

Strategic Plan Narrative

COSMA

August 2016

Overview

This document represents a strategic plan for COSMA that sets our priorities, focuses our energy and resources, strengthens our operations, ensures that our employee/volunteers and other stakeholders are working toward common goals, establishes agreement around intended outcomes/results and assesses and adjusts COSMA's direction in response to a changing environment. The strategic planning effort produced fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what COSMA is, who we serve, what we do and why we do it, with a focus on the future. This document articulates not only where we are going and the actions needed to make progress, but also how we will know if we are successful. The document was completed June 23, 2016, by individuals representing individual and program members of COSMA and the Board of Commissioners and Board of Directors.

Heather Alderman, COSMA Executive Director
Lori Braa, University of Mount Union
Dina Gentile, Endicott College
Phylis Hadley, Southwestern Christian University
Brittany Jacobs, University of Northern Colorado, BOD
Darlene Kluka, Barry University, BOC
Lisa Miller, APUS, former BOC member
Clay Stoldt, Wichita State University, Chair of COSMA BOD

The document will expire in June 2021 and a new strategic planning committee will be convened at that time. The COSMA Board of Directors (BOD) will oversee the implementation and progress of the action plans outlined toward the end of this document. If necessary because of evolving circumstances, the BOD may modify the actions implemented in support of attaining the plan's outcomes.

Background/History of COSMA

In the mid-1980s, sport management programs in higher education began proliferating throughout North America. Two movements occurred simultaneously: (a) Academics from the U.S. and Canada created the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM); and (b) the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE), one of five national organizations comprising the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD*), began developing professional standards for sport management education programs. At the 1986 AAHPERD Convention in Cincinnati, Ohio, NASPE and NASSM representatives discussed collaboration on professional standards.

Following the meeting, NASPE appointed a task force of sport management faculty and field-based professionals to develop guidelines for undergraduate, master's, and doctoral programs. (*In 2014, AAHPERD officially re-branded as SHAPE America - Society of Health and Physical Educators.)

The NASPE Sport Management Task Force developed the original curriculum guidelines in 1986 and the NASPE Board of Directors approved the guidelines in 1987. As a result of discussions within and between the organizations, NASSM President Bill Sutton formed a Committee on Curriculum and Accreditation in June 1989. NASPE and NASSM leadership agreed that there was a need to provide some level of quality assurance to students enrolling in sport management programs and to the employers hiring graduates of those programs. The organizations formally joined together in 1989 to create the NASPE-NASSM Joint Committee that would oversee the continued development of curricular guidelines for sport management. These guidelines were approved by the NASPE and NASSM members at their annual conferences in 1990. From this work came the creation in 1993 of the Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC), an independent entity acting on behalf of both NASPE and NASSM for the purpose of reviewing and approving sport management programs.

In July 2005, NASPE and NASSM representatives met to discuss the proposed direction of SMPRC, including movement toward accreditation. Two task forces were formed, comprised of members from each association: the Accreditation Task Force and the Standards Task Force. These task forces were charged with investigating sport management education accreditation from process, policy and standards perspectives.

The Accreditation Task Force and Standards Task Force provided preliminary reports to representatives in May 2006. At the 2006 NASSM Annual Conference, a roundtable discussion was held to collect feedback from the NASSM membership regarding sport management accreditation.

The formation of the Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA) was proposed in January 2007 and draft accreditation manuals were provided to NASSM and NASPE members for review and feedback. Additional meetings were held at the 2007 NASSM and AAHPERD Annual Conferences to present the refined model. In September 2007, NASSM and NASPE identified a timeline to officially launch the COSMA organization in July 2008.

Additional historical materials:

Susan G. Zieff, Angela Lumpkin, Claudia Guedes & Terry Eguaioje (2009) NASPE Sets the Standard, *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 80:8, 46-49, DOI: 10.1080/07303084.2009.10598378.

NASPE-NASSM Joint Task Force on Sport Management Curriculum and Accreditation (1993) Standards for Curriculum and Voluntary Accreditation of Sport Management Education Programs, *Journal of Sport Management*, 7, 159-170.

An Abridged History of the NASPE-NASSM Sport Management Program Approval, 1986-2007.

Bowling Green State University, Center for Archival Collections - find materials and meeting minutes from the early years of the SMPRC.

Vision/Mission/Core Values

COSMA Vision

The vision of COSMA is to be the leader in mission-driven and outcomes-based programmatic accreditation for sport management education for student-oriented institutions of higher education worldwide.

COSMA Mission

The Commission on Sport Management Accreditation is a specialized accrediting body whose purpose is to promote and recognize excellence in sport management education worldwide in colleges and universities at the baccalaureate and master's levels through specialized accreditation.

COSMA Core Values/Statement of Academic Quality

COSMA utilizes a distinctly different approach to specialized accreditation in sport management education. It uses both **characteristics of excellence in sport management education** and **assessment of educational outcomes** as a basis for making accreditation decisions, rather than the prescriptive input standards approach. For COSMA, the measurement and **advancement of academic quality** focuses on the overall level of performance of the academic unit in the context of its mission and broad-based goals as measured by the degree to which it accomplishes its intended student learning outcomes and operational outcomes.

Because of the essential role that educational processes play in determining educational outcomes, COSMA has developed **accreditation principles** based on best practices in sport management education. These principles promote excellence in sport management education through a benchmarking process, which is helpful in determining whether the sport management program is, or is not, achieving its mission and broad-based goals, and is interpreting the results of the outcomes assessment process.

Educational institutions are unique, with differing missions, goals, processes, and intended learning outcomes. COSMA principles **assess progress toward excellence**, allow for a continuum of accomplishment, and encourage continuous improvement. There is no

standard of learning that fits all programs, but there are principles that can apply to all programs.

COSMA is committed to a **developmental approach** to excellence in sport management education. COSMA and its members function in a collaborative and cooperative manner, encouraging each other toward higher levels of quality in sport management education.

COSMA is both **flexible and innovative** in applying its philosophy of accreditation. It recognizes that sport management education exists within a dynamic, complex environment that requires innovative approaches to achieving quality educational outcomes.

Membership in COSMA entitles an academic unit to pursue accreditation of their sport management programs. Accredited status is achieved through an intensive process that includes completion of a candidacy program, completion and review of a self-study, site visit by accreditation team, final approval by the COSMA Board of Commissioners and submission of annual reports. Once approved, accredited status is valid for seven years.

COSMA is the only organization offering discipline-specific accreditation in sport management education. COSMA is recognized by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)(3) charitable organization.

SWOT analysis

	Helpful to Obj.	Harmful to Obj.
Internal	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mission driven ● Outcomes based ● Publicity & Promotions in place ● Professional memberships and organizational memberships ● No direct competitors ● Parents interested in accreditation ● BOD/Commissioners/ED ● Conference ● Accreditation enhances internal program strength (Gentile, 2016) ● Accredited programs report positive effects (Gentile, 2016) ● 501c3 status ● Member interest in leadership positions ● SM programs lead on O/A as its gains traction at institutional level and with other accrediting bodies ● University support for program accreditation (when applicable) 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1 full-time employee ● Voluntary; not a “profession” with competencies or certification/board exam (e.g., lawyers, teachers, nurses, physicians) ● Lack of certification program for sport managers ● Student engagement/conference participation ● Limited financial resources ● Modest response to training opportunities ● ROI assessments ● Only an indirect relationship between COSMA accreditation and enrollment (Gentile, 2016) ● Must wait for two doctoral programs to go through the accreditation process before changing our scope of accreditation ● Perception that COSMA only works in the USA and Canada ● Limited collaboration with related professional organizations (e.g., NASSM, WASM)
External	<p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Partnerships - funding/scholarships, VIK etc. ● CHEA recognition ● COSMA Conference delivery options ● CEUs at COSMA conferences - (only if a sport manager certification program is created) ● Enhanced engagement/ collaboration with other professional organizations 	<p>Threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strong programs not “buying in” / “don’t need it” ● Some institutions unwilling to devote to necessary resources (financial, personnel) to pursue COSMA accreditation (Gentile, 2016) ● Lack of stakeholder (prospective students, industry partners) understanding of what COSMA accreditation represents ● Potential for budget cuts in various

	<p>(NASSM, WASM, EASM, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Target institutions with AACSB/CAEP accreditation ● Globalization of sport management education programs ● Focus at institutional level/other accrediting bodies on outcomes assessment ● Better articulate value of specialized accreditation ● High school partnerships (increase membership to HS students, parents). ● Sponsorships for events/programming. ● COSMA Journal (research can take many forms, assessment best practices, accreditation tips). ● Recognition in the promotion and tenure process 	<p>higher education settings to impact COSMA (e.g., decreased memberships)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Preference for AACSB, IACBE, AABSP accreditation - seen as either/or not both/and ● Lack of journal articles/research supporting COSMA benefits. ● Proliferation of sport management programs ● Negative perception of academic quality of SM ● SM degree perceived as money maker on campuses, ROI of accreditation not proven, degree does not lead to employment
--	--	--

Focus areas: 2016-2021

1) Increase Program Membership

a. Enhance self-promotion/marketing/social media

Many of COSMA's goals moving forward are centered around increasing program membership. In order to accomplish this overarching goal, it is paramount that the pertinent stakeholders are both aware of COSMA and its offerings, and are well-educated regarding the value that COSMA accreditation provides to Sport Management programs. In order to facilitate advancement in this area, COSMA will implement the following courses of action:

1. Utilize Facebook/Twitter/Instagram to engage individual and program members
 - a. Conduct a social media market analysis in order to better understand their space in the social networking marketplace/ determine brand personality
 - b. Develop a monthly social media plan, including a social media calendar, promotions, and base metrics
 - c. Incite interaction with pertinent stakeholders to develop social relationships/rapport - practitioners, academics, students

- d. Utilize Facebook events to promote upcoming opportunities - will push to all fans Facebook feed/notifications
 - e. 7 percent increase in engagement metrics by Jan. 1, 2017
 - f. 10 percent increase in fans/followers by Jan. 1 2017
2. Increase awareness amongst international program members and individual members

b. Enhance student engagement

Student members are an incredibly important part of COSMA's continued success. It is the student members that will represent their respective sport management programs, and vicariously COSMA, as they enter the workforce. As this critical linchpin between the academic and practical spheres, COSMA will take the following steps to highlight the significance of these stakeholders:

1. Provide voting rights for student members in accordance with COSMA by-laws
 - a. Update by-laws to express student voting rights
 - b. Inform student members of their voting rights upon by-law approval
2. Offer student specific initiatives at COSMA Conference
 - a. Student/faculty mentorship program
 - b. Student research presentation category - consider awards here -- even if there is no monetary gain, value for the student can be the item that they can add to their CV
3. Facilitate Practitioner/Student interaction
 - a. Maintain student internship/job board
 - b. Host virtual meet and greets
 - c. Resume/Cover letter exchange program - anonymous (or not) feedback from a practitioner on your resume/cover letter
4. Offer opportunities for High school student/ parent engagement with COSMA Sport management programs
5. Gather and publicize student success stories

c. Attain CHEA recognition

COSMA is seeking CHEA recognition as it "legitimizes" COSMA's mission to accredit sport management programs based on widely-accepted standards. In addition, preparing for and going through the process of recognition keeps COSMA on a course of "continuous improvement" based on internal interests, the ever-changing sport industry and shifts in accreditation and higher education writ large. With both internal and external accountability, COSMA can aspire to provide the most relevant, high quality accreditation program in its capacities. It is also hoped that achieving CHEA recognition will increase the number of sport management programs that seek COSMA accreditation. As a voluntary,

specialized accrediting body, COSMA accreditation is not mandated by any state, regional or worldwide accrediting body.

d. Target programs not in business schools

Sport management programs may be most commonly affiliated with business schools, but a significant number continue to be housed in other colleges such as education, human development, sport sciences, or tourism and hospitality. Those in non-business settings represent a distinct opportunity to build membership because they are less likely to be included under some other form of specialized accreditation such as AACSB (see Appendix A). In order to promote the value of COSMA membership and accreditation to these programs, COSMA will take the following steps:

1. Develop a database of programs housed in settings other than business.
2. Send at least one membership appeal annually to a program contact (including a Dean and/or Provost)
3. Messaging to focus on COSMA effect (Gentile, 2016): validation, recognitions, accountability, and value added to program brand that they would not attain through other accrediting bodies (e.g., CAEP for education)
4. Social media communications to support same messages.
5. Identify brand ambassadors for COSMA who work in non-business affiliated programs.

e. Increase stakeholder buy-in & engagement

In order for COSMA to increase its impact on sport management education worldwide, it must continue to increase support and participation from key stakeholders such as non-member/non-accredited programs, especially those commonly perceived as leaders in the field, and practitioners. To support advancement in this area, COSMA will take the following steps:

1. Access/conduct research specific to non-member/non-accredited programs regarding how to best incentivize engagement.
2. Employ most relevant incentives in promotional messaging
3. Explore implementation of an awards program as an engagement mechanism with programs and practitioners.
4. Provide seminars for members on strategic planning, teaching, more.
5. Alumni database

- f. Engage/educate:** Parents, high school students via social media and targeted programming (e.g., NATA devotes space on website to high school athletic training initiatives; resources for local high school programs/clubs – speakers bureau).

2) Better connect COSMA accreditation with positive program outcomes

a. Enhance mentoring program

COSMA has had a formal mentoring program since minor revisions were made to the Accreditation Process Manual in the Spring of 2014. The mentoring program is designed to utilize COSMA members' and volunteers' experience with the accreditation process to offer their expertise and guidance to members who ask for assistance or who are guided to utilize the program by the Board of Commissioners. Mentoring happens outside of the COSMA process on both informal and formal bases, as heard of anecdotally. To date: Only one program will be using the mentoring process as it is outlined in the Accreditation Process Manual. A list of mentors is maintained by the Executive Director and consists of former members of the Board of Commissioners and Board of Directors and active site reviewers. This list has been passed along to inquiring members, whether or not they choose to go through the formal mentoring process.

But does this work to assist programs in successfully going through the accreditation process with a greater understanding of its core concepts (i.e., outcomes assessment)? It is not clear whether programs that have engaged a mentor are more likely to go through the process successfully or with fewer areas of partial or noncompliance. In order to better understand the current use of mentors and impact on programs, the following is recommended:

1. Add a question(s) about the use of a mentor(s) to the annual COSMA survey
2. Document the use of mentors in each program's Annual Report
3. Analyze the "Notes" and "Observations" for programs who have utilized mentors versus those who have not to understand possible impact.
4. Consider requiring programs to utilize the formal mentor process as determined by the BOC as they review programs at various stages of the accreditation process.

b. Improve program outcomes

COSMA could create more outreach efforts for members to share best practices with each other. Questions that arise during the accreditation process could be documented and added to a "best practices" or FAQ list available to all members.

c. Demonstrate benefits of implementing COSMA's O/A plan

COSMA could consider using online tools to share entire or parts of outcomes assessment plans, with permission. In addition, frequently asked questions can be collected and answered on the website along with a list of the most common areas of non-compliance and the steps taken to come into compliance.

3) Identify needs/interests of SM programs and how COSMA might fulfill them

COSMA deployed a member survey last in 2013 (see Appendix B) and included the questions as part of its annual reporting process as outlined in the Accreditation Process manual. However, the survey has not been sent out since 2013 and the questions in the survey have been used to identify the needs and interests of member programs and may continue to point to ways COSMA could fulfill program needs.

4) Improve benefits of individual membership

Honor individual members by how long they have been members (updated website 5/26/16), email, newsletter). Provide individual members with a “matching” service for faculty seeking sabbatical opportunities and for institutions and programs who are seeking faculty on sabbatical. It could be part of an annual survey that goes to all COSMA contacts and to the Sport Management Listserv.

For programs --

Name of the program/institution:

Contact person/email:

Expectations (3-5 bullets):

Teaching opportunity:

Willingness to pay a partial salary:

When/Duration:

Willingness to support a faculty exchange: Y/N

For faculty --

Name/Email:

Areas of Expertise:

Expectations (3-5 bullets):

Research/teaching only or both (specify):

Duration:

Salary expectations:

Willingness to participant in a faculty exchange: Y/N

5) Diversify COSMA Conference delivery options

Some additions to the COSMA Conference may be as follows:

1. Periscope
2. Some sessions pre-determined to be recorded and made available on the website (through YouTube)
3. Student “track” - encourage submissions of their research; could also seek feedback on their presentation skills
4. Celebrate members (years of service, special events, community giving)

6) Expand partnerships (funding; constituents)

Partnerships - corporate and other - may be pursued:

1. Conference host connections: hotel, local teams, host University
2. SBRnet
3. IAVM
4. Individuals (faculty, administrators, etc.)
5. Corporate sponsors in sport management domain
6. SM alums

7) Expand revenue generating tactics

Potential actions include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Training - online, in person
2. Paper copies of manuals
3. COSMA conference registration fees
4. Corporate partners
5. Reconfigure program dues structure. Programs with more than one degree take longer to review and are more complex. Sometimes they are much larger institutions or have multiple campuses.
 - a. 1 program \$1,800
 - b. 2 programs \$2,200
 - c. 3 or more programs \$2,600
6. Reconfigure site visit administration fee
 - a. 1 program \$1,200
 - b. 2 programs \$1,600
 - c. 3 or more programs \$2,000

8) Engage international constituents

To date, COSMA has yet to attract the attention of non-U.S.-based sport management degree programs. COSMA has one international member: Massey University in New Zealand. Most Canadian, European and Australia/New Zealand programs are research based and the number of undergraduate programs (compared to the U.S.) is fewer and the emphasis is on graduate programs. The concentration of professional sports teams is not as broad or deep as in the U.S. and most countries do not have high school, collegiate and professional sports to the degree the U.S. does. Programs also use different nomenclature when referring to course content. For example, a course entitled "Sport Economics" may mean "Sport Business" to U.S. programs. Programs in Central/South America, Asia and Africa are developmentally in a position that mirrors North American and European programs in the 1980s and 90s. It took sport management programs in the U.S. twenty years to develop

COSMA and keeping that development in mind is important for COSMA to consider: How can COSMA improve academic quality in sport management worldwide? (see Appendix C)

Recommended Actions

1. Establish a taskforce representing undergraduate and graduate in sport management to initiate the discussion about international accreditation. Curricular strategies should be part of the discussion: strategic alliances, joint ventures, exchange programs and operating agreements to leverage the reach of schools across borders.
2. Enhance engagement with other SM organizations (EASM, WASM, NASSM).
3. Cultivate a discussion of how to resolve research masters and doctorates in collaboration with U.S.-style masters and doctorates.
4. Understand how COSMA accreditation should be modified and interpreted for international sport management programs to best utilize it.
5. Understand how – without a professional licensure – programs worldwide find value and interest in pursuing COSMA accreditation.
6. Focus on globalization – “COSMA worldwide” is the international accreditation body for sport management.
7. Address ways to expand international value and international membership.

Action Plans

Opportunities	Actions	Responsibility	Timeline	Desired outcome
<p>Increase self-promotion: social media, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Utilize Facebook and Twitter to engage individual and program members · Increase awareness amongst international program members and individual members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Conduct a social media market analysis in order to better understand their space in the social networking marketplace/ determine brand personality o Develop a monthly social media plan, including a social media calendar, promotions, and base metrics o Incite interaction with pertinent stakeholders to develop social relationships/rapport - practitioners, academics, students o Utilize FB events to promote upcoming opportunities - will push to all fans facebook feed/notifications 	<p>Brittany Jacobs; Heather Alderman</p>	<p>Market analysis: Fall 2016</p> <p>Monthly social media plans: Fall 2016</p> <p>Increase in engagement by January 2017</p>	<p>7% increase in engagement metrics by Jan. 1, 2017</p> <p>10% increase in fans/followers by Jan. 1, 2017</p>

Opportunities	Actions	Responsibility	Timeline	Desired outcome
<p>Student engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Provide voting rights for student members in accordance with COSMA by-laws · Offer student specific initiatives at COSMA Conference · Facilitate Practitioner/Student interaction · Offer opportunities for HS student/parent engagement with COSMA SM programs · Gather/publicize student success stories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Update by-laws to express student voting rights o Inform student members of their voting rights upon by-law approval o Student/faculty mentorship program o Student research presentation category (awards) o Maintain student internship/job board o Host virtual meet and greets o Resume/Cover letter exchange program - anonymous (or not) feedback from a practitioner on your resume/cover letter o Student success stories 	<p>Student Engagement Task Force</p>	<p>By-laws updated May 2016 and individual and program members informed of change in voting rights</p> <p>February 2017 – COSMA Conference (mentorship, research presentation, cover letter/resume exchange)</p> <p>Ongoing – virtual meet & greets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased student engagement ○ Increased awareness / support of COSMA as students transition to become faculty members

Opportunities	Actions	Responsibility	Timeline	Desired outcome
CHEA Recognition	COR review November 2016	Heather; BOD	Submit final recognition narrative 8/1 Prepare for COR oral review Nov 21, 2016	Receive CHEA recognition
Opportunities	Actions	Responsibility	Timeline	Desired outcome
Target programs in business schools that do not have AACSB; target programs not in business schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Develop database of programs housed in settings other than business. o Send at least one membership appeal annually to a program contact. o Messaging to focus on COSMA effect (Gentile, 2016): validation, recognitions, accountability, and value added to program brand that they would not attain through other accrediting bodies (e.g., CAEP for education) o Social media communications to support same messages. o Identify brand ambassadors for COSMA who work in non-business affiliated programs. 	Clay Stodt; BOD; Heather Alderman	Spring 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increase membership by one program per year. ○ Maintain current membership (retention).

Opportunities	Actions	Responsibility	Timeline	Desired outcome
Increase stakeholder buy-in and engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access/conduct research specific to non-member/non-acc redited programs regarding how to best incentivize engagement. ○ Employ most relevant incentives in promotional messaging. ○ Explore implementation of an awards program as an engagement mechanism with programs and practitioners. ○ Provide seminars to members on strategic planning, teaching, more. ○ Alumni database 	Clay Stodt; BOD; Heather Alderman	<p>2017: Research, launch awards program</p> <p>2017-18: Launch seminars</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More faculty per program engaged with COSMA directly ○ Retention of current membership ○ Increased participation in COSMA Conference ○ Increased participation in other COSMA activities (e.g., site visits, BOC/BOD, newsletter, etc.)
Engage/educate parents, high school students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Devote space on website to high school SM initiatives ○ Social media/targeted programming 	Dina Gentile; Heather Alderman	TBD	TBD

Opportunities	Actions	Responsibility	Timeline	Desired outcome
<p>Better connect COSMA accreditation with positive program outcomes</p>	<p>1. Mentoring program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add a question(s) about the use of a mentor(s) to the annual COSMA survey ○ Document the use of mentors in each program’s Annual Report ○ Analyze the “Notes” and “Observations” for programs who have utilized mentors versus those who have not to understand possible impact. ○ Consider requiring programs to utilize the formal mentor process as determined by the BOC as they review programs at various stages of the accreditation process. <p>2. Improved program outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Creating more outreach efforts for members and by members to share best practices. Documenting questions during accreditation process to add to best practices list available to all members <p>3. Demonstrate benefits of implementing COSMA’s O/A plan</p>	<p>Program Outcomes Task Force</p>	<p>2017 - Establish task force</p> <p>2017+ - Task force to develop timeline</p>	<p>TBD by task force</p>

Opportunities	Actions	Responsibility	Timeline	Desired outcome
<p>Identify needs/interests of SM programs and how COSMA might fulfill them</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual COSMA Survey – already exists ○ Improve benefits of individual membership ○ Honor individual members ○ Provide individual members with a “matching” service for faculty seeking sabbatical opportunities and for institutions and programs who are seeking faculty on sabbatical. ○ Website updated to reflect # of years for each member ○ Write up in COSMA Insights Newsletter ○ Honor at AMM at COSMA Conference 	<p>Heather Alderman</p>	<p>2017 - Begin phase-in of actions with information gathering</p> <p>All in place by end of 2017-18 academic year</p>	<p>50% or greater participation of membership in the survey</p>

Opportunities	Actions	Responsibility	Timeline	Desired outcome
COSMA Conference delivery options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Periscope ○ Some sessions pre-determined to be filmed and made available on the website (through YouTube) ○ Student “track” - encourage submissions of their research; could also seek feedback on their presentation skills ○ Celebrate members 	Conference Planning Committee	COSMA Conference February 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased student engagement ○ Increased participation in conference ○ Enhanced “post-conference” experience
Partnerships – funding/constituents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Could happen in connection with Conference hosts - hotel, local teams, host University ○ SBRnet ○ IAVM ○ Darlene Kluka ○ Corporate sponsors in sport management domain, tap SM alums 	Partnership / Revenue Task Force	February 2017	TBD by task force in consultation with BOD
Revenue generating opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Training - online, in person ○ Paper copies of manuals ○ COSMA conference registration fees ○ Corporate partners ○ Reconfigure program dues structure. ○ Reconfigure site visit administration fee 	Partnership/Revenue Task Force	February 2017	TBD by task force in consultation with BOD

Opportunities	Actions	Responsibility	Timeline	Desired outcome
Engage international constituents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Establish a taskforce representing undergraduate and graduate in sport management to initiate the discussion about international accreditation. Curricular strategies should be part of the discussion: strategic alliances, joint ventures, exchange programs and operating agreements to leverage the reach of schools across borders. ● Enhance engagement with other SM organization ● Cultivate a discussion of how to resolve research masters and doctorates in collaboration with U.S.-style masters and doctorates. ● Understand how COSMA accreditation should be modified and interpreted for international sport management programs to best utilize it ● Understand how – without a professional licensure – programs worldwide find value and interest in pursuing COSMA accreditation. ● Enhance engagement with other SM organizations (EASM, WASM, NASSM) 	International Task Force (e.g., Darlene Kluka; Lisa Miller; Heather Alderman; Ming Li - others)	<p>2016: Talks with WASM in progress</p> <p>TBD: Task force to establish five-year plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Engage international SM programs ○ Increase international individual and program membership

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focus on globalization – “COSMA worldwide” is the international accreditation body for sport management• Address ways to expand international value and international membership			
--	---	--	--	--

Appendix A: Differences between the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) business and the Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA)

AACSB accreditation focuses on both inputs and outputs by asking schools to document how their programs are making a difference and with what impact. There is a strong focus on continuous improvement, annual questionnaire and a five-year review of strategic progress. They explicitly state that they adapt accreditation approaches to different cultural situations.

Process: Start with eligibility requirements – demonstrate alignment with core values of the accreditation process. Each standard is listed along with definitions, basis for judgment and guidance for documentation. The document includes more descriptions and fewer tables to document responses.

Six Core Values (similar to our Characteristics of Excellence in SM education)

1. Ethical Behavior
2. Collegial Environment
3. Commitment to Corporate and Social Responsibility
4. Accreditation scope/AACSB Membership
5. Oversight, sustainability, continuous improvement
6. Adherence to standards, integrity of submissions

Strategic Management and Innovation: Schools are required to articulate a clear mission, how they act on that mission, how they translates that mission into expected outcomes and what strategies they develop for achieving those outcomes.

Innovation is aligned with this section and others; is not a separate standard.

Standard 1: Mission, Impact, Innovation

Standard 2: Intellectual Contributions, Impact, and Alignment with Mission

1. "Provide portfolio of evidence."
Table 2-1 – puts all faculty together and presents intellectual contributions as unit
2. Provide "impact indicators."
3. COSMA asks for professional activities – not less emphasis on scholarly research, but the addition and focus on the practical.

Standard 3: Financial Strategies and Allocation of Resources

4. Asks about contingency plans if resources were cut
5. Realistic sources of funding

Participants – Students, Faculty, and Professional Staff

1. Focus on admission, support and progression of students.
2. Focus on production and maintenance of faculty intellectual capital for currency and relevance.

3. School makes case that division of labor of faculty and staff are sufficient to support mission and outcomes.

Standard 4: Student Admissions, Progression, and Career Development

1. Not just about admissions (input) but progression and career development.
2. Career development supports.

Standard 5: Faculty Sufficiency and Deployment

1. Participating faculty – deeply engaged; delivery at least 60 percent of teaching in its discipline
2. Supporting faculty – fewer responsibilities

Standard 6: Faculty Management and Support

1. Orientation, guidance, mentoring for faculty

Standard 7: Professional Staff Sufficiency and Deployment

1. Resource plan for professional staff and services

Learning and Teaching

Standard 8: Curricula Management and Assurance of Learning

1. Curriculum mapping
2. No specific guidance for outcomes assessment

Standard 9: Curriculum Content

1. Guidance for appropriate content areas for master's and doctoral level programs (not just undergraduate CPC areas)

Standard 10: Student-Faculty Interactions

1. Access to content experts

Standard 11: Degree Program Educational Level, Structure, and Equivalence

Standard 12: Teaching Effectiveness

1. Teaching enhancement activities.
2. Document innovative and/or effective teaching practices that have had significant, positive impact on student learning.

Academic and Professional Engagement

Standard 13: Student Academic and Professional Engagement

1. Left open to school to define but does not require a practicum or internships. COSMA's requirement is stronger in CPC and internal/external relationships

Standard 14: Executive Education

1. COSMA does not accredit certificates

Standard 15: Faculty Qualifications and Engagement

1. Distinguishes between academic, applied practice and doctoral degree versus professional experience

Appendix B: Survey questions

1. In what year did you join COSMA?
2. At what stage are you in the accreditation process?
3. Which of the following characteristics best describes your institution – public or private?
4. Which of the following characteristics best describes your institution – small (<1,000 students), medium (between 1,001 – 5,000 students), or large (more than 5,000 students)?
5. Which of the following characteristics best describes your institution – teaching and research, teaching-focused, research-focused?
6. What type of SM program does your institution have – undergraduate, master’s , doctoral, working to create a graduate program?
7. Which of the following describes the most relevant reasons for your program to work toward COSMA accreditation? Rank the following options from 1 to 9 with 1 being the “most relevant” and 9 being the “least relevant.”
 1. State/University/College requirement
 2. To attract students
 3. To gain recognition on campus
 4. Increase program visibility
 5. To make our program the best it can be
 6. Gain additional resources for our program
 7. To help graduating students find jobs
 8. Parents/prospective students ask us about COSMA/accreditation
 9. Industry recognition
8. From Question #6, include your own response, as needed.
9. In your opinion, what might hinder the continuation of a program’s membership in COSMA? Rank the following options from 1 to 7 with 1 being the “most relevant” to 7 being the “least relevant.”
 1. Funding cuts
 2. Loss of regional accreditation
 3. Department moves from one college to another (e.g., from Education to Business)
 4. Loss of administrative support
 5. Paperwork and reporting requirements
 6. Not see benefits or return on investment
 7. Lack of industry recognition
10. From Question #8, include your own response, as needed.
11. What support/guidance would you need from COSMA to help you through the accreditation process? Rank the following options from 1 to 5 with 1 being the “most relevant” and 5 being the “least relevant.”
 1. Training

2. Access to mentors
 3. Data related to the benefits of accreditation
 4. One-on-one assistance
 5. Industry support and involvement
12. From Question #10, include your own response, as needed.
13. In your opinion, what does COSMA do well? Rank the following options from 1 to 7 with 1 being the “most relevant” and 7 being the “least relevant.”
1. Training
 2. Guidance at all stages of the process
 3. Mentoring
 4. Pushing programs to a higher level
 5. Creating/refining an effective outcomes assessment process
 6. Professional development opportunities (e.g., BOC, BOD, presentations at conferences)
 7. Helping programs gain needed resources
14. From Question #12, include your own response, as needed.
15. In your opinion, what could COSMA do better?

Appendix C: Engaging International Constituents

Background

The potential of international business and impact of sport globally are evident when analyzing the profit line of sport events and corporations. Not only do mega sport events generate revenue, but also sport stars and champions. International business opportunities in and through sport are evident on a global scale. These opportunities can easily move across national borders on all continents. Athletes and coaches relocate and get new nationalities, impressive salaries, and lifelong benefits.

The ultimate success of sport globally depends upon sport managers' abilities including cultivating global mindsets and competencies and the translation of threats, opportunities, trends, patterns and changes in the sport business environment. Where are these global mindsets, competencies, dispositions and skill sets accessed? How are sport management degree programs worldwide preparing their graduates to function and prosper in the global sport business environment?

Sport management, as an academic discipline with a professional orientation, is one of the top fields with rapid global growth. One of the most significant drivers of this rapid diversification appears to be globalization itself. At no other point in history have universities begun to invest so much energy into seeking new means of expanding international networks, incorporating international perspectives into learning experiences and faculty research and establishing a globally recognized brand.

Challenges and Trends

Sport management is increasing everywhere, generating money that breeds corruption. Large gaps remain in our knowledge about globalization of sport management education in terms of scale, scope, curriculum, modes of collaboration and impact. The concept, sport management education, reflects the need for effective management of sport beyond the for-profit environment. Presently, globalization has enlarged differences between rich and poor and between extraordinary and ordinary. Non-profit sport is going to survive as a result of volunteers. It also includes non-profit and governmental agencies and any organization that requires effective management of sport in order to meet mission, goals, partners and objectives. The journey from globalization to globalism will continue as long as people are driven to look across borders for resources, ideas, efficiencies and services. Examining the trends of globalization of sport management programs in higher education is important for several reasons:

- How to serve sport management professionals
- Globalization is a disruptive force of change in sport management education
- Quality of the learning experiences for students
- The impact that sport management programs have on globalization itself

Accreditation

Accrediting bodies whose scope includes programs worldwide include many of the same principles as COSMA. They include:

- Outcomes Assessment
- Strategic Planning
- Curricular Content
- Faculty
- Resources
- Internal and External Relationships/Oversight
- Educational Innovation

In addition, the following broad-based goals apply and mirror COSMA's Characteristics of Excellence:

1. Graduates need global mindsets and competencies in order to succeed in a global sport environment.
2. Students need international learning experiences that require a comprehensive approach to individual courses as well as overall program design.
3. The content of sport management courses should be delivered in a manner that is appropriate, effective and stimulates learning.
4. Faculty in the program model ethical character and integrate ethical viewpoints and principles in their teaching.
5. Faculty are effective teachers who are current in their fields and active in their professional contributions to their institution and discipline.