

**College of Education and Allied Studies
Department of Kinesiology**

**B.S. in Kinesiology
M.S. in Kinesiology**

**Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) Annual Report
May 2012**

1.0 Program Status

a. Curricular Changes

During the past two years the department has made significant changes to both the graduate and the undergraduate curriculum. The change in the graduate curriculum was initiated three years ago and the department removed the four focus areas and developed new course work to make the program more applied in nature to fit the needs of our graduate students.

- Starting in January 2011, numerous changes were made to the undergraduate curriculum. This curriculum had not been modified in nearly 15 years. Some of the major changes included:
 - Addition of an Introduction to Kinesiology class that will be lower division and became part of the Community College Transfer program.
 - Name change from Pre-Physical Therapy option of Therapeutic Studies
 - Removal of Pre-Athletic training program
 - Addition of options in Physical Activity Studies and Social Justice
 - Slight course modifications and renumbering of some courses

b. Resource Changes

- We continue to operate with same operating budget. However over the last two years we have received nearly \$100,000 of new equipment for our laboratory through the Provost's program.

c. Retirements, Resignations, FERP – no change

d. Any new tenure track hires

- In the Fall of 2011 we advertised for a tenure track position and hired in April, 2012.

e. Revision of program Goals or outcomes – None in this review cycle

f. Any other changes in the program

- Our major continues to grow. In the Fall of 2008 we had 383 majors. In the Spring of 2012 we have 554 majors (Data derived from David Garcia – Planning/Enrollment Secure Report). Our current tenure track faculty of seven (including the Chair) cannot begin to cover the courses we need to offer to support our major. Like most of the other CSUs as well as most other Kinesiology program in the nation, we continue to grow and are one of fastest growing majors in the state and in the nation. Our major classes all have wait lists (sometimes up to 30) yet we do not have adequate faculty to cover the classes. Also since there are no Ph.D. programs in Kinesiology in California, we are hard pressed to find “local” talent to cover additional classes.
- We are desperately in need of additional faculty to cover our courses.

2.0 Summary of Assessment (next page)

Key Assessments: Changes in assessment system are italicized in the table.

Program Level	Course Level
<p>Survey Monkey (Online) questionnaire (completed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Described below in results section 	<p>Content quizzes (Fall 2012)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be administered Fall 2012. - Consist of 5-item quiz to be completed in every required Kinesiology course at the beginning and end of the quarter.
<p>Focus groups (Spring 2012)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Groups representing each Kinesiology option (Pre-Physical Therapy, Pre-Athletic Therapy, Physical Education Teaching, and Exercise, Nutrition, and Wellness) will be asked to describe their experiences within their program as well as how effectively they feel the program prepares them for their future careers. 	<p>Grades of selected course assignments (Fall 2012-Spring 2013)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Courses assignments will be selected which require students to demonstrate their understanding of and ability to apply the various SLOs.
<p>Course Mapping (completed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Faculty to identify the various SLOs they address in their respective courses. 	<p>Subjective reports from faculty participating in mock-job interview sessions with students (Winter 2013)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports will summarize the quality of students' expression/application of the various SLOs during the mock interview.

Results for 2010-2011: A total of 239 (143 males; 96 female) Kinesiology majors completed an online questionnaire during 2 time periods: Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. The questionnaire comprised two sections:

- 1) A quantitative Likert-scale response section where students rated various behaviors, attitudes, and/or cognitions related to each of the five Kinesiology SLOs (i.e., Content Knowledge, Practical Assessment Abilities, Critical Thinking and Communication Skills, Professionalism and Ethics, and Commitment to Life-Long Physical Activity); and, 2) A qualitative section where students were asked to comment on: things that they most and least enjoy about the CSUEB Kinesiology program; the usefulness of the Kinesiology student advisor, academic advisor, and the group academic advising sessions; the aspect of the Kinesiology program they found most helpful in learning course materials (e.g., textbooks, teaching style, class notes, study guides, etc.); and thing that they felt could improve CSUEB Kinesiology program.

Quantitative results: For each SLO, students generally indicated that they feel as though they do demonstrate behaviors, cognitions, and attitudes consistent with the Department's SLOs.

Qualitative results: Several themes emerged from the quantitative results regarding things that students enjoyed about being a major in Kinesiology. The most frequently cited themes were: Professors are empathetic and genuinely care about student learning; Professors are highly knowledgeable in subject areas; Kinesiology Department creates 'family' atmosphere among students and among students and instructors. Students also identified things they did not like about the kinesiology program. The most frequently cited themes were: Course offerings frequency and timing; Class sizes; Select professors were viewed as 'dry' lecturers; Course delivery that is not focused on application of concepts and theories

Students generally felt that the academic advisor, student advisors, Kinesiology office staff, and group advising sessions were very helpful in helping students plan their course schedules as well as in assisting students with various academic tasks and challenges.

The following themes represent things that students reported as being most useful to them in learning course content: Lab classes; Teaching styles that were dynamic and engaging; Being able to work in the Kinesiology lab

To improve the Kinesiology program, frequently-cited themes from students included: improving Kinesiology lab conditions (space and equipment); offering more classes each quarter; encouraging professors to be more engaging in lecture

California State University, East Bay
APR Summary Data
Fall 2006 - 2010

Kinesiology & Physical Education					
Item	Fall Quarter				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	249	303	353	385	415
2. Postbaccalaureate	2	2	4	5	1
3. Graduate	38	25	36	40	31
4. Total Number of Majors	289	330	393	430	447
College Years					
B. Degrees Awarded					
	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
1. Undergraduate	35	54	51	71	64
2. Graduate	14	13	17	16	16
3. Total	49	67	68	87	80
Fall Quarter					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	5	7	7	7	7
2. Part-Time	3	3	2	2	1
3a. Total Tenure Track	8	10	9	9	8
3b. % Tenure Track	40.0%	45.5%	27.3%	26.5%	27.6%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	1	1	2	2	1
5. Part-Time	11	11	22	23	20
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	12	12	24	25	21
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	60%	55%	73%	74%	72%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	20	22	33	34	29
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	6.4	8.1	6.0	7.0	5.8
9. Lecturer FTEF	19.2	16.6	22.1	21.7	19.9
10. Total Instructional FTEF	25.5	24.7	28.1	28.8	25.7
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	83.9	107.2	108.9	152.5	114.1
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	24.3%	30.5%	23.6%	32.5%	30.3%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	261.8	244.3	353.3	317.5	262.5
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	75.7%	69.5%	76.4%	67.5%	69.7%
13. Total FTES taught	345.7	351.5	462.2	470.0	376.5
14. Total SCU taught	5185.0	5272.0	6933.0	7050.0	5648.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	13.2	13.3	18.1	21.7	19.9
2. Lecturer	13.7	14.7	16.0	14.6	13.2
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	13.5	14.2	16.4	16.3	14.7
4. Lower Division	20.9	20.9	24.7	27.0	27.3
5. Upper Division	12.6	12.4	14.4	13.3	11.3

6. Graduate	5.7	6.9	9.4	14.7	12.0
<i>E. Section Size</i>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	128.0	132.0	139.0	127.0	104.0
2. Average Section Size	22.2	21.0	24.9	25.7	29.2
3. Average Section Size for LD	25.3	28.4	33.4	33.8	37.4
4. Average Section Size for UD	21.7	20.1	23.7	23.7	24.3
5. Average Section Size for GD	13.8	8.4	9.4	17.0	11.8
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	2	8	7	8	3
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	15	24	16	23	15
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	8	8	11	5	6
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	80	85	76	69	39
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	50	45	58	50	42
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	2	0	3	0	0

Source and definitions available at:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/apr/summary/definitions.pdf>