Summary of Portfolio Assessment – September 2013

The Goal: to conduct a retrospective assessment of RTM Senior Portfolios for evidence of fulfilling COAPRT standards 7.02 and 7.03.

Method:

The portfolios currently available at the department were submitted by students from the semesters Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. The portfolios were divided into three levels based on overall GPA (Group A = 3.5 to 4.0; Group B = 3.0 to 3.49; and Group C= 2.0 to 2.99). The stratified random sample had 17 portfolios that were reviewed by a faculty member and/or a practitioner based on the attached rubric. Of the 17 portfolios 5 represented level A, 5 from level B, and 7 from level C. GPA levels were not indicated to the reviewers. Two faculty members reviewed the sample portfolio and an industry partner was also brought in to review a select number of the sample pieces.

The rubric used for the evaluation is attached to this report. The 7.02 standard was split into three sub-sets as reflected in the rubric.

Summary Evidence and Reflections for Faculty Consideration:

- a) Dividing the assessment by GPA was a helpful strategy to represent a greater diversity of portfolios and to reflect on the difference in quality of evidence as a function of type of student.
- b) The portfolios under review had minimal behavioral evidence of leadership competency in the 7.03 standard. The students may have those competencies but the portfolios in their current configuration show minimal evidence of leadership good or bad.
- c) Team projects in the RTM 304 class and RTM 202 class left a question of whose competency was demonstrated with no indication of that role a student played in the team project.
- d) Although there was evidence of 'diversity and inclusion' being taught in the curriculum there was minimal direct evidence in the portfolio of how this was explicitly a part of program design and delivery.
- e) The overall scores given to the multiple indicators (3.18 to 3.91) are lower than would be desired.

Recommended Changes to Curriculum or Instruction for Faculty Decision (completing the loop):

- a) Change the format of the portfolio organization to a 'demonstration of professional competencies' approach rather than being organized by course sequence of RTM 202 to RTM 490. The learning process of students first organizing the project by courses and doing the reflective summary of key learning from each course seems to be a great sequence. However as the next step students could then present the portfolio by showing what they can do/have done in terms of 7.02 and 7.03 standards. As an example the program plan and supporting evidence of an event they organized would be a section rather than having a section from RTM 202 Event Planning.
- b) Identify how students can provide a stronger level of 'evidence' regarding the leadership competencies. Although self-reflection about leadership is a valid indirect measure of leadership, students could have a more behavioral demonstration of leadership competencies. The portfolios under review had minimal behavioral evidence.
- c) Continue to raise the 'scores' of performance in these areas on the rubric to a desired average of 4.0.

d) Create individual as well as team projects in the RTM 304 class (entrepreneurial studies) similar to changes made in the RTM 202 class last year (programming event planning).

Data Summary of Portfolio Rubric for 7.02 and 7.03 Standards – 2011-2013

	Evidence Samples from 17 Portfolios	Average Quality Score (1=poor to 5=excellent)
7.02 Program Design	Brochure/ flyer (13); Program plan or design (4); Product marketing proposal (1); Press Release (1); Internship letter (1)	3.91
7.02 Program Evaluation	Assessment survey (15); Industry report (2); focus group (2)	3.18
7.02 Program Diversity	Inclusion interview (1); survey report for LGBT; volunteer report (1); disability report/ access survey (8); site visit report (1); homeless paper (1); elder interview (1)	3.51
7.03 Management Competencies	Facility design in business plan (2); marketing/PR Report (13); advocacy letter (2); resume (3); interview (1); business plan (12); business plan marketing part (3); cover letter (6); budget (1); business plan slides (1); event promo material (1); leadership report (1); internship reference letter (1)	3.65
Overall Comments/Recommendations on portfolio and therefore to program consideration for change	Organization of projects range from poor to excellent – mostly excellent. Leadership evidence missing/ needs to strengthen presentation in portfolio Business plan- teams too large (6) for individual assessment Portfolio presentation should beyond class syllabus & project but integrate competencies. Overall good balance of skills demonstrated Range of quality in projects significant Overall evidence of professional competency is present.	Preferred quality score to be 4.0 or higher. Minimum standard at 3.5.

RTM 490: Challenges of Leisure Services Seminar

Portfolio Assessment for Professional Competencies

Category	Expected Evidence in Portfolio	Quality of Evidence (1-5)*	Comments
7.02 Students graduating from the program shall be able to demonstrate the ability			
7.02 to design and implement, targeted human experiences	e.g. Program design plan, brochures, needs assessment, leadership video, etc. Key Indicator:		
7.02 to evaluate services	e.g. Evaluation		
that facilitate targeted human experiences	questionnaire, focus group questions or report, online survey, etc.		
	Key Indicator:		
7.02 to embrace personal and cultural dimensions of diversity in program development.	e.g. program plan indicating inclusion and or diversity issues, etc. Key Indicator:		

7.03 Students graduating from the program shall be able to demonstrate		
7.03 entry-level	e.g. business plan,	
knowledge about	leadership reflection	
management/administration	paper, budgets,	
	interview schedules, etc.	
	Key Indicator:	

Student's Identifier

*Overall Assessment: 1=Poor, 2 =Fair, 3= between Fair and Good, 4= Good, 5=Excellent

COMMENTS: