Summary of Portfolio Assessment – January 2014

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

Method:

The portfolios that were used for evaluation were from the Fall 2013 semester. 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 4 portfolios (out of 23) that were reviewed by a faculty member, an alumnus, and a practitioner based on the attached rubric. The 4 portfolios were represent by 1 level A, 2 from level B, and 1from level C. GPA levels were not indicated to the reviewers. One faculty members reviewed the sample portfolios and an industry partner and alumnus were also brought into the conference room for a blind review of the same sample portfolios that faculty reviewed. 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 Reflections for Faculty Consideration:

The discussion by the review team affirmed many of the suggestions from the initial retrospective report conducted last fall (2011-2013) and those are repeated here. The new external reviewers by practitioners did not review the previous summary report until after their independent reviews but affirmed earlier reflections.

a) Dividing the assessment by GPA remains 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 what 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 (3.81 to 4.3) are higher than the previous years (3.18 to 3.91 average from 2011-2013).

Recommended Changes to Curriculum or Instruction (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 – Fall 2013

	Evidence Samples from 4 Portfolios	Average Quality Score (1=poor to 5=excellent)
7.02 Program Design	Brochure/ flyer (3); Program plan or design (4); Product marketing proposal (1); Press Release (2); need assessment (2); Sample menu (1)	3.84
7.02 Program Evaluation	Assessment survey and report(4) – program, establishment, event (play), and service, ; Industry report (1); focus group (1); play log observation (4); self-assessment report (1)	3.81
7.02 Program Diversity	Inclusion (disability) interview (4); volunteer report for Special Olympic(1); site visit report (3) – ADA access and senior home; Elder interview (2); Women's Leisure report (2); Senior travel report (1); Community service paper (2); Human trafficking report (1)	4.04
7.03 Management Competencies	Business plan (4); marketing/PR Report (3); advocacy letter (1); resume (4); budget analysis (4); leadership report (2); internship reference letter (1); letter of recommendation (3), market trend (1), risk management project (2); self-reflection report (1); award and certificate (1); professionalism and professional competency (2); internship critique (1); Competitive analysis (1); grant proposal (1); cover letter (1)	4.30

| Overall Comments/Recommendations on portfolio and therefore to program consideration for change | • Organization of projects range from good to excellent – mostly excellent. Presentation of portfolio should be improved.
• Leadership related evidence (leadership evaluation paper) was presented but not sufficient.
• All portfolios demonstrate managerial admin and skills very well.
• All portfolios present the diversity related evidence, however, they are related to disability only (missing LGBT or other populations).
• Marketing plan was found in all portfolios, however, the content was superficial (missing key components such as SWOT analysis, competitive analysis, etc).
• Business plan was too genetic (no detailed information was provided).
• Missing internship or career development related evidences – SMART objectives, certificate, awards, etc.
• 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 that facilitate targeted human experiences	e.g. Evaluation 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 knowledge about management/administration	e.g. business plan, leadership reflection 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: