

Program Review Memorandum of Understanding
Kinesiology Department
JULY 23, 2013

1. Executive summary of the changes required for program improvement

The process of Program Review has allowed the Kinesiology faculty to both refine and create learning outcomes for our academic programs, to refocus our department mission on student learning, to identify, outline and implement the specific means of assessing our learning outcomes, and to proceed with specific curricular and pedagogical changes that we contend will lead to departmental improvement and enhanced student learning over the next 5-7 years. Throughout the program review process, we explored strategies to enhance our already strong and effective programs in athletic training and applied health sciences, and we proposed a new curriculum to APC and the faculty to improve our ability to prepare students for the Exercise and Sport Science professions.

At the completion of our self study, an External Review team reviewed the report and conducted extensive on-campus interviews with faculty, staff, students, alumni and administrators. At the exit interview, the External Review Team produced the following 7 summary recommendations for program improvement:

1. Resources need to be put into the Exercise Science major and the Exercise Physiology lab. More personnel, more equipment, and more space, as well as more hands-on opportunities for students are needed.
2. Seek to equalize faculty involvement within the department.
3. Highlight the significant value that the Kinesiology department plays in the General Education of every PLNU student.
4. It is recommended that the Kinesiology Dept. continue to collaborate with the School of Education to shape the Physical Education concentration of the Exercise and Sports Science major and maintain it as a clear career option for students.
5. Consider having the Bachelor of Science degree for the Exercise Science major as opposed to the current Bachelor of Arts degree.
6. Create more opportunities for Exercise Science students to do original research, exploration and scholarship alongside professors.
7. Information literacy needs another outcome that addresses students' need to know when, where and how to find relevant information and know how to use it appropriately and ethically.

Mission and Vision:

The Department of Kinesiology endeavors to prepare students to inform and improve the health, fitness and quality of life of themselves and the people they serve. We are 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.

Our continued vision, which is a commendation that our External Reviewers also noted, is to successfully *“develop students academically, professionally and as whole persons...availing ourselves to our students for relationship building and modeling, reflecting a strong commitment to Christian higher education.”*

Kinesiology Program objectives over the next 5 years:

Considering the findings of the External Review Team, the Kinesiology faculty presents the following specific objectives for program improvement over the next 5 years:

1. Continue to prepare students for entry into graduate study in the allied health professions.
2. Continue to prepare students to pass the national Athletic Trainers' BOC Examination at a rate above the national average for entry into the Athletic Training profession and/or entry into graduate school in related allied health professions.
 - a. Position our ATEP for successful reaccreditation by the CAATE in 2018-19 concurrently with the next cycle of program review.
 - b. Consider restructuring the undergraduate ATEP into an entry-level master's degree program.
3. Successfully implement and increase the reach and influence of the new Exercise and Sport Science major.
4. Propose to APC and the faculty in AY 2013-14 that the newly-named Applied Health Science major become a Bachelor of Science degree.
5. To creatively address what we see as a growing campus need for improved fitness and better health in students, faculty and staff. To have our EXSS students take leadership in this PLNU fitness initiative.
6. To revisit our general education offerings and to restructure future offerings to meet the current interests of students (e.g. pilates, CrossFit™ or high-intensity interval training) while also considering budgetary concerns related to unfunded loading of the activity courses.
7. To address the significant structural inefficiency of our current practice of requiring Kinesiology faculty to carry out significant loads in the Athletics department in coaching while also teaching.
8. To continue to develop key partnerships with colleagues in Biology, Chemistry, Nursing, Psychology and Dietetics toward interdisciplinary collaboration and enhanced education for our students.

2. Commendations for those involved in the program review process

The Program Review Committee appreciated the Kinesiology Department's good-faith Self Study draft submitted in 2011-12. After a careful perusal, a number of key recommendations were made by the Program Review Committee, and the Self Study was substantially revised. In that revised document, the PR Committee especially appreciated (1) the external and market benchmarking, as well as (2) the effort to address the other departmental programs with the degree of rigor that had been required for ATEP accreditation. The committee also lauded (3) the academic unit for its willingness to move proactively away from a major that is no longer viable in today's marketplace into a related area that has greater potential internally and externally.

The Program Review Committee thanks the Kinesiology Department for its willingness also to revise this MOU to allow it to be a more effective model for future self-studies of academic units now working to follow the new Guidelines.

The External Review, an important step in every program review, has made several important commendations and recommendations. It appears that good progress is already underway to make use of these recommendations. The Committee acknowledges the healthy faculty/student

community that was highlighted by the external review team and commends the faculty in the department for their strong commitment to mentoring their students. The Committee suggests that all full- and part-time faculty members be involved in the on-going work of assessment, culminating in Annual Reporting and in a new cycle of Program Review. Only when every professor is involved in this conversation can a department or school make deep and lasting changes that are necessary for the health of the unit—and ultimately the health of the university as a whole.

3. Action Plan: specific steps to improve the Kinesiology programs (including learning outcomes, faculty, curriculum, resources, etc.)

While conducting the program review, the Kinesiology faculty discovered the following gaps in the *learning outcomes, curriculum, resources, and faculty* of our department. For each gap, we have included specific action steps to be taken to achieve the desired outcome and a timeline and budgetary impact for each action step. Where appropriate, we have listed who is responsible for the implementation of the action.

a. Learning Outcomes:

While the ATEP assessment plan and learning outcomes are refined and complete as a function of external accreditation, we had substantial gaps in our assessment plans and practices for our other programs. We evaluated and created new assessment plans for each of the 3 majors, including DLOs, PLOs and CLOs, curriculum maps, a multi-year assessment timeline and evaluation rubrics for each signature assignment.

- i. Significant work by the department, substantial help from IR, and a streamlined Assessment Wheel process have resulted in the creation and routine evaluation of our DLOs taking place each semester. We did not previously have DLOs or curriculum maps and assessment plans for 2 out of 3 academic programs in the department. We are now measuring 1-2 DLOs in each semester. Additionally, we have standardized and created direct measures of the General Education learning outcomes (i.e., measuring heart rate, recovery HR, lean body mass, strength, flexibility, etc.) and are using a rubric to evaluate students on these outcomes.
 - a. Cost and resource implications: no cost
 - b. Benchmark and timeline for action: Ongoing. We will continue to measure 1-2 DLOs each semester by implementing the assessment rubrics; we will post outcomes to the Assessment Wheel after each semester.
 - c. Responsibility for implementation: We created a curriculum committee within the department at the outset of the program review; this committee will implement and annually review the assessment plans.
- ii. The external reviewer team noted that “Information literacy needs another learning outcome that addresses students’ need to know when, where and how to find relevant information and know how to use it appropriately and ethically.” The ATEP and Applied Health Sciences programs are accomplishing this but do not directly state information literacy as a specific learning outcome. We will address this need by updating our DLOs.
 - a. Cost and resource implications: no cost.
 - b. Timeline for action: Spring, 2013.
 - c. Responsibility for implementation: Kinesiology faculty.

- iii. According to our multi-year assessment timeline, we are past due in deploying an alumni survey to summatively evaluate the extent to which we have achieved our learning outcomes. We worked with the alumni office and with MICS and PSY to create a Qualtrics alumni survey which is now ready to be deployed.
 - a. Cost and resource implications: no cost
 - b. Timeline for action: Summer, 2013 & summer, 2016.
 - c. Responsibility for implementation: Kinesiology Chair will disseminate the survey and post outcomes to the Assessment Wheel with each administration of the survey.
 - iv. Now that the proposed major in Exercise and Sport Science has been approved by the faculty, we will refine the PLOs and CLOs for the new program and complete the assessment plan by creating and finalizing curriculum map, signature assignments and grading rubrics.
 - a. Cost and resource implications: no cost
 - b. Timeline for action: Spring and summer 2013.
 - c. Responsibility for implementation: The curriculum committee will implement the new assessment plan.
- b. *Curriculum and pedagogy: Changes in majors, minors, courses, etc.*
- i. The review of our curriculum led to the APC proposals enumerated in Appendix A. These curricular changes were approved by APC and the full faculty in Spring 2013 and are being implemented Fall 2013:
 - a. Cost and resource implications: no cost (-7 units).
 - b. Timeline for action: Completed. New curriculum begins fall 2013.
 - c. Responsibility for implementation: Kinesiology faculty.
 - v. We will make changes in departmental advising to more equitably balance the advising load among faculty members. With the approval of the new EXSS major, we will change advisors for roughly 40 students in the department.
 - a. Cost and resource implications: no cost.
 - b. Timeline for action: Spring 2013.
 - c. Responsibility for implementation: Chair will more equally distribute advisees by end of spring 2013.
- c. *Interdisciplinary Collaboration with other departments and schools*
- i. Kinesiology previously offered 3 service courses (PED 300, 301 and 308) and we now offer 4 (PED 200, 201, 225 and 308). We will continue to collaborate with the School of Education—as well as with LEAP (as these programs are in transition)—in a collaborative fashion.
 - ii. We will seek to expand key partnerships with colleagues in Biology, Chemistry, Nursing, Psychology and Dietetics toward interdisciplinary study. Some ideas include:
 - a. Consider partnering with Nursing, Psychology and Dietetics in a more efficient and cost-effective academic structure such as a College of Allied Health Sciences.
 - b. Explore a revenue generating Master of Science degree in Kinesiology with three concentrations: Exercise Science, Sports Management and Applied Biomechanics.
 - iii. While our cooperative involvement through service courses could be increased, we will continue to offer a robust selection of GE physical activity courses and will seek to

expand these options for students, faculty and staff. In addition, we have creative ideas regarding a campus wide collaborative fitness challenge as well as increased opportunities for fitness “classes” available to faculty and staff.

- a. Cost and resource implications: potential cost for adjunct faculty or graduate students to lead the fitness classes (Estimated 1 unit of FTE at average adjunct rate = \$1200/semester). Another option is to pay senior Kinesiology students to lead classes. (Estimated 3 classes per semester x 12 weeks x \$8/hr = \$288/semester)
- b. Timeline for action: Fall 2013 and spring 2014.
- c. Responsibility for implementation: Kinesiology faculty will explore this further.

d. *Faculty*: Identification of faculty needs or changes

- i. Both our self study and the external review team supported a new faculty position in Exercise Physiology. In fall 2012, the Cabinet approved this hire and a search has been successful in hiring a candidate to begin fall 2013. The external reviewers commented that the new curriculum in EXSS requires “*significant expertise and resources but will drastically improve the overall quality of the degree*”. Because the academic load for the new joint Kinesiology/Biology position is 40% in Kinesiology and 60% in Biology, we contend that a need still exists for 60% FTE in Exercise-and-Sport-Science-related load (i.e. EXS 201, 350, 350L and KIN 340 and 340L).

- ii. The External Review Team also stated that “*the exercise science program seems to be limited in its capacity to cover the current knowledge and best practices in the field. This may be a result of the unbalanced faculty in the Kinesiology department. Currently, five (5) faculty are ATC, but there is not an exercise physiologist.*”

This concern has also been partially addressed by the successful hiring of a joint Kinesiology/Biology faculty member who is an Exercise Physiologist. However, as stated in item “di” above, this new hire represents only 7-8 units of faculty load in Kinesiology. Given the continued and rapid growth in the number of Kinesiology majors since the time we proposed the joint position (specifically in the Applied Health Science major), the load of the Kinesiology faculty has necessarily increased. The core KIN courses (280, 325, 327, 340, 385, 440) have each added a section due to enrollment #'s above 50 students. To date, we have overloaded FT faculty to teach these courses, due partly to limited success with hiring adjunct faculty. FT faculty instruction therefore seems best as it maintains the desired 80/20 ratio (FT/PT) and allows for more effective teaching, advising and internship development.

- a. Cost and resource implications: 60% of faculty FTE.
- b. Timeline for action: Partially completed with new hire. Ongoing need to recruit additional FT faculty or adjunct.
- c. Requirements and responsibility for implementation: Kinesiology chair will continue to meet with Dean and Provost to explore models and implement structural changes in Kinesiology faculty. Some of these changes could result in partial FTE that may be reallocated toward the EXSS and AHS majors. But we contend that additional load is needed.

- iii. The current and historical structural inefficiency of the Kinesiology faculty should be addressed. The External Reviewers noted: “*There is question whether the current faculty structure in the KIN department is unbalanced, evidenced by the division of workload among faculty. This is likely to be the result from “split load” faculty between academics and athletics. There is significant disparity between the degree of academic training and expertise among the Kinesiology Faculty.*”

A rebalance of faculty structure is warranted. That is, we should decrease the teaching load of faculty coaches, consider adjunct faculty for these units, and add resources to the AHS and EXSS areas.

- a. Cost and resource implications: Difficult to determine, but will potentially increase costs for Athletics/Student Development in FT staff salary.
- b. Timeline for action: A.Y. 2013-2104
- c. Requirements and responsibility for implementation: Kinesiology chair will continue to meet with Dean, Provost, Athletic Director and VP for Student Development to implement structural changes in Kinesiology faculty, possibly offering a mechanism by which some would become FT staff with or without the option to become PT adjunct faculty.

e. *Students*: changes in student support services

The Kinesiology faculty appreciates the feedback from the External Review Team that:

“Students consistently express gratitude for both their learning opportunities from diverse and qualified faculty and their personal relationships with faculty across the department... Students feel prepared for graduate and professional schools and most have been successful in gaining admittance.”

- i. Because our internship and practicum experiences are the pinnacle of the course of study for our students, we have worked during the program review process to establish roughly 15 new clinical affiliate sites in the San Diego area for our Applied Health Science and ATEP students. We will work to establish similar affiliates for the EXSS students. We will also continue to recruit regional health care and fitness professionals as Kinesiology lecture series presenters.
 - a. Cost and resource implications: Requiring internships is a new paradigm for AHS and EXSS majors that will affect faculty loads (ATEP has historically required 15 units of practicum/internship). While we cannot precisely predict the increase in load at this point, it is estimated to be 3-6 units per semester.
 - b. Timeline for action: Ongoing.
 - c. Requirements and responsibility for implementation: Kinesiology chair, ATEP Director and Applied Health Science clinical coordinator will continue to develop these aspects of our programs.

f. *Resources*: Proposal for different or new resources

- i. While ATEP resources are sufficient and serve to substantially enhance student learning, the resources for Applied Health Science are lacking at a time when growth in this program has been dramatic. The External Review team noted: “The Athletic Training program is well equipped with a wide range of therapeutic modalities. The Athletic training room is spacious, physically attractive, and well maintained. In contrast the Exercise Science program has one metabolic cart which seems to be dated and perhaps in need of reconditioning.” It deserves noting that most of the current laboratory equipment, including the metabolic cart, was donated from the Naval Health Research Center.

Thus, the first recommendation of the External Site Visit team was: “*Resources need to be put into the Exercise Science major and the Exercise Physiology lab. More personnel, more equipment, and more space, as well as more hands-on opportunities for students.*” Our interpretation of this recommendation follows:

Rationale for new resource requests:

Appendix B demonstrates a 94.5% increase in Kinesiology majors over the past 5 years (108 to 210 majors). It also demonstrates a 100% increase in the percentage of PLNU undergraduate students that Kinesiology serves (from 4.5% of total PLNU undergraduates in 2007-8 to 9% in 2012-3). When we began the program review in 2010, the department had grown about 67% from 2007 to 2010. Clearly this growth has not slowed and we have continued to grow dramatically in the past 2 years. Over this 5-year period, our department budget has not increased, except last year when we requested approximately a 3% increase.

Based on this data, we request a budget increase that closely reflects our department growth and that matches the increasing % of PLNU undergraduate students that we serve. This is a request to utilize the prioritization process that has been discussed in campus wide by reallocating increased resources to Kinesiology commensurate with the undergraduates we serve.

- a. Cost and resource implications: **we request a 35% Kinesiology budget increase (\$10,000) for 2013-14** for increased operational expenses and to contemporize our basic department needs for equipment and laboratory supplies for all majors, but specifically for the Applied Health Science program which has seen the largest growth and has the most antiquated resources.
- b. Timeline for action: 2013-14 budget cycle.

Table 1 outlines basic departmental needs as well as ideal solutions* and estimated quotes:

Basic Need:	Ideal Need and Solution (Prioritized):*	Quote:
Equipment: in laboratory budget for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metabolic cart software upgrade (\$450) • Upgrades to Dartfish 2-dimensional biomechanical motion analysis system (\$300) 	1. Diagnostic Ultrasound machine: Terason T3000, with vascular/musculoskeletal probe (\$26,750) 2. Metabolic cart: **Treadmill (not part of original MOU) Monark 828E Stationary Bicycle Cardiovascular Tester	1. \$26,750 (\$54,500 retail) \$2000 Cart (monitor) \$7000 (Echo probe) <hr/> \$33,500 total 2. 3-yr Warranty \$21,897.29 5-yr Warranty \$24,397.29 <i>Option: Treadmill \$7,022</i> <i>Option: Bike \$6,344</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laboratory updates: (\$2500) New paint, two small conference tables and 20 chairs for K4 classroom/Exercise Science lab. 		Working with physical plant to accomplish this. Kinesiology will cover painting, need help with flooring rather than chairs and tables.
Total (estimated) = \$3,250	Total (estimated) = \$64,840	

- ii. Aside from the 60% additional faculty FTE (see section 3d, page 5) no further faculty staffing is requested at this time.

4. Provost Statement

a. Responding to the University mission

It is unclear from the language of the vision statement how the department's mission aligns to the University mission. It is clear from the feedback gained in the program review process for the Kinesiology department that there is a strong commitment to the Christian mission of the University within the members of the department and the community that forms between faculty and students. However, in looking at the language of the department mission statement, it is unclear how one could distinguish it from a mission statement from a secular university. It is recommended the department revisit this issue and determine if there is anything about "preparing students to inform and improve the health, fitness and quality of life of themselves and those they serve" that finds its roots or meaning in the Christian mission of the University. If so, how can that be articulated more clearly?

b. Program viability and sustainability

The majors within the Kinesiology department have experienced significant growth in over the last few years which mirror the local and national demand trends for these allied health related programs. Our most recent institutional data shows that the programs in Kinesiology fall into a medium demand, moderately low cost category that is operating at or near its capacity given current resources. This combination indicates a healthy and sustainable program moving forward. While the demand for these programs may continue to increase, the dependence upon other science service courses in departments with no current capacity to increase will by necessity limit future growth in the Kinesiology programs. This may create some enrollment management challenges for the University so it is recommended that the University identify and employ strategies to "right size" all of our impacted science and allied health related programs.

c. Cost cutting requirements

Due to the recent high growth in student numbers in the department, it is necessary to increase budgetary funding to Kinesiology as part of the reallocation of funds from a prioritization process. The one area in the department where cost cutting ramifications come into play is with the load assigned to PE Activity courses. There is currently a half unit of unfunded load for each section of these courses (1.5 units for instructor costs but only 1 unit from student revenue). This is an area that will need examination in the 13-14 academic year and the department has offered some potential solutions for this in section 3.C.iii of their action plan. In addition, the external review team identified the issue of whether or not activity courses continued to make sense in today's environment and noted that this question has been addressed differently at other universities. The external review recommendation was to embrace these as a part of the GE program. The administration would like the Kinesiology department to make this an item for further analysis both from a cost/efficiency perspective as well as an external benchmarking perspective. We would like a report with recommendations regarding this in the spring of 2014.

d. Efficiencies in course offerings needed

With the curricular changes that have occurred in the curriculum of the programs, most course efficiencies have been addressed. Given this along with the high number of students in the

programs, this should not be a significant issue for the department in the near future. It is recommended that this be analyzed as part of the department's multi-year assessment efforts for any changes that might make this an issue in the future.

e. Discussion about resource allocation

The program review identified several resource needs in the programs within the department. These needs fall into three categories.

1. Annual Budget-The enrollment in the department nearly doubled over the past 5 years from 100 to 200 students. Over that time the departmental budget only had standard incremental growth while the costs of serving the increased students in laboratory and clinical settings increased dramatically. The 13-14 budget request was increased 35% (\$10,000) to essentially catch up to the growth that had already occurred. This increase is recommended and can be accomplished through reallocation within the academic affairs budgets without an overall net increase. Additionally, the lab and course fees for the department are being analyzed and recommendations will be forthcoming that will identify revenue that can cover the increase in annual budget and help keep pace with adequate equipment and supplies.

2. Facilities and Equipment- The ATR program in Kinesiology, due to its external accreditation and clinical interface, has been well funded and supported in terms of physical space and equipment/supplies. The Exercise Science program has scraped by with limited space and old antiquated equipment that severely limits the education experience of the students. The ATR program is capped so the main growth in Kinesiology has been in the Exercise Science program. The growth has not only been in numbers of students but also in the quality of students. Student feedback through the program review process surfaced a clear student perception of the "haves and have nots" in regards to these programs with the exercise science students feeling like second class citizens. This also carried over into the students' ability to participate in research opportunities in the discipline. The growth in student number and quality has also raised the student expectation levels for what their educational experience should entail. The limited and antiquated equipment that sufficed for a smaller number of students clearly does not meet the current demand and expectations. The department has requested several equipment/software items as well as a facelift for their lab. The total request for these improvements comes in at between \$65-70,000. This amount is available in the 12-13 Academic Equipment budget so it is recommended that we fully fund this request.

3. Staffing- The department was approved a shared position with the Biology department for the coming year and this position was filled. The faculty member will reside in the Kinesiology department but 60% of his load will be teaching in the Biology department Anatomy and Physiology courses, which are service courses for Kinesiology students. The program review process identified a uneven ownership of the programs amongst the faculty that divide roughly along the lines of Teaching Faculty and Faculty Coaches. The external review team also identified differences in professional qualifications for the Kinesiology programs also similarly divided along these lines. The trend over the past few years that will continue over the next few years is for coaches to be hired as staff positions rather than faculty positions. These changes that have and will continue to occur are creating a widening deficit in qualified faculty to teach in the Kinesiology programs, placing a large and growing burden on a shrinking number of faculty. The department is requesting the approval of at least a 60% staffing load increase to bring them to at least a one FTE increase (combined with 40% shared position). As we go through the prioritization process, we should consider shifting a FT faculty position into the Kinesiology department at a minimum. The Kinesiology department is also exploring the possibility in a Masters program which, if it gets approved, will require additional staffing to support both the grad and undergrad programs. It is recommended that a staffing analysis be done over the 13-14 year to determine the appropriate staffing need in this department.

g. Expected program improvements

The rising number and quality of students in the Kinesiology programs has created increased expectations of program quality from both the students and the faculty in the department. This has led to a dramatically revised curriculum and the replacement of an old underperforming major with one that aligns with student demand and employment trends both locally and nationally. Whether the department can rise to the increased expectations will depend on a number of things.

1. Qualified faculty teaching in the department and even distribution of ownership and workload within the faculty of the department. The expectation on faculty in the department is that if they hold a full time faculty position, their highest priority and commitment will be to the academic programs of the department.

2. The newly created learning outcomes and assessment plan for the department will need to be implemented and monitored to determine if the program is achieving the department goals and expectations. This will also require full department participation to create a culture of shared ownership and a continuous improvement in departmental and student learning.

3. The departmental advising loads need to be equitably distributed amongst all of the department's faculty and quality of advising monitored and resources through advisor training efforts. While advising has been identified as a strength in the department, it has been localized to a few individuals. This is not a sustainable model with the dramatic increase in the number of students and complexity of the curricular and clinical experiences. Because of this, the expectation is that those who hold full-time faculty positions within the department will take the responsibility to know and understand their academic programs and how they fit into the university requirements such that they can become effective advisors to their students.

4. Better coordination and shared responsibilities within the department amongst the faculty and staff. The department faces a challenge with the dramatic increase in students in their programs. They have been known for their strong faculty/student community, which is easier to build and maintain with smaller numbers. Many of the former methods of achieving this result may not be scalable to the new size of the programs so it will take a lot more intentional coordination. Departments that have successfully made this kind of shift at PLNU have had to shift their culture from a "chair centered" model of work/responsibility expectations to a "team centered" approach of shared work/responsibility where the chair takes on more of a facilitator role and the faculty share the logistical and administrative responsibilities of the programs.

If the department is able to navigate these issues well and manage the transitions they are experiencing, there should be several evidences that show up in their assessment results. One would expect to continue to see strong student satisfaction in the programs with increasing retention and graduation rates. One would also expect to see an increasing percentage of students getting accepted into allied health graduate programs and/or being employed in allied health related fields post graduation.

5. Resourcing and Institutional support plan

- a. Any budget implications
-See section f above.
- b. Capital improvements including facility, equipment and furniture
-See Table 2 above.
- c. Additional faculty and staff resources
-60% additional faculty FTE

6. Signature page

Signed:

Kerry Fulcher, Ph.D., Provost

Jeff Sullivan, Ph.D., Chair, Kinesiology

Appendix A

Curricular Changes Resulting from the Kinesiology Self Study

1. Phased out the Physical Education major and added the Exercise and Sport Science major (EXSS) for a net decrease of 7 units. The EXSS major allows our students to specialize in various career opportunities in exercise physiology, strength and conditioning, sport nutrition, physical education and coaching. The new major aligns our curriculum with the changing needs of students.
2. Added the following courses to the EXSS Major:
 - EXS 201: Fundamentals of Fitness Assessment and Development (2)
 - EXS 330: Nutrition for Exercise and Sport Performance (3)
 - KIN 340L: Physiology of Exercise Laboratory (1)
 - EXS 350: Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription (3)
 - EXS 350L: Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription Laboratory (1)
3. Deleted the following courses from the catalog:
 - PED 301 (2) Contemporary Health Issues
 - PED 303 (2) Sports Officiating
 - PED 330 (3) History and Trends of Physical Education
 - PED 416 (3) Methods of Teaching Secondary Physical Education
 - PED 450 (3) Psychology & Sport Performance for Coaches and Athletes
4. Combined PED 210 (2): Team Sports Fundamentals (GE) and 212 (2): Team Sports Strategies (GE) into PED 220 (2): Team Sports Fundamentals and Strategies (GE); also combined PED 211 (2): Individual and Dual Sports I (GE) and PED 213 (2): Individual and Dual Sports II (GE) into PED 230 (2): Individual and Dual Sports (GE). Net decrease of 4 units.
5. Added clinical internship experience to the options for upper division requirement in Applied Health Science.
6. Changed PED 300 to PED 200 to accommodate transfer students and the courses that we commonly accept as meeting the requirement for Optimal Health.

Appendix B

Rationale and Justification for Proposed Resource Increases

5-Year Growth in the Kinesiology Department

Kinesiology Student Data	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
# of Declared Majors	108	122	151	179	197	210
% of PLNU undergraduate students	4.5%	5.1%	6.3%	7.5%	8.2%	9%

