**DEPARTMENT & PROGRAM:** Hotel and Restaurant Management – BS

**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 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 quantitative skills competency required for each segment of the course. During the semester the instructor teaching the course will select six (6) 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 and reviewed and revised from eight (8) to six (6) questions in the Spring of 2018. 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 skills questions correctly.

**Assessment Results & Analysis**: In 19-20, 85.3% of the students (N = 109) answered 70% of the quantitative questions presented from the approved test bank correctly.

The standard of 70% was met as 85.3% 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. Faculty highlight the significant of providing extensive reviews for students and a second project designed to solidify the concepts as a potential explanation for the positive results. Students who failed to meet the described metric may have failed to recognize the instructions, as many did not provide two responses, as requested in the question that presented the least student success. This year’s performance maintains the high level of success established by prior adjustments as described below.

In the 18-19 year, the standard of 70% was met as 85.2% of the students responded to 70% of the questions correctly, an indication that the students have achieved quantitative skill competencies. In the 17-18 year the standard was met, and 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 included 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 2017-18 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. The quantity of questions was reviewed, and it was determined that a total of six (6) questions would be sufficient to measure the learning objectives. Phrasing of the questions was reviewed as well to ensure that they would provide the best assessment of the student learning.

Instructors all agreed that early identification of the areas where student comprehension of the concepts does not meet the established standard would allow for instructors to provide students with feedback and additional resources early in the semester. This awareness early on in the course will allow the instructor to be more proactive to the student learning process and should result in improved results reflected in the final assessment used to measure the given standard. While measures were taken in the 2018–19 year to monitor performance via the form of quizzes and other projects, the overall percentage of students scoring 70% or better remained flat to the 2017-2018 year, the number of students taking the course increased.

Historically,

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **N =** | **% students who scored 70% on the quantitative questions** |
| 19-20 | 109 | 85.3% |
| 18-19 | 223 | 85.2% |
| 17-18 | 103\* | 86% |
| 16-17 | 53 | 80% |

*\*Beginning with Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 results from both semesters are included.*

**Program Improvement Plans**: The instructors for this course reviewed the 2019-20 results and discussed how to improve measurement of the quantitative skills before this academic cycle. One area of focus in ensuring that all instructors are including six (6) quantitative questions in the final exam. Instructors also discussed continuing to measure 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 revisions introduced in the Fall 2018 exams are allowing for ease in analysis by faculty and it has been proposed that perhaps the standard should be increased to have 70% of the students score 75% or better on the quantitative questions. The data demonstrate the continued value for reviews and a second project to solidify the concepts, while faculty highlight that student exam literacy may account for some deviations. Whereas faculty are providing the appropriate course material resources to maintain strong success levels, students may benefit from connecting with university and advising resources to review testing strategies, and faculty can continue to ensure that test design ensure adequate clarity.

**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.

**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 six (6) 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 critical thinking 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 and reviewed and revised from eight (8) to six (6) questions in the Spring of 2018. 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 19-20, 90.8% of the students (N = 109) answered 70% of the critical thinking questions presented from the approved test bank correctly. The standard was exceeded.

The standard of 70% was met and improved as 90.8% of the students responded to 70% of the questions correctly, an indication that the students have achieved critical 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. These results are a recognized improvement over the previous year’s results. The faculty emphasized continual availability of concept review time, as well as the focus on a second project to reinforce concepts.

In the 18-19 year, 83.4% of the students responded to 70% of the questions correctly. In the 17-18 year the standard was met, 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 included 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 2017-18 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. The quantity of questions was reviewed, and it was determined that a total of six (6) questions would be sufficient to measure the learning objectives. Phrasing of the questions was reviewed as well to ensure that they would provide the best assessment of the student learning.

Instructors all agreed that early identification of the areas where student comprehension of the critical thinking concepts does not meet the established standard would allow for instructors to provide students with feedback and additional resources early in the semester. This awareness early on in the course will allow the instructor to be more proactive to the student learning process and should result in improved results reflected in the final assessment used to measure the given standard. While measures were taken in the 2018–19 year to monitor performance via the form of quizzes and other projects, the overall percentage of students scoring 70% or better decreased compared to the 2017-2018 year and the number of students taking the course increased.

Historically,

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **N =** | **% students who scored at least 70% on critical thinking questions** |
| 19-20 | 109 | 90.8% |
| 18-19 | 223 | 83.4% |
| 17-18 | 103\* | 100% |
| 16-17 | 53 | 85% |

*\*Both Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 results included.*

**Program Improvement Plans**: The instructors for this course reviewed the results and discussed how to improve measurement of the critical thinking skills. One area of focus in ensuring that all instructors are including six (6) critical thinking questions in the final exam. Instructors also discussed continuing to measure 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 revisions introduced in the 2018-2019 exams are allowing for ease in analysis by faculty and it has been proposed that perhaps the standard should be increased to have 70% of the students score 75% or better on the critical thinking questions. A meeting will take place in the Spring of 2021 to discuss the change once the 2019-2020 results are reviewed, with particular emphasis on the transition into temporary online learning format.

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

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 instructor will review all the papers including the final based on the seven (7) criteria: Format, Introduction, Relevance to Core Material, Concern for Details, Application, Grammar, and Overall Presentation to determine if the student paper met the established standard.

Meeting or exceeding the standard will provide a good indication 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. If the students do not meet the standard the instructor will need to evaluate the process and how the material was presented in order to elicit better retention and application by the student. 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 receive a score of 75%.

**Assessment Results & Analysis**: In 19-20, 94% of the students (N = 246) earned a score of 75% or better on their final paper. The standard was 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.

The 2018-2019 year had the standard change from a score of 70% to 75%, exceeding the new standard continues to demonstrate that the earlier writing requirements in the curriculum along with the writing/ grammar tools that are provided are both having a positive impact on the students writing proficiency. In addition, the pre-writing grammar self-assessment currently being used by all instructors is providing timely feedback that can guide students to the University Writing Center to provide further assistance and improve their writing throughout the course of the semester.

Historically,

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **N =** | **% students who earned a 75% or better on final paper** |
| 19-20 | 246 | 94 |
| 18-19 | 256 | 94 |
| 17-18\* | 159 | 98 |
| 16-17\* | 126 | 79 |

\*Indicates the standard in those years was 70% of students would achieve 70% or better

**Program Improvement Plans**: The instructors met to discuss the results of the measurements. All instructors indicated that they would continue use the last paper written by the students, they would keep the grading rubric the same; keep the current standard of 70% of the final papers submitted by students will earn a score of 75%. Continuing to include more writing within other parts of the curriculum and providing the pre-writing assessments will be part of the continuing plan. In Fall 2020 the instructors reviewed the 2019-2020 results via an online feedback tool and determines if any changes need to be implemented for the 2020 – 2021 year. All the instructors indicated at this time they would like to proceed as they have and perhaps look at modifications after the 2020-2021 year. Instructors placed value on continued writing opportunities, consistent and clear feedback, and opportunities for revision as critical for student confidence and success. Additionally, it is noted that students are invested in the topics of the writing, which generates positive outcomes in the scoring and student learning.

**Attachments-**

HRM 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**

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?

1. **Introduction (14 possible points):**

Are the topics briefly introduced?

Is the organizational format established?

1. **Relevant to Core Material (14 possible points):**

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

1. **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?

1. **Application (14 possible points:**

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

1. **Grammar (24 possible points):**

Grammar

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

Word choice

1. **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)**