in capstone activities.	• The assessment reporting and analytical processes are conducted by the program coordinator or assistant chair with data being collected by faculty. • Faculty review outcomes and resulting data at least once per year.	• The program has an organized systematic plan in which all faculty participate in at least one stage of assessment. • Analysis of results informs faculty decision-making related to curricular and program improvements. • Faculty review outcomes and resulting data at least once per year collectively, but those discussions influence other program discussions made throughout the year.	• Program faculty are highly engaged throughout the assessment process as demonstrated at all stages. • Faculty recommend interventions and participate in revising assessment activities for continuous program improvement.
BEGINNING ☐	DEVELOPING ☒	ACCEPTABLE ☐	EXEMPLARY ☐

Comments:	It is assumed that all HTM faculty were participating in the aforementioned 7 meetings where assessment was discussed and determinations were made as a group. In the assessment plan of 'collected by' all faculty are tasked with the responsibility in alignment of their role as instructor, internship coordinator, and/or program coordinator. There is an appearance that all HTM faculty are heavily invested in assessment at this time and have taken part in a coordinated plan that involves numerous stages (completed and planned). At this time, aspects related to reviewing outcomes, analyzing results, and interventions have not yet been undertaken.

HTM Assessment Plan
Non Accredited Program Year 2 Review
October 15 2020

Learning Outcomes	EIU UG Learning Goal	Measures	Data	Desired Level	Instrument Used	Collected By	F or S*	I or D*
Demonstrate effective communication skills for the hospitality and tourism industry using written, oral, and technological formats	W1-W7 S1-7	EIU EWP Ratings	3.39 (2018-19) 3.08 (2019-20)	Above EIU avg. 3.40 (2018-19) 3.34 (2019-20)	EWP rating rubric	EIU	S	D
		EIU Speaking Ratings	3.10 (2018-19) 2.00 (2019-20)	Above EIU avg. 3.30 (2018-19) 3.38 (2019-20)	Primary Trait Rubric	CMN 1310G	F	D
			3.70 (2018-19) 2.75 (2019-20)	Above EIU avg. 3.55(2018-19) 2.75(2019-20)	Primary Trait Rubric	Senior Seminar	S	D
		HTM 2700: Trends and Issues presentation		2.5/4.0	HTM Speaking Rubric	Brooks: Course Instructor	F	D
		HTM 4380: Company Analysis Paper		3.0/4.0	HTM Writing Rubric	Wilkinson: Course Instructor	S	D
		Internship Supervisor Evaluation		3.0/4.0	Site Supervisor Survey A Items Average	Internship Coordinator	S	I
		Senior Exit Survey	5.0	4.0/5.0	Exit Survey Q14	Program Coordinator	S	I

Analyze problems and apply managerial solutions utilizing quantitative reasoning and critical thinking skills	C1-6 Q1-6	HTM 2740: STR Reports		2.5/4.0	HTM Quant Rubric	Hugo: Course Instructor	F	D
		HTM 3370: Case Studies		3.0/4.0	HTM Thinking Rubric	Brooks: Course Instructor	S	D
		HTM 3786: Inventory Assignment		3.0/4.0	HTM Thinking Rubric (Student Position and Conclusions items)	Wilkinson: Course Instructor	S	D
		HTM 4380: Hotel Simulation Final Report		3.0/4.0	HTM Quant Rubric	Wilkinson: Course Instructor	S	D
		Internship Supervisor Evaluation		3.0/4.0	Site Supervisor Survey B Items Average	Internship Coordinator	S	I
		Senior Exit Survey	4.5	4.0/5.0	Exit Survey Q 5, Q12 average	Program Coordinator	S	I
Develop an awareness of ethical values and social responsibility in a multicultural environment	R1 –R4	HTM 2600G: Final Paper		2.5/4.0	HTM Ethics &SR Rubric	Hugo: Course Instructor	F	D
		HTM 3370: Utilitarian Assignment		3.0/4.0	HTM Ethics &SR Rubric	Brooks: Course Instructor	S	D
		Internship Supervisor Evaluation		3.0/4.0	Site Supervisor Survey C Items Average	Internship Coordinator	S	I
		Senior Exit Survey	5.0	4.0/5.0	Exit Survey Q 7, Q13 average	Program Coordinator	S	I

Demonstrate functional and operational skills relevant to the hospitality and tourism industry	W1, W3 Q1, Q2							
		HTM 2740: Case Studies				Hugo: Course Instructor	F	D
		HTM 3784: Final Management Report		3.0/4.0	HTM Writing Rubric (Research/Data and Managerial Response items)	Wilkinson: Course Instructor	S	D
		Internship Supervisor Evaluation		3.0/4.0	Site Supervisor Survey D Items Average	Internship Coordinator	S	I
		Senior Exit Survey	4.0	4.0/5.0	Exit Survey Q6,Q8,Q9,Q10,Q11 average	Program Coordinator	S	I

* F or D = Formative or Summative Measures
* I or D = Indirect or Direct Measures

Improvements and Changes

As a new program (start date July 1 2019), HTM began developing the assessment process in Spring 2020 during numerous faculty meetings, and continued discussion into the fall semester, as outlined below.

January 14: HTM faculty reviewed learning objectives from a number of ACPHA accredited programs, and the learning goals used previously for the FCS-Hospitality Concentration assessment plan.

February 11: HTM faculty finalized four learning objectives and began exploration of measures for each. Discussion of integrating ACPHA formative/summative, and direct/indirect columns yielded incorporating them into the assessment plan/document.

March 10: HTM faculty discussed revising the senior exit survey and the internship site supervisor survey to better align with the new learning goals. Discussion of specific courses/activities as measures continued. Discussion of use of rubrics was discussed and it was agreed that common rubrics would be utilized.

April 14: The revised senior exit survey and internship site supervisor survey were approved. Several sample rubrics were reviewed and discussion yielded agreement on development of multiple rubrics each using a 4 point scale.

May 5: Revised rubrics were approved. Rubrics posted on HTM shared file. It was agreed that assignments/activities at the formative level (1000 and 2000 level courses) would have an expected level of 2.5 out of 4.0, and at the summative level (3000 and 4000 level courses). Faculty were asked to determine activities in their courses that would be appropriate measures for the learning goals.

September 22: HTM faculty asked (e-mail) to determine if a holistic score from a rubric or selected items from the rubric would be used as measures for learning objectives.

September 29: HTM faculty discussed a draft assessment plan. Minor revisions were discussed and incorporated into the plan. Rubric data to be collected on each student, with results combined on a spread sheet. Spreadsheets to be organized by learning goal.

As a new program there is limited data to review at this point.

History of Annual Review		
Date of Annual Review	**Individuals/Groups Who Reviewed Plan**	**Results of the Review**
September 29 2020	HTM faculty and chair	Assessment plan and process finalized.