

Academic Degree Programs:

Athletic Training
Exercise Science
Physical Education

Introduction and Overview

This report summarizes progress in carrying out the Kinesiology Department assessment plan, analyzing key findings, and making program improvements during the 2010-11 academic year. The department is currently conducting a self-study (Phase 1) of the institutional Program Review process.

The overarching focus of our annual assessment process was to look at ways to improve student learning while continuing to meet our department mission and goals (see our revised mission statement on page 2). Therefore, in addition to addressing ongoing department business, and while continuing to navigate the changes to the Athletics Department in which many of us have concurrent responsibilities, the department faculty met monthly over the course of the year to accomplish the following assessment activities:

- To evaluate the Student Learning Outcomes for each of the three academic degree programs to determine if the outcomes were relevant, valid, and contemporary.
 - To approve the SLOs upon the review of each program.
- To update and revise our Department Learning Outcomes so that they were aligned with the Institutional Learning Outcomes.
- To align the Student Learning Outcomes for our department’s general education offerings with the larger Shared Educational Experience learning outcomes that have been developed.
- To discuss amendments and enhancements to our Student Learning Outcomes to include new directions in knowledge in our disciplines, new faculty expertise and research, and current market trends in the professions that our students most commonly enter upon graduation.
- To map our DLOs and PLOs to our courses to ensure that students are given the opportunities in the curriculum to gain knowledge and skills pertinent to the designated outcomes.

The discussion, data collection process and analysis of each of the bullets above has varied significantly; the status and progress of some areas can be described as ‘completed’, whereas other items are in their infancy and will require continual assessment.

The evidence of student learning that occurs as a function of the interaction and instruction between students and faculty is described briefly below, and is demonstrated more thoroughly in the following documents attached to this summary report as appendices (next page):

Appendix 1: Alignment of ILOs_DLOs_PLOs_Athletic Training Education Program

Appendix 2: Alignment of ILOs_DLOs_PLOs_Exercise Science Program

Appendix 3: ATEP Assessment Diagram and Curriculum Map

Appendix 4: Exercise Science Assessment Diagram and Curriculum Map

Appendix 5: Health and Fitness Assessment Diagram and Curriculum Map

Appendix 6: ATEP Multi-Year Assessment Plan

Appendix 7: Summary of ATEP Board of Certification Pass Rates

Appendix 7b: BOC results_2010

Appendix 8: BOC Self Assessment Exam results__ATR 494_2011

Appendix 9: Summary of PED 100.3_Student Cardiovascular Fitness Outcomes

Appendix 10: Department Meeting Agendas

Assessment Planning & Process

1. Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose: Our Mission Statement

In reviewing our department mission statement, it became evident to us that the mission needed significant refocusing and revision for a few reasons. The first was that the statement was written from a faculty position and was not focused on student learning. The second was that the mission did not completely describe the current state of the department. Namely, we identified changes over the past decade in student interests, and in regional and national market trends in education, health care, and fitness. We also experienced changes in faculty expertise through the natural hiring and retirement or reassignment processes.

Revised Department Mission Statement (3/30/11):

The mission of the Department of Kinesiology is to prepare students to inform, maintain and improve the health, fitness and quality of life of themselves and the people they serve. The department is committed to educating our students and community in the science and benefits of optimal health and human performance; to developing in all students a lifelong habit of living healthfully; and to preparing students for the variety of career opportunities that utilize Kinesiology as a foundation.

2. Department Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

Alignment of Kinesiology Learning Outcomes to PLNU Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

ILO1. Learning, Informed by our Faith in Christ

Members of the PLNU community will

ILO1.a display openness to new knowledge and perspectives;

Kinesiology Learning Outcome: Students will engage and demonstrate competence in current knowledge in human movement, physical fitness and allied healthcare

ILO1.b think critically, analytically, and creatively; and

Kinesiology Learning Outcome: Students will critically evaluate, creatively apply and effectively communicate essential information in their discipline

ILO 1.c communicate effectively.

Kinesiology Learning Outcome: see 1b above

ILO2. Growing, In a Christ-centered Faith Community

Members of the PLNU community will

2.a demonstrate God-inspired development and understanding of others,

Kinesiology Learning Outcome: Students will demonstrate an appreciation for the beauty and gift of the human body—and the benefits of optimal health and physical fitness—by actively pursuing a healthy lifestyle.

2.b living gracefully within complex environmental and social contexts.

Kinesiology Learning Outcome: Students will apply their emerging knowledge for the benefit of their clients, patients and the community.

ILO3. Serving, In a Context of Christian Faith

Members of the PLNU community will

3.a engage in actions that reflect Christian discipleship in a context of communal service and collective responsibility,

3.b serving both locally and globally.

Kinesiology Learning Outcome: Students will serve others in clinical, educational and/or athletic settings as they live out their vocation & calling.

3. Program Learning Outcomes: the alignment of the Program learning outcomes to the Institutional learning outcomes is demonstrated in Appendices 1 & 2.

See Appendix 1: Alignment of ILOs_DLOs_PLOs_Athletic Training Education Program

See Appendix 2: Alignment of ILOs_DLOs_PLOs_Exercise Science Program

4. Curriculum Map: Appendices 3, 4, & 5 identify where the learning outcomes align with the curriculum.

The approach we took was to align our learning outcomes with the University mission statement and ILOs. We then enumerate where students encounter opportunities in the curriculum to gain knowledge and skills pertinent to the designated outcomes; that is, where opportunities are:

I= Introduced, D=Developed, and/or M=Mastered.

See Appendix 3: ATEP Assessment Diagram and Curriculum Map

See Appendix 4: Exercise Science Assessment Diagram and Curriculum Map

*See Appendix 5**:* Health and Fitness Assessment Diagram and Curriculum Map

***Please note that Appendix 5 is under significant revision. This work represents a new direction in curriculum and a new undergraduate major in Health and Fitness that the department plans to propose to the APC in the fall.*

5. Multi-Year Assessment Plan: Appendix 6 identifies the ATEP learning outcomes and the year in which each will be assessed. The Exercise Science and Physical Education majors have not created a multi-year assessment plan.

See Appendix 6: ATEP Multi-Year Assessment Plan

Assessment Activities:

6. Methods of Assessment and Criteria for Success: how student learning was assessed during 2010-11.

ATEP learning outcome assessed:

LO#5: ATEP graduates will demonstrate the knowledge and skills required of an entry-level Certified Athletic Trainer.

- **How do we know students are learning in this area?**
 - We assess student scores on the mock certification exam (given in ATR 493) and on the Board of Certification Exam.
- **What were the criteria for success and performance targets?**
 - 80% of students will score 70% or better on all domains of the NATA Mock Certification Exam in ATR 493.
- **To what degree have we been successful?**
 - See Appendix 7: BOC Exam Results (National averages vs. PLNU) and Employment Data
 - See Appendix 8: Self Examination (Mock Exam) Results by Domain

- **When was the assessment conducted, and by whom?**
 - The mock exam was conducted in ATR 493 by Jeff Sullivan, ATEP Director.
 - The BOC examination was conducted by a national testing agency, all students took the examination in April, the first available time the exam was offered. This is a first for our program and not common nationally.

PE/General Education learning outcome assessed:

LO#2: Students will demonstrate a lifestyle of physical activity.

LO#4: Students will understand how to apply Biblical stewardship principles via their physical bodies.

- **How do we know students are learning in this area?**
 - Students enrolled in PED 100 made improvements in their cardiovascular and muscular fitness. **See analysis in Appendix 9:** Summary of PED 100.3_Student Fitness Outcomes.
- **What were the criteria for success and performance targets?**
 - *80 % of students will demonstrate improved physical activity from pre to post survey as a result of course.*
- **To what degree have we been successful?**
 - >90% of students improved in cardiovascular and muscular fitness, as well as in body fat % after taking PED 100. **See Appendix 9** for detailed analysis.
- **When was the assessment conducted, and by whom?**
 - The fitness measurements were conducted in PED 100 by Ann Davis.
 - **See Appendix 9.**

7. Summary of Data collected:

- **Results of the assessment process for the designated Learning outcomes.**
 - **Appendices 7-9** demonstrate that the assessed outcomes were largely met.

8. Use of Results: *How we are using what we have learned.*

The improvements we have made in the past 12 months as a result of our assessment efforts:

- The major initiative that the department has considered—both as a result of our annual assessment activities and our program review self study process—is developing new curriculum comprised of a new major program with three potential concentrations. We are exploring a major in Health and Fitness based on:
 - Positive trends we have seen in student interest in the health, fitness and disease prevention
 - A decrease in enrollment in our Physical Education major
 - The lack of job opportunities in teaching physical education in the San Diego Unified School District and in California generally

How we review, disseminate and discuss the assessment results:

- The assessment results contained in this annual report as well as in the appendices will be discussed with the department faculty at the first department meeting of the 2011-12 academic year.
- The results of the assessment of individual learning outcomes (and their implications) are discussed in department meetings as a natural order of business (please **see Appendix 10:** Department Meeting Agendas).

- We determined that there was a need for a subcommittee within the department to discuss new directions in our curriculum. Therefore we tasked a Curriculum Committee with developing a response to the new curriculum discussed above.
 - Members of the Curriculum Committee are: Jeff Sullivan, Leon Kugler, Ted Anderson, Ann Davis, Alisa Ward.

Based on your findings, what do you plan to do now?

- As stated above, the key initiative for us is in developing a new major program.
- General Education Offerings: While we contend that we are meeting our general education goals, we have also attempted over the past two years to increase the variety and creativity of our offerings. We have done this by restricting 5 sections of our PED 100 course.

Program modifications, changes and timeline for implementation of changes:

- We plan to modify the Physical Education major and propose the new curriculum to the APC in Fall 2011, to be implemented in Fall 2012.

Budgetary implication(s) resulting from the program modifications or changes:

- At this point, we do not anticipate an increase in budget based on curricular changes.