



**ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	CEAS
Department	Kinesiology
Program	BS and MS Kinesiology
Reporting for Academic Year	2016-2017
Last 5-Year review	2013-2014
Next 5-Year Review	2020-2021
Department Chair	Paul Carpenter
Date Submitted	10.20.2017

**I. SELF- STUDY.**

**A. Five-Year Review Planning Goals**

The most recent 5-year review was submitted in Spring 2014 and approved through Academic Senate. The 5-year plan that was presented in the review was viewed as open to revision based on (a) the move to semesters and (b) the appointment of an outside chair.

*Curriculum.* Even though the undergraduate and graduate curricula have been modified extensively in the previous 5-years, the move to semesters will require a transformation of the core classes in the major, the concentrations available to students, and the culminating program experience (Professional Field Experience/Theses Project) at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. In addition, the department focus on evidence-based practice and hands-on experience through laboratory experiences will also need to be transformed to address the number of units available in the undergraduate program as well as resource issues related to the number of students and available space and equipment.

*Enrollment.* Major numbers have seen no slowing at the undergraduate level. This may require reviewing entry requirements to limit numbers in order to continue to offer a quality experience and work within available resources (faculty, advisors, space, equipment, co-curricular programs). Additional Internship opportunities need to be developed to help students secure employment on graduation. For the MS while enrollments are steady strategies for enrollment growth need to be developed.

*Faculty.* With the current number of Majors additional faculty are needed to cover the required major classes as well as the general education classes the department offers. With the high undergraduate demand filling faculty workload it is becoming more difficult to offer the required rotation of graduate classes. Moreover, the development of high impact practices within the curriculum and co-curricular offerings has increased the need for additional faculty to ensure the continued success of these programs. Further, the success of faculty in securing research support for reassigned time has placed additional stress on having qualified instructors to cover student demand.

*Resources.* The impact of the number of majors is also evident in pressure now on space for laboratories, lectures, activity classes, and the outreach programs offered such as the Kinesiology Research Group, Get Fit, Stay Fit, and the Center for Sport and Social Justice. The available laboratory space is also ‘unfit’ for purpose given today’s needs for kinesiology laboratory experiences for undergraduate and graduate students. Increased numbers also puts pressure on available equipment both in terms of the amount of equipment needed and the increased maintenance and replacement demands. As course fees are no longer permitted consumables and equipment have to be acquired through submitting grant proposals creating uncertainty as to whether basic class materials will be available. Increased student numbers

has also raised the need for additional support staff for advising and managing the kinesiology laboratory.

#### B. Progress Toward Five-Year Review Planning Goals

*Curriculum.* In terms of curriculum, this past year the transformed programs have been submitted and approved for the BS and MS degrees in Kinesiology. The MS program outcomes were revised and program revamped to meet changes in the profession. Under semesters, the MS program has moved to 4-unit semester classes. In addition, the transition between the BS and MS programs has been made more seamless as a way to encourage students to move to the MS degree on graduation. The BS program also revamped its learning outcomes as well as updating the core and also removing concentrations and focusing more on a flexible range of elective courses to meet students' professional career choices.

*Enrollment.* In the transformed semester curriculum classes identified through Bay Advisor as core to student success in terms of minimum passing grades have had minimum grade requirements added. As noted above, improving the transition from the BS to the MS, along with having transformed the semester curriculum for the MS, should make the program more attractive to prospect students to improve numbers.

*Faculty.* Two new Faculty positions were successfully filled this past year and started in Fall 2017 in the areas of Exercise Physiology, Epidemiology, and Health Equity and Biomechanics. Filling these two positions will help cover the increased demand for classes in the areas of exercise physiology and biomechanics. The position in epidemiology and health equity will also provide expertise in a growing area of the profession as well as focus on the department's commitment to social justice. One faculty member started FERPing in 2017, and along with demand in the area of Physical Education, an additional faculty member in the area of Sport Pedagogy is required.

*Resources.* Significant challenges still exist with laboratory space given enrollments, faculty and student research needs, outreach projects as well as the space being unsuited to teaching, research, and outreach needs. Continued issues with adequate HVAC, power and lighting constrain our ability to provide the learning experience students need. A growing concern is the funding of essential laboratory operations. Increasingly required equipment and consumables have to be applied for through A2E2 funding which creates uncertainty as to whether we have the funds to be able to run the required laboratory sections. One area where we have been able to improve the laboratory is with respect to technical support. The department did secure a 50% laboratory support but turnover has been high. Given this and growing demand we have been able to increase this to a full-time 10-month position and also been able to raise the second support position to a fulltime 12-month position.

#### C. Program Changes and Needs

Program needs are much the same as when the 5-year plan was initiated – additional resources in personnel and space are still pressing to meet enrollment demand that has continued to grow at the undergraduate level. The department was given one of the new Faculty Advising Fellows (FAF) and starting this past summer there have been regular meetings with the rest of the advising team on how to best utilize the FAF position. Progress has already been made in reaching out to 'at-risk' students. Using the advising tools available we have also identified core courses that are highly predictive of degree success based on the grade achieved. Under

the transformed semester curriculum we will be adopting that threshold grade as a key marker for progression in the degree. A pressing consideration is that the facilities (activity space and laboratories) need significant modification and upgrading to meet demand and also the needs of the educational experiences students must have to be competitive in today's job market as well as meet faculty needs for research, and growing amount of service work the department undertakes. The current state of the facilities also provides constraints on the equipment needed and usage demand has also put pressure on the maintenance and life expectancy of the equipment. Challenges in seeking funding for these core services is a growing concern.

## II. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT

### A. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)

#### *Undergraduate Program Student learning Outcomes*

Content Knowledge – Students will demonstrate foundational knowledge and skills related to the broad domain of physical activity, and will have the ability to apply perspectives from the humanities and the social, behavioral, and life sciences. (Aligns with ILO number 6, specialized discipline)

Professional Application – Students will be able to identify and integrate relevant information to design, act, and evaluate within disciplinary practice. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking and number 6, specialized discipline)

Critical Thinking – Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills when evaluating situations, questions, and issues related to physical activity. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking and number 6, specialized discipline)

Communication Skills – Students will be able to use appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to articulate physical activity issues in both oral and written forms. (Aligns with ILO number 2, communication skills)

Professionalism and Ethics – Students will demonstrate professional dispositions—such as integrity, personal and cultural sensitivity, collaboration, and leadership—and commitment to social justice for physical activity participants. (Aligns with ILO number 3, social justice and ILO number 4, leadership)

Commitment to Life-Long Physical Activity – Students will be able to articulate the importance of a commitment to life-long physical activity for all. (Aligns with ILO number 6, specialized discipline)

#### *Graduate Program Student Learning Outcomes*

Cross-Disciplinary Knowledge: Students will demonstrate the ability to synthesize and apply perspectives from the humanities, and the social-, behavioral-, and life-sciences. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking and ILO number 6 specialized discipline)

Problem Solving: Students will be able to use disciplinary knowledge to design and implement innovative professional applications. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking and ILO number 6 specialized discipline)

Critical Thinking: Students' thought process will be characterized by the exploration of discipline-relevant issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating a perspective. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking)

Communication Skills: Students will be able to use contextually-grounded and compelling content to articulate physical activity issues in both oral and written form. (Aligns with ILO number 2, communication)

Leadership: When leading others in a kinesiology-relevant domain, students will demonstrate professional dispositions – such as integrity, personal and cultural sensitivity, and collaboration

– as well as a commitment to social justice for physical activity participants. (Aligns with ILO number 3, social justice and to ILO number 4, leadership)

#### B. Program Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

In the current assessment cycle the department assessed the undergraduate program student learning outcomes of Professionalism and Ethics that is aligned with ILO 3 (Social Justice) and ILO 4 (leadership).

#### C. Summary of Assessment Process

One of the concentrations in the undergraduate program is in Physical Education. Students taking this concentration follow a course of study that on completion waives the content area test on application for a credential program. As part of the requirements students must complete and submit a Professional Portfolio as part of their teaching observation requirement. Aligning with the program-learning outcome that focuses on a number of professional dispositions, a rubric has been developed (attached) and was used to evaluate specific work students presented in their portfolio (see attached).

#### D. Summary of Assessment Results

In the Fall quarter of 2016 a total of 19 portfolios were submitted out of the 20 students enrolled. In the Winter quarter of 2017, 20 portfolios out of 22 were submitted. A benchmark of 85% of students either meeting or exceeding expectations was set as a measure of success for each criterion. Applying the rubric (see table below), the data show that with the exception of accountability that benchmark was met. The poor results for accountability in part reflect the failure of some students to follow through fully on the requirements set for accountability. This could have been as a result of missing elements in the portfolio related to this part of the outcome. This concern will be addressed at a faculty meeting in the Fall 2017 quarter as part of confirming assessment plans for 17/18. Also of concern with the data is the trend (on average two-thirds) toward students meeting rather than exceeding expectations. Initial discussion suggest that this may be due to the pattern of classes students take prior to undertaking their teaching observation requirement. Currently there are no pre-requisites on the teaching observation. Students completing more of the program prior to undertaking their teaching observation seem to do better. This is something we will address as part of the advising process when we move to semesters.

Table: Summary of Students Performance on Program Learning Outcome on Professionalism and Ethics

Criterion	% Exceeded Expectations	% Met Expectations	% Failed to meet Expectations
Self Confidence	20.0	72.9	7.1
Empathy	17.2	74.4	8.4
Integrity	21.0	69.2	9.8
Accountability	28.3	53.8	17.9
Collaboration	23.1	69.2	7.7
Leadership	30.8	64.1	5.1

#### E. Assessment Plan for Next Year

For the next assessment cycle the plan is to assessment the Undergraduate Program Student Learning Outcome of Content Knowledge that is aligned with ILO 6 (Specialized discipline

knowledge) and the Graduate Program Student Learning Outcome of Cross-Disciplinary Knowledge that is aligned with ILO 1 (critical thinking and ILO 6 specialized discipline).

### III. DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS

#### A. Discussion of Trends & Reflections

##### **Notable Trends**

Reviewing the data provided a number of concerns were noted. For example, the program teaches a substantial number of activity and laboratory classes yet the data indicates we teach zero in each of these categories. Possibly the class type has been incorrectly coded? I assumed that total headcount reflected the number of declared majors and these seem correct based on our own data. These numbers though do not seem to correspond to Majors enrollment count. It isn't clear though what that number reflects (is it headcount? FTES? Is it unique students?). Likewise the numbers for GE enrollment are unclear. Total FTES looked correct but it is unclear how this relates to the following table listing Major FTES, GE FTES, and wait list FTES as the two totals do not tally.

Looking at student headcount and student demographics there is no discernable trend over the time frame for which data were presented. In terms of overall student numbers there does seem to be a leveling out when compared to the substantial growth experienced pre-2013. Graduation rates for undergraduate students indicate that the 6-year for Freshman and 4 year for transfer students are robust and significantly higher for Transfer students. Looking at this in terms of Non-URM versus URM students the graduation rate for URM is lower. Graduation rates at the MS level vary widely for both the 2-year and the 4-year rate. They tend to be higher for URM that is encouraging.

Looking at faculty data there is consistency both in terms of numbers of faculty and instructors as well as the ratio between the two. There is also consistency in proportion of FTES accountable to instructors versus faculty although this does not reflect the proportion of faculty to instructors. The SFR is consistently higher for instructors than faculty. Total FTES has generally been consistent across the reporting period.

##### **Reflections on Trends and Program Statistics**

While it is possible that student headcount for majors is leveling off, the rapid growth of the kinesiology program means that across the board resources are stretched to accommodate the growth and the total number of majors. The stronger graduation rate for 6 year Freshman and 4 year Transfer may in part be explained by data that suggests 48% of Kinesiology majors did not start in kinesiology. In many cases this may add time to degree, as the major from where they are transferring may not include classes that transfer to the kinesiology degree. The varying graduation rate at the MS level is hard to explain, but may reflect the very small sample size. For the same reason the high success rate for URM should not be a reason for complacency. It might be interesting to look at the data more closely to see if there is a correlation between those students who undertake a thesis versus a project for their capstone course as the former often are harder to complete in a timely manner. Overall, the department graduation rates compare favorably with the overall university rates.

The balance between activity classes, GE lecture classes, and major classes has been fairly consistent and is reflected in the balance between the number of instructors and faculty which has changed little although more lecturers have been hired to teach major classes with the

growth in the number of majors and in a move to help time to graduation. It should also be noted that with nearly 200 diverse 1-unit activity classes taught each year the need for instructors to teach these classes is high. Overall though, the total number of faculty is still low relative to the need to teach undergraduate and graduate major classes. The difference in SFR between faculty and instructors also reflects the difference in class caps for activity classes versus major classes as well as the strong laboratory element in the major with those classes largely taught by faculty due to the required expertise needed to teach the kinesiology laboratory courses content.

#### B. Request for Resources

##### **Request For Tenure-Track Hires**

The department requested two tenure-track hires for a fall 2017 start. Only one, in Biomechanics, was funded. The second position request was in sport pedagogy. With only one faculty member in pedagogy we rely heavily on part-time lecturers to teach the required classes for the concentration that prepare students to move on to the credential program (KIN 3072 Individual and Dual Sports, KIN 3075 Aquatics and Outdoor Education, KIN 3079 Combatives and Fitness Activities, KIN 3080 Team and Field Sports, KIN 3255 Fitness and Wellness for a Lifetime, KIN 4004 Elementary School Physical Education, KIN 4006 Secondary School Physical Education, KIN 4008 Adapted Physical Activity). Students in this concentration (currently 92 students have identified this as their concentration) also need to do a clinical placement (KIN 4031 Professional Field Experience) and this stretches the one faculty member. The classes we offer for Liberal Arts (KIN 3251 Physical Education for the Classroom Teacher: Physical Considerations, KIN 3252 Physical Education for the Classroom Teacher: Psychological Considerations) are also in the area of Sport Pedagogy and are currently taught by adjuncts. With the increased demand for K-12 teachers we are seeing more interest in students wanting to pursue a career as a physical education teacher that is place even greater demand on the one faculty member in this area. Given these factors, there is sufficient workload for two full-time faculty members in the area of Sport Pedagogy.

##### **Request For Other Resources**

As has been reported elsewhere in this document, a major area in need of investment is bringing the department's laboratory facilities in line with what is required in the profession as well as making us competitive in the market place. While this is the most critical resource issue, as the department has grown so has the need for faculty office space and specialized teaching space to address the integration of high impact teaching practices into the curriculum. Consumable and equipment resources needed for both activity classes as well as for laboratory classes that were once funded through course fees, is now a competitive process through A2E2 funds. This creates a lot of uncertainty as we are never sure what the funding level will be and if it will be sufficient to run the required classes. The department needs a base level of funding to ensure core curricular activities are adequately funded on a consistent and reliable basis.

Attachment A: Rubric for Student Learning Outcome

Criteria	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Self-Confidence	Confidently and realistically acknowledges and articulates personal and professional skills, abilities, strengths, dispositions, and growth areas; actively engages in self-reflection to gain insight and applies that insight to developing themselves.	Acknowledges and articulates personal skills, abilities, strengths, dispositions, and growth areas; engages in self-reflection to gain insights and begins to apply that insight to conceptualizing their professional selves.	Exhibits little to no evidence of awareness of personal skills, abilities, strengths, dispositions, and growth areas. Exhibits little to no effort to engage in self-reflective activities.
Empathy	Acknowledges and values the skills, abilities, strengths, dispositions, and areas of growth in relation to their own.	Acknowledges the skills, abilities, strengths, dispositions, and areas of growth, but does not fully value and relate them to their own.	Lack of awareness of others in general.
Integrity	Incorporates ethical reasoning into action; explores and articulates the values and principles involved in personal decision-making; acts in congruence with personal values and beliefs; exemplifies dependability, honesty, trustworthiness, and transparency	Student has formulated a sense of ethical reasoning; framework for ethical decision making is further developed yet student is still formulating; students are beginning to connect the dots between values, beliefs, and actions	No evidence of ethical reasoning; Little to no reflection regarding a process for personal decision-making; Lack of congruence between personal values, beliefs, and actions. Absence of qualities such as dependability, honesty, and trustworthiness
Accountability	Solicits and accepts guidance and direction from others as needed; holds oneself accountable for obligations; demonstrates initiative; assesses, critiques, and then improves the quality of one's work.	Discusses raising standards for self and begins to engage in a process to do so. Assesses and critiques the quality of one's work.	Demonstrates little to no accountability towards obligations, nor a sense of personal initiative; Does not assess or seek improvement for the quality of their work or work environment.
Collaboration	Consistently and respectfully listens, interacts, discusses, and contributes to the group, helping the group to achieve a consensus.	Usually respectfully listens, interacts, discusses, and contributes to the group, helping the group to achieve a consensus.	Rarely respectfully listens, interacts, discusses, and contributes to the group, helping the group to achieve a consensus.
Leadership	Uses strong verbal and non verbal behavior to convey authority and concern.	Looks comfortable and confident in exercising leadership duties.	Gives an impression of reluctance or uncertainty about exercising leadership.

## Attachment B: Evidence Used for Outcome Assessment

The students' professional portfolios were evaluated based on the below categories:

**Self Confidence** was assessed through students searching through past and current work that demonstrated their best work and submitting those as evidence in their professional portfolios in areas of observations, unit and lesson plans, teaching field experience, critically thought scientific experiments, reflective thoughts, analysis of movement, synthesis of information from the literature, usage of assessment tools in teaching situations, commitment to diversity, integration of technology, teaching toward CA physical education standards, NASPE standards, New CA standards, and professionalism.

**Empathy** was assessed through student evidence in their professional portfolios in the areas of unit and lesson plans, reflective thoughts, commitment to diversity and teaching toward standards (both NASPE and CA).

**Integrity** was assessed through student evidence in their professional portfolios in the areas of critically thought through scientific experiments and synthesis of information from the literature.

**Accountability** was assessed, as students were required to turn in their professional portfolios twice a year and self-assess one time a year. They were formally graded the two times that they turned in their professional portfolio and informally graded as they reviewed and commented on their professional portfolio. The two times they are formally assessed, the instructor who evaluated evidence was able to review past comments and see updated evidence whether that is in the form of placing evidence, replacing evidence with better perceived work, and/or adding additional best work to any category to express their versatility within their professional portfolio.

**Collaboration** was assessed through student evidence in their professional portfolios in the areas of unit and lesson plans, usage of assessment tools in teaching situations, integration of concepts as students submitted evidence that they have collaborated with peers in order to achieve a common goal, which were creating a good project and receiving a desirable grade.

**Leadership** was assessed through student evidence in their professional portfolios in the areas of professionalism and standards (NASPE, CA and New CA), which are demonstrated with certificates or written in paragraph form.