

Annual Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) Report

Department of Kinesiology

Fall '15 – Spring '16

Introduction

There were two notable assessment related events for the Department of Kinesiology for the '15-'16 academic year; they were:

- (1) The Physical Education Teacher Education program earned *National Recognition* from CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) and their SPA (Specialized Professional Associations) accreditation review. Here is an excerpt to frame this organization and the accomplishment of being recognized:

CAEP

Vision: Excellence in educator preparation.

Mission: CAEP advances excellent educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that assures quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning.

Why? Simply put, accreditation is quality assurance through external peer review. When an institution or specialized program is accredited, it has demonstrated that meets standards set by organizations representing the academic community, professionals, and other stakeholders. To maintain accreditation, the institution or program must undergo a similar review on a regular basis. Typically, reviews are conducted every 7 to 10 years. CAEP is a professional accreditor because it reviews departments, schools, and colleges which prepare teachers and other educators. After completing a program, teachers seek licensure or certification from the state in which they wish to teach.

- (2) The Department of Kinesiology completed its scheduled campus External Program Review, which also occurs about every 7 years. While the program review team noted many long-term and sustained strengths of our department, they also noted a few key opportunities for our consideration moving forward. To help understand the essence of our most recent program review, here are the questions we developed for the review team:

1. How can the Department expand its presence and formally engage with the Life Science elements of this campus?
2. Given the Department's dependence on student-credit hours generated from its highly effective and heavy teaching loads, how can the Department maintain this excellence when the new campus interest is in growing research faculty and research productivity?

3. Based upon the Department's trajectory, what should its signature area(s) be in five years?
4. What assets should the Department have in place prior to pursuing a Ph.D. program?
5. With the increasing popularity of online courses, the Department's own continually full online course offerings, and the push towards more entirely online programs, how can the Department keep up with this trend when its offerings are mostly hands-on degrees?

I mention these two significant events to offer perspective and validation that we are quite active in assessment practices, both internal and external to the campus. Additionally, we value the formative and summative data we retrieve and use this data to inform how we develop and deliver our curriculum to ensure student learning and success. This is evidenced in the fact we work closely with Steven Graunke (IRDS) in helping us disaggregate data from our adjoining department (TECM) in PETM so that we have data unique to KINES when various IRDS reports come out.

Finally, while these two events in and of themselves could easily satisfy any expectations of this PRAC report, we will maintain our consistency in creating a separate report to fulfill our campus obligations to PRAC.

Disclosure

Also, in full disclosure, we use the data reported out via, both, NSSE and the campus Undergraduate Retention and Graduation report as authored by Steven, and keep active with the various dashboards available to us via the campus. However, we have not received any PUL reports as of late, therefore PULs are not reflected in this report. The typical reporting tool for PULs was adjacent to grades being posted, and we do not have PUL assessment prompts in the tool that we are using.

Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs.

The Department of Kinesiology has two academic program emphases: (a) Exercise Science / Fitness Management and Personal Training and (b) Teacher Preparation. Across these individual areas there are 14 respective student learning outcomes (SLOs). They are as follows:

Exercise Science (pre-Med, pre-Occupational Therapy, pre-Physical Therapy) and Fitness Management and Personal Training majors in the department align its curricular student learning outcomes with the framework of the American College of Sport Medicine (ACSM) Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) certification. The HFS is a degreed health and fitness professional qualified to pursue a career in university, corporate, commercial, hospital and community settings.

Therefore, the particular SLOs are as follows:

- a. Identify the general principles of exercise science concepts.
- b. Conduct health and fitness appraisals and clinical exercise testing.

- c. Describe the key electrocardiography, diagnostic, patient management, medication, pathophysiology and risk factors associated with exercise and clinical exercise testing.
- d. Perform exercise prescription and programming for clients.
- e. Explain the essentials of nutrition and weight management.
- f. Apply basic human behavior principles and counseling skills as it applies to strategies of enhancing exercise and health behaviors.
- g. Demonstrate safety, injury prevention and emergency procedures in various physical activity settings.
- h. Be able to list key program administration and outcomes assessment for exercise testing.

The **Physical Education Teacher Preparation** program in the department aligns its curricular student learning outcomes with the framework of the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE); as such, the students will be able to:

- a. Apply discipline specific and theoretical concepts when developing physically educated individuals.
- b. Demonstrate competent movement and health enhancing fitness skills.
- c. Implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences to address the diverse needs of all students.
- d. Use effective communication and pedagogical skills and strategies to enhance student engagement and learning.
- e. Utilize assessments and reflection to foster student learning and make informed instructional decisions.
- f. Demonstrate dispositions essential to becoming effective professionals.

What opportunities do students have to learn / acquire the outcomes?

Primarily, the respective departmental curriculums; all of which are: (1) mapped to the aforementioned SLOs (2) adhere to the 120 credit hour state mandate (3) are representative of the approved 30 credit hour General Education expectation and (4) Infuse the campus defined curricular experiences that meet the RISE initiative. In particular, here is what the Department of Kinesiology utilizes to address this:

- i. Research (Zero-credit hour Research course, School FROG grants (faculty) which require undergraduate research opportunities, engagement in the Department's Center for Physical Activity, Wellness, and Disease Prevention, Campus MURI, UROP, and, DSRP grants, and external professional foundation grants (i.e. ACSM, ICC));
- ii. International (International study abroad with Moi University partnership and Cultural Immersion Project (international student teaching), and South Korea Study Abroad Program);

iii. Service Learning (i.e., Motor Activity Clinic, Ability Fitness Clinic, INShape Fitness Programs, Legacy Center, multiple Campus-Community Partnerships with K-12 schools, Live Laugh Dance, etc);

iv. Experiential Learning (It is important to note that all departmental majors participate in a capstone experience; this is in the form of either an (a) internship or (b) student teaching; we also offer a P498 course..

Finally, there exist various departmental student-social, academic, and activity clubs (Phi Epsilon Kappa, PESO, OK, and PE student council) along with opportunities for participation in state, regional, and national conferences as advised and mentored by faculty.

How are you measuring each of the desired behaviors?

A. With regard to the Academic Program emphasis SLOs (yet independent of the particular tract) the faculty/staff utilize the following measures as evidence of success:

Direct:

1. Course grades; per selected assignments and/or overall
2. Capstone mentor observation / evaluation
3. GPA
4. Passing of national / standardized tests
5. Formal student presentations
6. End of Course Assessments
7. Unit Tests, Quizzes, sections of tests, etc.
8. Performance Rubrics

For the direct measures, the Department of Kinesiology has adopted a 5 point performance rating scale to standardize scores across programs and assessments. The levels of performance are defined below. *It is important to note we define a score of 3 as the threshold expectation level for students:*

Level 5 (E): Exceptional (A)

Student performance in learning outcome consistently exceeded expectations due to exceptionally high quality of work performed, resulting in an overall quality of work that was superior.

Level 4 (EE): Exceeds expectations (B)

Student performance in learning outcome often exceeded expectations and the quality of work overall was above average.

Level 3 (ME): Meets expectations (C)

Student performance in learning outcome met expectations and was considered average.

Level 2 (I): Improvement needed (D)

Student performance in learning outcome often did not meet minimum expectations and was considered below average.

Level 1 (U): Unsatisfactory (F)

Student performance in learning outcome was always below expectations and was considered unacceptable.

Indirect:

1. Exit Interviews
2. Surveys
3. Student-based focus group interviews

B. With regard to the general outcomes we offer the following as evidence:

1. Passing rates on select national examinations.
2. Faculty Annual Reports / Report from the Center for Service and Learning; as it relates to mentoring undergraduates exclusive to the RISE initiative.
3. Admission rates to graduate or professional programs.

3. What are the assessment findings?

Exercise Science

Direct Measures

National Examinations - While there are national examinations for Exercise Science students, the governing associations do not release aggregated test scores. Therefore, we rely on the following measures:

Course assignment / evaluation: Within our professional course work we utilize a bundle of assignments to assess the SLOs; these, range from Daily Assignments (quizzes, homework) to End of Term Assessments (project, final exam). These assessments, for this report, were embedded in and reported out from nearly 18 different courses. See the table below for a summary of student achievement in these select courses.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Total Students Assessed	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	% at or above "meeting expectations"
A	531	220	181	78	29	23	90%
B	183	130	40	3	4	6	95%
C	62	47	10	4	0	1	98%
D	301	100	123	47	19	12	90%
E	63	39	18	4	2	0	97%
F	82	58	4	11	9	0	89%
G	536	185	218	89	33	11	92%
H	92	59	10	12	8	3	88%

Teacher Education

National Exam - Teacher preparation does require a national examination (PRAXIS II); for the 2015 AY (similar to the previous 3 academic years) our program had a 98% passing rate; significantly above the national average of ~88%.

Course assignment / evaluation – The assignments used to collect data ranged from Direct Observation to End of Semester Assessments. These assessments, for this report, were embedded in and reported out from 7 different courses during the last academic year. See the table below for a summary of student achievement.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Total Students Assessed	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	% at or above "meeting expectations"
A	77	37	25	4	7	3	87%
B	20	13	6	0	0	1	95%
C	54	8	21	22	2	1	94%
D	16	10	2	2	0	2	88%
E	52	21	18	6	5	2	87%
F	44	14	22	3	2	3	89%

RISE data for Kinesiology

- (1) Taking all the **research** opportunities together we, as a department had approximately 30 undergraduate students actively involved in undergraduate research within either one of our 4 research labs or as part of their capstone course. Many of these students also concluded their work with either a poster presentation, oral presentation, or as a co-author on a publication.

- (2) **International** efforts – this year we report 0 students engaging in an international experience.
- (3) **Service-Learning / Civic Engagement** (for simplicity and to compress any possible duplicative interpretation, I will combine this data): According to the IUPUI Department of Community Engagement, the Department of Kinesiology is #2 on campus as it relates to the number of students involved in civic engagement and #3 in the number of hours, overall, it spends in the community. This equates to about 11 of our instructors and 13 of our courses being actively engaged in the community. Additionally, KINES had 1 faculty development grant and 24 Sam H. Jones Scholars (the most of the entire campus – equating to \$43,200 student scholarship to students) for the reported AY.

What improvements have been made based on assessment findings?

Quite honestly, the biggest lesson we learned with regard to our national accreditation efforts, the external program review, and the annual PRAC report is that we need a more efficient and better data reporting and analyzing tool. Currently, at the request of the university we are using Qualtrics, yet there exist severe limitations here. While we have procured funding for a 3rd party vendor, the university is asking us to refrain from going in that direction and has advised us to look internal. At this point we are looking at RedCap; and this looks promising.

Outside of this, taking all the data together from the accreditation, program review, SLO entry, along with information gleaned from exit interviews, and course evaluations, we here in the Department of Kinesiology are addressing the following, at the direction of the external review team:

“The Department has developed a set of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the Exercise Science and Personal Fitness options, as well as for Physical Education. The SLOs for Physical Education teaching align with the framework of the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE), and the Exercise and Fitness options have aligned their SLOs with the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) certification guidelines. This is an excellent step. However, the team suggests that all Kinesiology majors should have some additional components in this assessment system that relate to the broader field of Kinesiology. For example, if the Introduction to Exercise Science became Introduction to Kinesiology, students would learn about the development of Kinesiology from Physical Education roots and also the breadth of Kinesiology that can span, in some programs, from the Humanities to Social Behavioral Sciences to Life Sciences. Then the department could emphasize its direction

- HPER 212 – Introduction to Exercise Science. Since the department is now called Kinesiology perhaps this class should be named Introduction to Kinesiology. The course could be expanded in terms of the breadth of topics covered to reflect the broad field of Kinesiology and include the humanities and social behavioral areas, despite the fact this department is not that broad in its offerings.

- HPER 397 Kinesiology – The description suggests that this course is Movement Analysis Applied Biomechanics related to teaching skills. While historically this name was used, now that the Department has changed its name to Kinesiology to reflect the entire broad discipline, it might be useful to rename this class so students clearly understand that the field of Kinesiology is broader than the content in this class. Although the Department does not focus on the humanities or behavioral sciences to any great extent, introducing students to those concepts in an introductory course would provide them with information about the broader field of Kinesiology.
- HPER 405 Introduction to Sport Psychology. This class is a 400-level class, yet it is called Introduction. Perhaps renaming it Sport and Exercise Psychology, Psychological Kinesiology or Psychology of Physical Activity would better reflect the content of the class.
- Currently, the Department of Kinesiology focuses heavily on the life science aspects or exercise science components of Kinesiology. Nationwide, many Kinesiology programs and national societies also embrace the humanities and behavioral aspects of physical activity. While the review team recognizes that all departments cannot do all things, and considering that life science is a strength of this Department, it would seem reasonable for the Department to expand its focus in the social and behavioral aspects of Kinesiology. One recent hire addresses this area, but some additional support may be needed.”