



ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

College	CEAS
Department	Kinesiology
Program	BS and MS Kinesiology
Reporting for Academic Year	2017-2018
Last 5-Year review	2013-2014
Next 5-Year Review	2020-2021
Department Chair	Paul Carpenter
Date Submitted	10.15.2018

DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS

A. DISCUSSION OF TRENDS & REFLECTION

Notable Trends

Looking at student headcount and student demographics there is no discernable trend over the time frame for which data were presented. The program has year-on-year seen a similar breakdown in terms of ethnicity, gender, and URM and PELL status. 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 have risen the past two-years likely as a result of students looking to graduate before semester conversion.

Looking at faculty data there is consistency both in terms of numbers of faculty and instructors as well as the ratio between the two as well as demographics. There has been a shift to more associate professors as faculty have successfully gone through the tenure and promotion process. This has been offset, to some degree, with two new tenure-track hires the past 2-years reflecting the increased number of majors being served. FTE rose in 2017 and was a result of offering more sections to help students graduate before semesters. There is also consistency in proportion of FTES accountable to instructors versus faculty although this does not reflect the proportion of faculty to instructors. Total FTES has been consistent across the reporting period although Fall 2017 so the highest number of FTES in the past five years. The explanation lies with students taking more classes to graduate before semesters.

The SFR is consistently higher for instructors than faculty. However, this metric is flawed as the SFR is being impacted by counting the coaches. Historically, coaches held teaching assignments within the department and were assigned WTUs for Intercollegiate Courses. These courses gave students credit (1 SCU) for their involvement in team practices. Under the course classification system these courses have a k-factor of 6. This skews the FTEF data and therefore the SFR. For Fall 2017 for example, the FTEF for the coaches teaching the 15 IC Courses is 4.4 and the FTES around 14. The only students who can take these courses are the athletes in the respective sport and historically the department has been required to schedule them. For some sports this is just a few students. When Kinesiology split with Athletics, coaches no longer need to be assigned WTUs, but this practice has continued in terms of calculating course data. Removing the coaches from the data increase the program SFR to 25 which is more indicative of instructional load.

Reflections on Trends & 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 have been stretched to accommodate the growth and the total number of majors. In addition, the general education program has also grown. It remains to be seen how numbers will play out for semesters given the deletion of Area F which was where the physical activity classes were located for general education. Under the semester model the physical activity classes are in Area E but this is prescribed. We are anticipating a drop in the number of students who will take these classes. This may in part be compensated by new lecture general education classes that were approved for semesters. It has been predicted that the number of students entering under the Star Act (SB1440) will grow and Kinesiology is one of the degree programs with a Transfer Model Curriculum.

The trend toward more high impact practices and hands-on experiences is impacting the department's ability to effectively deliver laboratory classes and those classes with an activity component at three levels. First, these classes come with a k-factor that increases the need for additional instructors. Finding qualified instructors in the Bay Area is challenging and this is compounded by the fact that all the Kinesiology programs are experiencing the same issue. Second, with restrictions on WTUs/semester and some of the k-factors being fractional it can be difficult to get people to a full-load. Third, these practices often require multiple and specialized teaching spaces for the one course. This creates further stress on limited space and creates challenges for scheduling.

The department has to some degree been a 'victim' of its own success. Faculty have been very successful in securing reassigned time for scholarship and/or being assigned to university level positions. It is good faculty are getting the due recognition for their expertise but this has placed stress on covering core major classes. As already noted, finding replacement instructors is difficult.

B. REQUEST FOR RESOURCES

Request For Tenure-Track Hires

An area of need highlighted in the 2016-2017 report was sport pedagogy. With only one faculty member in sport pedagogy we rely heavily on lecturers to teach the required classes for the single subject waiver option in physical education as well as the physical education courses for the Liberal Studies Teacher Preparation Program. 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 placing 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.

Recently, the department was granted one of the new positions from funds earmarked by the legislature to increase faculty density. The position announcement calls for recruiting an individual with a strong pedagogy background and a focus on special populations. A successful search will see our need for an additional tenure-track faculty member in Sport Pedagogy met. Currently, we have one-person FERPing and when this expires in two-years we will need to request a tenure-track position in the area of motor development.

Request For Staff Positions

The department has two full-time laboratory support personnel (one 10-month, and one 12-month). This level of support is currently sufficient to meet the needs to support laboratory classes as well as faculty research, community outreach program, and the support of in-house programs (Get Fit, Stay Fit, Kinesiology Research Group). Faculty and staff demand for membership in Get Fit, Stay Fit continues to grow as does student interest in the Kinesiology Research Group. In addition, in line with professional developments including the American College of Sport Medicine promotion of Exercise is Medicine and certifications in Strength and Conditioning as well as new initiatives with Community Partners, additional staff support may be required in the future.

Kinesiology and Recreation, Hospitality, and Tourism operate an administrative and advising collective. The current level of administrative support staffing addresses the departments need for supporting faculty and instructors with the day-to-day management of course delivery, budgeting, and general administrative support. The number of students in Kinesiology and Recreation, Hospitality and Tourism (currently a combined total of around 1000 majors) stretches the current advising team that comprises two full-time advisors and on part-time advisor. With the need to meet the targets set in the GI2025 additional advising support would improve retention and graduation rates.

When Athletics and Kinesiology split, one of many agreements in allocating resources was that Athletics would support the equipment room – checking equipment in and out, setting equipment up, and managing inventory. Due to a number of factors, the number of equipment room personnel hired by Athletics has fallen. Currently, much of the equipment support for Kinesiology is being provided by part-time personnel. While this is addressing most of Kinesiology's needs, it has resulted in a reduced level of service. A longer-term solution needs to be identified.

Request For Other Resources

Consumables & Equipment: 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. The department has been successful in securing A2E2 funds to meet most of its equipment needs. However, 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. Each year we need to request essential equipment for major classes to replace equipment that has passed its life expectancy. As long as A2E2 funds are available we should be able to meet student needs although a replacement process would allow this to be better managed. As a discipline, technology changes very quickly and as a result we need to acquire new technologies that students will use professionally. The number of students using Kinesiology equipment is high (over 4000 students in any given term). This creates substantial wear-and-tear and accelerates the need for replacement equipment.

Kinesiology Laboratory: As the enrollment data of the past 5-years shows, the BS in Kinesiology degree has experienced significant growth. This growth has led to numerous challenges in meeting student demand in terms of instructional faculty, support staff, equipment, and specialized teaching space. One area that has become particularly problematic is with respect

to the laboratory experiences essential for student learning and preparing students for careers as well as for faculty engaging in research and outreach activities.

The current laboratory space for kinesiology on the Hayward campus has a number of limitations most of which cannot be rectified without significant expenditure of time and money. The space is one large open footprint making it impossible to run multiple laboratories at the same time and accommodate the different laboratory set-ups needed for the disciplinary areas in kinesiology. Separate laboratory spaces are needed for exercise physiology, biomechanics, motor control and motor learning, sport psychology, and wellness and nutrition. The single footprint space means we are also constrained in the number of laboratories we can offer in a week and this is now insufficient for the number of laboratories we need to schedule given student demand. A lack of laboratory space is creating graduation bottlenecks. These concerns are further compounded by the need to also use the existing laboratory space for ongoing research projects as well as testing for athletics and external constituents. The current space does not meet accepted standards for power and HVAC and recently we have been experiencing major difficulties in running needed software in our biomechanics labs.

Office & Classroom Space: The growth in student numbers and a corresponding growth in the number of tenure-track faculty has placed pressure on faculty office space. Currently several faculty have to share office space and if the new hire is successful additional space that currently does not exist in the Physical Education building will be required. Office space is also shared with the Athletics Coaches for Basketball (men's and women's) and women's volleyball. In addition, the growth in Kinesiology majors has increased the need for specialized teaching space to address the integration of high impact teaching practices into the curriculum.

Fitness Center & Fitness Studios: The Fitness Center (PE202) was recently reconfigured to improve the flow of users and better accommodate the multiple groups who use this room. This single space is shared between Kinesiology classes (physical activity and major) as well as Athletics (strength and conditioning for the NCAA teams), the Get Fit, Stay Fit Program (in-house Fitness Program for Faculty and Staff), and Fitness assessments for community outreach programs. This creates scheduling pressures and the sharing of space is far from ideal from an instructional perspective. If these programs continue to grow, additional space will need to be found to accommodate the multiple users. The Fitness Studios (PE201A & B) are increasingly being requested for use by other university units as well as external groups as space on campus is pressured. A major concern with this is the wear and tear on the specialized equipment in PE201B, namely, the martial arts mat. This is difficult to lift and should not be used for any other activity other than the martial arts classes. Unfortunately, in some cases this requirement is over-ridden due to demands on space and the space inappropriately used. The department is responsible though for the cost of maintenance and replacing the mat when damaged.

Gym & Outdoor Space: Unauthorized use of the Stadium and associated spaces has risen. There is currently no effective way to secure entry into the Stadium. As with most space needed for Kinesiology, use is shared with Athletics. In general, we have been able to schedule such that each group's needs are met. One area in need of renovation is the upper field. It is no longer in a good enough state of repair to use for classes. In the gym, we have had ongoing issues with the basketball hoops (in need of repair) as well as cleaning and sealing of the gym floor and replacing the lights.

Physical Education Building: The level of deferred maintenance for the PE Building I understand is at over \$4M. In the last three years over 400 tickets been submitted to address damaged or non-functioning equipment and facilities. Recently, several water fountains had to be taken out of operation due to high lead levels. Overall, the facility needs substantial renovation and refurbishment to common spaces such as hallways and stair wells as well as office and classroom space, equipment rooms, gym, fitness center, fitness studios, and locker rooms. There have been ongoing issues with the level of janitorial support to keep spaces clean and appropriately sanitized as well as leaks and sewage back-up. A major source of concern is building security. It is impossible to regulate access and the number of unauthorized uses of the facility has risen. There have been instances of homeless individuals using the facility to shower. This creates potential health and safety problems.

The Physical Education building faces a number of challenges. With changes in the way both kinesiology and athletics now need to operate, the building as currently configured constrains what we need to accomplish. In addition, this is compounded by (a) the budget situation and the accumulation of deferred maintenance and (b) the growth of our respective operations (faculty, staff and student number).

The building is the public face of CSUEB with the number of university functions, athletic events, and kinesiology programming (as well as Theater and Dance and Recreation, Hospitality, and Tourism) drawing internal and external constituents. A conservative estimate is that several thousand people pass through the building daily. Given this, it is imperative that a positive image is conveyed.

Compared to similar departments and programs at other CSU schools and across the USA, our facilities are outdated and no longer fit for purpose. This constrains not only our ability to attract the best students and faculty and to engage in the teaching and service activities that reflect best current practice, but also restricts the type of research we can conduct and instructional effectiveness.

Attachment A: Summary of Program Data (Fall 2013 – Fall 2017)

Kinesiology	Fall Quarter				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	653	715	793	733	764
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	1	0	0	0
3. Graduate	23	25	29	28	22
Gender					
4. U/G Females	298	351	370	343	365
5. U/G Males	355	364	423	390	399
6. G Females	11	9	10	8	5
7. G Males	12	16	19	20	17
Admit (U/G)					
8 Freshman	338	370	420	394	408
9. Transfer	315	345	373	339	356
Level (U/G)					
10. Freshman	150	155	178	143	140
11. Sophomore	60	83	84	95	86
12. Junior	177	180	199	169	217
13. Senior	266	297	332	326	321
1st Generation					
14. U/G YES	353	407	444	407	449
15. U/G NO	300	308	369	326	315
16. G YES	9	12	13	16	11
17. G NO	14	13	16	12	11
PELL (U/G)					
18. YES	331	356	410	359	392
19. NO	322	359	383	374	372
URM					
20. U/G YES	243	271	322	298	338
21. U/G NO	410	444	471	435	426
22. G YES	5	7	9	9	6
23. G NO	18	18	20	19	16
Ethnicity (U/G)					
24. American Indian	1	2	3	1	1
25. Asian	166	181	218	213	203
26. Black/African American	68	58	65	63	57
27. Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	8	3	3	4	6
28. Hispanic/Latino	170	209	253	234	280
29. International	8	17	18	20	17
30. Multiple Races	60	70	74	67	67
31. Unknown	32	40	36	22	30
32. White	140	135	123	109	103
Ethnicity (G)					

33. Asian	4	5	4	4	2
34. Black/African American	2	4	4	4	1
35. Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			1	1	
36. Hispanic/Latino	3	3	5	5	5
37. International		1	1	1	3
38. Multiple Races	2	3	6	6	4
39. Unknown	3	2			3
40. White	9	7	7	7	4
Total Number of Majors	676	741	822	761	786
	College Years				
B. Degrees Awarded	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17
1. Undergraduate	97	110	113	154	147
2. Graduate	8	6	6	7	14
Total	105	116	119	161	161
	Fall Quarter				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track/Lecturer Headcount					
1. Tenure track	11 (26%)	12 (29%)	12 (29%)	12 (29%)	14 (32%)
2. Lecturer	30 (71%)	28 (67%)	28 (67%)	30 (71%)	30 (68%)
3. Teaching Associate	1 (2%)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)		
4. FTE Count	25.08	34.91	25.73	24.96	27.37
Grand Total All Faculty	42	42	42	42	44
Ethnicity					
5. Asian	4 (11%)	5 (14%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)
6. Black/African American	4 (11%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)
7. Hispanic/Latino	3 (8%)	3 (8%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	3 (8%)
8. International	2 (5%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)
9. Unknown	6 (16%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)	5 (14%)
10. White	19 (50%)	18 (50%)	19 (54%)	20 (56%)	20 (54%)
Gender					
11. Female	25 (66%)	22 (61%)	23 (66%)	23 (64%)	22 (59%)
12. Male	13 (34%)	14 (39%)	12 (34%)	13 (36%)	15 (41%)
Rank					
13. Full	4 (11%)	5 (14%)	5 (14%)	5 (14%)	5 (14%)
14. Associate	2 (5%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	4 (11%)	5 (14%)
15. Assistant	5 (13%)	5 (14%)	6 (17%)	3 (8%)	4 (11%)
16. Lecturer	27 (71%)	24 (67%)	23 (66%)	24 (67%)	23 (62%)
D. Instructional Data					
1. FTES	579.68	566.85	613.44	596.62	631.56
2. FTEF	25.4	26.2	27.3	27.4	28.1
3. SFR***	22.8	21.7	22.4	21.8	22.5
4. FTEF Tenure-track (%)	7.8 (31%)	7.6 (29%)	8.7 (32%)	9.8 (36%)	10.2 (36%)
5. FTEF Instructors (%)	17.6 (69%)	18.6 (71%)	18.6 (68%)	17.6 (64%)	18 (64%)
Course Level Data					
6. FTES Lower Division	256.2 (44%)	258.8 (46%)	251.4 (41%)	260.3 (44%)	249.8 (40%)
7. FTES Upper Division	315.1 (54%)	295.3 (52%)	349.2 (57%)	324.3 (54%)	372.2 (59%)

8. FTES Graduate	8.5 (1%)	12.7 (2%)	12.8 (2%)	12 (2%)	9.5 (2%)
9. FTEF Lower Division	8.8 (35%)	9.8 (38%)	9.3 (34%)	9.6 (35%)	8.9 (32%)
10. FTEF Upper Division	15.7 (62%)	15.2 (58%)	17.1 (62%)	16.8 (61%)	18.5 (66%)
11. FTEF Graduate	0.9 (3%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0.7 (2%)
12. SFR Lower Division	29	26.3	27.1	27	28.0
13. SFR Upper Division	20.1	19.4	20.4	19.3	20.1
14. SFR Graduate	9.8	12.8	12.8	12	14.3
<i>General Education</i>					
15. FTES GE	334.9 (58%)	330.6 (58%)	415.8 (68%)	389.4 (65%)	461 (65%)
16. FTES NON-GE	246.7 (42%)	236.3 (42%)	197.7 (32%)	207.2 (35%)	220.5 (35%)
17. FTEF GE	15.2 (60%)	15.7 (60%)	18.4 (67%)	17.4 (64%)	18.2 (65%)
18. FTEF NON-GE	10.2 (40%)	10.4 (40%)	9 (33%)	10 (36%)	9.9 (35%)
19. SFR GE	22.1	21	22.7	22.3	22.5
20. SFR NON-GE	23.9	22.6	22	20.8	22.3

Notes:

*** The SFR inappropriately includes the Coaches in the calculation (see text for detailed explanation).



CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY
E A S T B A Y

ACADEMIC SENATE
Committee on Academic Planning and Review