

ASSESSMENT REPORT

DEPARTMENT & PROGRAM: Hotel and Restaurant Management – BS—San Antonio Campus

ACADEMIC PROGRAM MISSION: We are the best in hospitality education and research as regarded globally by the academic and hospitality communities. We embrace and foster an environment that includes community relevance, collaboration, multiculturalism, experiential learning, innovation, integrity and passion. The College, therefore, is committed to prepare our students to engage as professional and leaders in all segments of the global hospitality industry.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Student Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate a high level competency in quantitative skills related to the area of accounting and finance in the context of hotel and restaurant management.

Student Learning Outcome Assessment: The final accounting/finance course in the HRMA curriculum is Financial Management. A committee was formed to insure the objectives required of a capstone course and the actual material in the course were in sync. As part of this process questions were developed that would measure the quantitative skills competency required for each segment of the course. During the semester the instructor teaching the course will select seven or eight (7 or 8) questions from this approved bank to include in their regular examinations and track the responses. Instructors may also elect to use all the questions related to quantitative skills provided in the bank to use for their exams. Once the semester is over the results from these questions measuring quantitative skills will be compiled and compared to the standard.

The results of all the questions related to the quantitative skill competencies were tracked and measured against the standard. In order to measure to the standard all the questions taken from the approved bank were listed by key course concept and then the total number of correct answers for each question was noted. The total number of correct responses was tallied and an average taken of total correct responses as a percentage of total students enrolled and/or taking the exams. The assessment and measurement process was completed and defined in the Spring of 2014. Results of the measurements are shared with both the Deans of the college, the curriculum committee of the college, the college Accounting and Finance Faculty Committee and the instructor. In the college Accounting and Finance Faculty Committee the measurement tools are discussed and how measurement of these skills can be improved.

Performance Standard: The standard is that 70% of the students will answer 70% of the quantitative questions correctly.

Assessment Results & Analysis: In 17-18, 100% of the students who were enrolled in the course (N = 15) answered 70% of the quantitative questions presented from the approved test bank correctly.

The standard of 70% was met as 100% of the students responded to 70% of the questions correctly, an indication that the students have achieved quantitative skill competencies. Results indicate that students were able to effectively apply these techniques to solve financial and managerial problems in order to make sound management decisions in various hospitality industry environments.

ASSESSMENT REPORT

In the 16-17 year the standard was not met; therefore, the results were used to review those questions where students were deficient and the course material or how the material was presented were reviewed and adjusted as necessary. Adjustments would include providing more resources or providing illustrations that would help in the comprehension of the specific concepts where the deficiency were identified.

Based on the results from the 2016-17 year, actions were taken to review concepts and how they were being presented. Both the San Antonio and Main campus instructors for this course met to discuss the results and to evaluate the format of the exam questions to determine what would provide the best indication of student learning. One thought considered was how to incorporate both calculation (quantitative) and interpretation (critical thinking) skills. The instructor in San Antonio reviewed the first exam the students were given to measure learning in both quantitative and critical thinking, identified any deficiency in the two areas and then incorporated into the course focus on those specific areas that were below the standard to improve student comprehension and understanding of those concepts.

Early identification of the areas where student comprehension of the concepts does not meet the established standard allowed for the instructor to provide students with feedback and additional resources. This awareness early on in the course allowed the instructor to be more proactive to the student learning process and resulted in improved results when the final assessment used to measure the standard was given.

Historically,

Year	N =	% students earning at least 70% on quantitative skills
17-18	15	100
16-17	3	62
15-16	16	89

Program Improvement Plans: The instructors for this course met to review the 2017-18 results and to discuss how to improve measurement of the quantitative skills. Considerations were whether to change the questions from multiple choice to short answer or a combination of both. The timing of exam to measure the student learning during the semester was also discussed so that the same concepts are being tested by all instructors in the same time frame. Instructors also discussed measuring the results of the first examination given to students to the standard to determine if the students are meeting the standard early in the course so that adjustments in how the material is presented later in the course could be incorporated. The instructors agreed to have less multiple-choice questions and more questions where students have to show their calculations as this would provide more insight into the student learning and understanding of the concepts. Revisions will be introduced in the Fall 2018 exams and faculty will meet to review the results and determine if any additional modifications are necessary to the measurement process.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will demonstrate a high-level competency in critical thinking skills related to the area of accounting and finance in the context of hotel and restaurant management.

ASSESSMENT REPORT

Student Learning Outcome Assessment: The final accounting/finance course in the HRMA curriculum is Financial Management. A committee was formed to ensure the objectives required of a capstone course and the actual material in the course were in sync. As part of this process questions were developed that would measure the critical thinking competencies required for each segment of the course. During the semester the instructor teaching the course will select seven or eight (7 or 8) questions from this approved bank to include in their regular examinations and track the responses. Instructors may also elect to use all the questions related to critical thinking provided in the bank to use for their exams. Once the semester is over the results from these questions measuring critical thinking skills will be compiled and compared to the standard.

The results of all the questions related to the quantitative skill competencies were tracked and measured against the standard. In order to measure to the standard all the questions taken from the approved bank were listed by key course concept and then the total number of correct answers for each question was noted. The total number of correct responses was tallied and an average taken of total correct responses as a percentage of total students enrolled and/or taking the exams. The assessment and measurement process was completed and defined in the Spring of 2014. Results of the measurements are shared with both the Deans of the college, the curriculum committee of the college, the college Accounting and Finance Faculty Committee and the instructor. In the college Accounting and Finance Faculty Committee the measurement tools are discussed and how measurement of these skills can be improved.

Performance Standard: The standard is that 70% of the students will answer 70% of the critical thinking questions correctly.

Assessment Results & Analysis: In 17-18, 100% of the students who were enrolled in the course (N = 15) answered 70% of the critical thinking questions presented from the approved test bank correctly. The standard was met.

The standard of 70% was met as 100% of the students responded to 70% of the questions correctly, an indication that the students have achieved critical thinking skill competencies. Results indicate that students were able to effectively apply these techniques to solve financial and managerial problems in order to make sound management decisions in various hospitality industry environments.

In the 16-17 year the standard was not met; therefore, the results were used to review those questions where students were deficient and the course material or how the material was presented were reviewed and adjusted as necessary. Adjustments would include providing more resources or providing illustrations that would help in the comprehension of the specific concepts where the deficiency were identified.

Based on the results from the 2016-17 year, actions were taken to review concepts and how they were being presented. Both the San Antonio and Main campus instructors for this course met to discuss the results and to evaluate the format of the exam questions to determine what would provide the best indication of student learning. One thought considered was how to incorporate both calculation

ASSESSMENT REPORT

(quantitative) and interpretation (critical thinking) skills. The instructor in San Antonio reviewed the first exam the students were given to measure learning in both quantitative and critical thinking, identified any deficiency in the two areas and then incorporated into the course focus on those specific areas that were below the standard to improve student comprehension and understanding of those concepts.

Early identification of the areas where student comprehension of the concepts does not meet the established standard allowed for the instructor to provide students with feedback and additional resources. This awareness early on in the course allowed the instructor to be more proactive to the student learning process and resulted in improved results when the final assessment used to measure the standard was given.

Historically,

Year	N =	% students earning at least 70% on critical thinking skills
17-18	15	100
16-17	3	67
15-16	16	90

Program Improvement Plans: The instructors for this course met to review the 2017-18 results and to discuss how to improve measurement of the quantitative skills. Considerations were whether to change the questions from multiple choice to all short answer or a combination of both. The timing of exam to measure the student learning during the semester was also discussed so that the same concepts are being tested by all instructors in the same time frame. Instructors also discussed measuring the results of the first examination given to students to the standard to determine if the students are meeting the standard early in the course so that adjustments in how the material is presented later in the course could be incorporated. The instructors agreed to have more questions where students have to provide a short answer as this would provide more insight into the student learning and understanding of the concepts. Revisions will be introduced in the Fall 2018 exams and faculty will meet to review the results and determine if any additional modifications are necessary to the measurement process.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will effectively communicate through writing as a hospitality leader.

Student Learning Outcome Assessment: Students in HRMA 4353: Leadership within the Hospitality Industry must demonstrate proficiency in effective written communication by creating professional papers in an appropriate style and format that meet the seven (7) criterion provided by the instructor.

ASSESSMENT REPORT

During the semester several papers are submitted and evaluated by the instructor to ensure the criterion provided have been reflected in the professional papers prepared by the students. This process should provide the student with sufficient practice in applying effective writing and communication skills into practice. The final paper submitted would be the measurement as to whether the student demonstrates proficiency in effective written communication. The final paper will be rated on the same criterion as the other papers submitted. Results of the measurements are shared with both the Deans of the college, the curriculum committee of the college, the college Lodging Management committee and the instructor.

Performance Standard: The standard will be that 70% of the final papers submitted by the students will earn a score of 70%.

Assessment Results & Analysis: In 17-18, 94.4% of the students enrolled in the course (N = 18) scored above 70% on the presentation. The standard was/ was not met.

Meeting or exceeding the standard indicates that the students have become proficient in effective written communication skills. Students should then be able to effectively apply the criterion to communicate and express their ideas. Currently no significant changes have been made to the current format for the writing component as the results continue to indicate that the students are proficient in effective written communication.

Historically,

Year	N =	% students earning at least 70% on communication skills
17-18	18	95.4
16-17	13	92.3
15-16	16	100

Program Improvement Plans: The instructors for the San Antonio campus and the Main campus met to discuss the results of the 17-18 measurement. Discussion included which paper should be used to measure the competency of effective written communications, the rubric currently being used and also the performance standard. All instructors indicated that they would use the last paper written by the students, they would keep the grading rubric the same; however, they decided to increase the standard to 70% of the final papers submitted by students will earn a score of 75%.

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Program Outcome 1: Graduates of the C.N. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management—San Antonio Campus will find employment after graduation.

Program Outcome Assessment: Each semester the Career Development and Placement Office contacts students via a survey to inquire the following:

ASSESSMENT REPORT

- Employment status
- Company with whom an employment opportunity has been offered/accepted
- Position accepted
- Salary
- Area of interest
- Delaying employment to pursue a higher degree (Master/PhD)

The responses are compiled to obtain a percentage of those successfully finding employment opportunities or delaying employment because they are registering in an advanced degree program.

The results from the survey/inquires made by the Career Development and Placement Office were organized not only to establish whether a student had received an opportunity for employment but also the type of employment accepted and the compensation level. In addition, the data was analyzed to determine whether the student was able to find an opportunity in their area of interest. Results of the employment placement report are sent to the entire faculty

Performance Standard: The standard is that 70% of all students graduating in a semester will have found employment opportunities or will have applied or been accepted for an advanced degree.

Assessment Results & Analysis: In 17-18, 75% of our graduates (N = 12) found employment or entered a graduate program. The standard is exceeded.

Placement Rate Fall 2017 Spring 2018	Undergraduate	%
Employed/Graduate School	9	75%
Still Searching	3	25%
TOTAL	12	100%

Historically,

Year	N =	% students employed or accepted to grad school
17-18	12	75
16-17	6	100
15-16	2	100

Program Improvement Plans: While the standard has been consistently met and improvement has been achieved year over year, the Career Development and Placement Office continues to find even more opportunities for students. Surveys have been used this past year to identify ways to further meet the need of companies recruiting on campus. In addition, more programs have been instituted to improve the student’s interview, communication and resume skills. Mini career fairs have been held for the past few years to also get students jobs before they graduate and many turn into full time professional opportunities upon graduation. More internship opportunities have also been found which also assists in finding full time positions upon graduation.

ASSESSMENT REPORT

Prior Program Improvement(s): Career Placement will continue targeting students early and encouraging them to participate in more internship opportunities and student organizations. This has encouraged them to think about different hospitality career paths and has increased their marketability. They will also continue to provide a “career exploration” workshop which led many to consider other career paths as well. In the 2018 -19 year the San Antonio students are taking more active roles in the main campus career fair to further expose them to potential employers and opportunities.

Program Outcome 2: Graduates of the C.N. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management—San Antonio Campus will ensure high quality of academic advising services.

Program Outcome Assessment: In the semester when the application for graduation is submitted, students are provided a detailed survey to complete during the mandatory graduation orientation. The survey questions prompt students to rate various aspects of the HRM program, among them satisfaction with academic advising services. Students are asked to rate from 1 to 4 (1 being the lowest, 4 being the highest) the Office of Academic Advising based on the following criteria:

1. Ability to meet with an advisor
2. Quality of academic advising
3. Support in reaching your education goals
4. Prompt return of e-mails/phone messages
5. Quality of customer service

In addition, students are asked to provide any additional written comments that may provide more insight on the process.

The survey item responses will be reviewed to see if the relevant standard has been met. Additional comments provided by the students on the survey will also be reviewed. The survey tool used is Qualtrics, which allows for the data to be analyzed in multiple ways if necessary. Students in the San Antonio campus complete the same survey as Main Campus students. Results of the exit surveys are sent to the entire faculty.

Performance Standard: The standard is that each item being rated (100%) achieves a mean of at least 3.5 out of a maximum of 4.

Assessment Results & Analysis: For the 2017 – 2018 year 100% of the rated items had a mean greater than 3.5. The standard was met.

Fall 2017

Q2 - How would you rate your satisfaction with the Conrad N. Hilton College Office of Academic Services?

ASSESSMENT REPORT

#	Question	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	Total
1	Ability to meet with an advisor	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	66.67% 2	3
2	Quality of academic advising	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	66.67% 2	3
3	Support in reaching your educational goals	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 3	3
4	Prompt return of e-mails/phone messages	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 3	3
5	Quality of customer service	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 3	3

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count	Bottom 3 Box	Top 3 Box
1	Ability to meet with an advisor	3.00	4.00	3.67	0.47	0.22	3	33.33%	100.00%
2	Quality of academic advising	3.00	4.00	3.67	0.47	0.22	3	33.33%	100.00%
3	Support in reaching your educational goals	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	3	0.00%	100.00%
4	Prompt return of e-mails/phone messages	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	3	0.00%	100.00%
5	Quality of customer service	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	3	0.00%	100.00%

Spring 2018

Q2 - How would you rate your satisfaction with the Conrad N. Hilton College Office of Academic Services?

#	Question	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	Total
1	Ability to meet with an advisor	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	12.50% 1	87.50% 7	8
2	Quality of academic advising	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 8	8

ASSESSMENT REPORT

3	Support in reaching your educational goals	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	8	8
4	Prompt return of e-mails/phone messages	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	8	8
5	Quality of customer service	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	8	8

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count	Bottom 3 Box	Top 3 Box
1	Ability to meet with an advisor	3.00	4.00	3.88	0.33	0.11	8	12.50%	100.00%
2	Quality of academic advising	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	8	0.00%	100.00%
3	Support in reaching your educational goals	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	8	0.00%	100.00%
4	Prompt return of e-mails/phone messages	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	8	0.00%	100.00%
5	Quality of customer service	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	8	0.00%	100.00%

N=11

Historically,

Year	N =	Mean rating for advising items				
17-18	11	3.78	3.84	4.0	4.0	4.0
16-17	5	3.00	3.00	3.60	3.60	3.80
15-16*	141**	3.68	3.61	3.67	3.71	3.70

ASSESSMENT REPORT

***No separate survey for San Antonio was completed that year; they were incorporated into the Houston Campus figures.**

**** Does not include the Field Experience N.**

Program Improvement Plans: The academic advising office continues to find ways to get more feedback from graduating students. Continuing to verify contact information after graduation through the alumni office and providing opportunities for students to complete the surveys before graduation is a focus. Additional focus will be placed on providing availability to meet with students either in person or remotely (i.e. online). In addition, the response on the quality will be assessed; processes used will be reviewed so that information provided to students during advising is relevant and clear in helping achieve their academic goals.

Prior Program Improvement(s): The standard was met for all areas; however, the processes will be reviewed to identify if there is any way to increase the mean score of each category being rated. Some students in the San Antonio program do attend the main campus for their final two years; this is a consideration when measuring the results for just the San Antonio campus, as the students that are part of that program are not necessarily at the San Antonio location.

To improve the academic advising process, the Office of Academic Advising will need to review the areas that were below the standard and then find new approaches to serving the needs of the students. Some areas that could be considered are:

- Continue to evaluate the orientation for students on the advising process upon acceptance to the college
- Updated information on degree plan and course requirements on the college website
- Incorporating degree requirements into PeopleSoft so that students may select courses for which they are eligible and reducing schedule changes throughout the semester.

Attachments: HRMA 4353- Supervision & Leadership in the Hospitality Industry Written Paper Criteria and Grade Sheet

**HRMA 4353
Supervision & Leadership in the Hospitality Industry Written Paper Criteria and
Grade Sheet**

ASSESSMENT REPORT

1. Format (15 possible points):

- Title
- Subtitles (*in left hand margin*)
- Team #/Student I.D. #'s on both pages (no names on paper)
- Grading sheet attached?
- Was the space used wisely? Not more than one page?
- Font, spacing, and easy to read?

2. Introduction (14 possible points):

- Are the topics briefly introduced?
- Is the organizational format established?

3. Relevant to Core Material (14 possible points):

- Did it refer to concepts discussed in-class and assigned readings?

4. Concern for Details (14 possible points):

- Was the topic discussed as thoroughly as possible given the space constraints?
- Were key points identified and discussed?
- Was the information accurate?

5. Application (14 possible points):

- Was the information applied to the industry with a very specific example?

6. Grammar (24 possible points):

- Grammar
- Spelling (3 points off for each misspelled word; do not rely on spellcheck)
- Punctuation
- Word choice

7. Overall Presentation (5 possible points):

- Did the paper flow overall?
- Was the total presentation and the format of the information presented in an organized fashion?

TOTAL (100 possible points)