
Department of Kinesiology
College of Arts & Sciences
Annual Assessment Report AY20-21
Submission Deadline: November 1, 2021

Program:

Kinesiology

Degree Type:

Kinesiology Major - Bachelor of Science

Faculty Coordinators:

Stephanie Cooper (SLCooper@usfca.edu)

Gerwyn Hughes (GHughes@usfca.edu)

Mission Statement:

“Through our programs of teaching and research, and our service to the community, we advance the knowledge and application of physical activity to promote the health and well-being of all people.”

[Last Modified: April, 2014]

This statement has not changed since the AY 2019-2020 assessment.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

1. Describe the relationship between physical activity participation and health, wellness and quality of life
2. Explain how the scientific process informs our understanding of physical activity
3. Design and evaluate physical activity programs that promote health and improve quality of life
4. Demonstrate an understanding and commitment to physical activity practice
5. Critically evaluate information about physical activity from a scientific basis
6. Critically evaluate research related to physical activity and its impact on health and chronic disease

[Last Modified: March, 2016]

PLOs have not changed since the AY 2019-2020 assessment.

Curricular Map:

KIN Major Requirements	Course #	PLO #1	PLO #2	PLO #3	PLO #4	PLO #5	PLO #6
		<i>Describe the relationship between physical activity participation and health, wellness, and quality of life</i>	<i>Explain how the scientific process informs our understanding of physical activity</i>	<i>Design and evaluate physical activity programs that promote health and improve quality of life</i>	<i>Demonstrate an understanding and commitment to physical activity practice.</i>	<i>Critically evaluate information about physical activity from a scientific basis</i>	<i>Critically evaluate research related to physical activity and its impact on health and chronic disease</i>
Required Lower Division Courses	KIN 100	I	I		I		
	KIN 120	I	I	I	I		
	KIN 200		I	I		I	I
	KIN 220	D	D		D	D	D
Required Upper Division Courses	KIN 300			D		D	D
	KIN 310	M	M	D	D	M	M
	KIN 315	M		D	M		D
	KIN 320		M			M	
	KIN 350		M			M	M
Upper Division Electives	KIN 325	M	M	M	M	M	M
	KIN 330	M		M	D		D
	KIN 335	M	M	M	D	M	M
	KIN 340					M	M
	KIN 354			M	M		D
	KIN 358	M	M	M	M	M	M
	KIN 360	M		D			D
	KIN 362	D		D			
	KIN 368	M	M			M	M
	KIN 398	M	M	M	M	M	M
	KIN 390					M	M
KIN 410					M	M	

I = Introduced

D = Developed

M = Mastered

[Last Modified: August, 2020]

The curricular map has not changed since the AY 2019-2020 assessment

Assessment Schedule:

Spring 2018: Academic Program Review (APR)			
Academic Year	PLOs	Level of Mastery	Course
2018-2019	1, 2, 4	Introduced	KIN 120: Introduction to Kinesiology
2019-2020	1, 2, 4	Introduced	KIN 120: Introduction to Kinesiology
2020-2021	1, 6	Mastered	KIN 325: Exercise & Disease Prevention
2021-2022	3, 5	Mastered	KIN 325: Exercise & Disease Prevention
2022-2023	2, 4	Mastered	KIN 325: Exercise & Disease Prevention
2023-2024	N/A	Indirect Assessment	
2024-2025	N/A	Year of Reflection	
Spring 2026: Estimated Academic Program Review (APR)			

Assessment Methodology:

For the 2020 - 2021 Academic Year (AY), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) 1 and 6 were assessed in KIN 325: Exercise & Disease Prevention. Students enrolled in this upper division elective course are expected to achieve the highest level of understanding for the program, such that they have “mastered” the knowledge and skills associated with every PLO. Since this course is one of only three courses in the major that aims for students to achieve the highest level of content mastery for *all* six of the PLOs, we will be evaluating two PLOs per year across three years. This year’s assessment will focus on the following PLOs:

PLO 1: *Describe the relationship between physical activity participation and health, wellness and quality of life*

PLO 6: *Critically evaluate research related to physical activity and its impact on health and chronic disease*

In order to evaluate the students’ understanding of PLOs 1 and 6, group presentations from the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semesters were assessed. PLO-specific rubrics were created and all faculty members from the kinesiology department evaluated 2-3 video recorded presentations each (see rubrics below). This allowed for each presentation to be independently evaluated twice, and the average score was calculated for each presentation. The average score was converted to a letter grade and categorized as one of the following levels of proficiency:

A (90 - 100%): Exceeds Expectations

C (70 - 79%): Approaches Expectations

B (80 - 89%): Meets Expectations

D/F (<70%): Does Not Meet Expectations

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: PLO 1

PLO 1: Describe the relationship between physical activity participation and health, wellness and quality of life				
	3 pts <i>Full Marks</i>	2 pts <i>Adequate</i>	1 pt <i>Needs Improvement</i>	0 pts <i>No Marks</i>
<p><u>INTRODUCTION 1.</u> Students present information about physical activity and/or fitness levels of participants with this condition/disease and/or present exercise recommendations to take into consideration (FITTP). What is already known about disease and physical activity/exercise response?</p>	<p>Students report on either 1) what is known about effects of PA on this disease; or 2) typical PA/fitness level for someone with this disease or 3) provide at least 1 example of a precaution or change needed for someone with this disease. Information provided was informative, complete and accurate</p>	<p>Students report on either 1) what is known about effects of PA on this disease; or 2) typical PA/fitness level for someone with this disease or 3) provide at least 1 example of a precaution or change needed for someone with this disease. Information provided may have lacked some clarity.</p>	<p>Students report on either 1) what is known about effects of PA on this disease; 2) typical PA/fitness level for someone with this disease and/or 3) provide at least 1 example of a precaution or change needed for someone with this disease. Information provided was incomplete or unclear</p>	<p>Students does not report on either 1) what is known about effects of PA on this disease; 2) typical PA/fitness level for someone with this disease and/or 3) provide at least 1 example of a precaution or change needed for someone with this disease. Information was missing.</p>
	3 pts <i>Full Marks</i>	2 pts <i>Adequate</i>	1 pt <i>Needs Improvement</i>	0 pts <i>No Marks</i>
<p><u>METHODS 2.</u> Describes physical activity curriculum/program components/elements (ie., FITTP)).</p>	<p>Physical activity programming was clear and all aspects of FITTP were provided (as relevant). Information provided was informative, complete and accurate</p>	<p>One important aspect of FITTP was not addressed or clear to understand the PA programming/intervention.. Information provided may have lacked some clarity</p>	<p>Several aspects of FITTP or PA programming were not provided or clear for the intervention. Information provided may have been incomplete or inaccurate</p>	<p>Information about the intervention (ie. FITTP) were missing</p>
	3 pts <i>Full Marks</i>	2 pts <i>Adequate</i>	1 pt <i>Needs Improvement</i>	0 pts <i>No Marks</i>
<p><u>RESULTS 3.</u> Explains at least 2 key graphs/figures of intervention results</p>	<p>2 key graphs/figures and/or tables of results were clearly explained. Information provided was informative, complete and accurate</p>	<p>2 key graphs/figures and/or tables of results were explained, but some results were not clear. Information provided may have lacked some clarity or had unclear components</p>	<p>2 key graphs/figures and/or tables of results were explained, but some results were hard to follow or not clear. Information provided may have been incomplete or inaccurate</p>	<p>Only 1 graph/figure/table was presented. Information was incomplete/inaccurate and unclear.</p>
	3 pts <i>Full Marks</i>	2 pts <i>Adequate</i>	1 pt <i>Needs Improvement</i>	0 pts <i>No Marks</i>
<p><u>RESULTS 4.</u> Summarizes major findings in simple lay words/terms (what did they find?)</p>	<p>Summary of study findings was given in lay terms that was easy to understand. Information provided was informative, complete and accurate</p>	<p>Summary of study findings was given in lay terms but may have not been clear or easy to understand. Information provided may have lacked some clarity</p>	<p>Summary of study findings was given but may have included complex/complicated terminology. Information provided was incomplete</p>	<p>Summary of study findings was missing</p>

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: PLO 6

PLO 6: Critically evaluate research related to physical activity and its impact on health and chronic disease				
	3 pts <i>Full Marks</i>	2 pts <i>Adequate</i>	1 pt <i>Needs Improvement</i>	0 pts <i>No Marks</i>
DISCUSSION 1. Compares/contrasts current study with previous research studies	At least 2 studies were compared/contrasted to the current study with regards to methods/results. Information provided was informative, complete and accurate and easy to follow	At least 1 study was compared/contrasted to the current study with regards to methods/results. Information provided may have lacked some clarity.	Only 1 study was compared/contrasted to the current study with regards to methods/results but Information provided was incomplete or inaccurate	No comparison to previous research was provided.
	3 pts <i>Full Marks</i>	2 pts <i>Adequate</i>	1 pt <i>Needs Improvement</i>	0 pts <i>No Marks</i>
DISCUSSION 2. Discuss strengths and weaknesses of the study	At least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses were given for the study design. Information provided was informative, complete and accurate	2 strengths and 2 weaknesses were given but may not have addressed the study design or weren't clear. Information provided may have lacked some clarity	Only 1 strength and/or 1 weakness was given – or those presented did not address study design. Information provided was incomplete or inaccurate	No strengths or weaknesses were given.
	3 pts <i>Full Marks</i>	2 pts <i>Adequate</i>	1 pt <i>Needs Improvement</i>	0 pts <i>No Marks</i>
DISCUSSION 3. Describes implications of result -what does this mean and why should we care? Interpret findings for clinical care of this disease/disability – what does this mean when working as an exercise professional with someone who has this disease/disability?	Implications for findings are clear regarding translation to real world. Information provided was informative, complete and accurate	Implications for findings may have lacked some clarity	Implications provided was incomplete or inaccurate	Implications not provided
	3 pts <i>Full Marks</i>	2 pts <i>Adequate</i>	1 pt <i>Needs Improvement</i>	0 pts <i>No Marks</i>
DISCUSSION 4. Identify any important future research questions or studies	At least 2 future directions were suggested and explained. Information provided was informative, complete and accurate	At least 2 future directions were suggested and explained but may have been unclear. Information provided may have lacked some clarity	Only 1 future direction was suggested and explained. Information was incomplete or inaccurate	No future directions for research were reported.

Assessment Results:

Eleven group presentations were evaluated from the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 cohorts, with a cumulative total of 33 students evaluated. Overall, the students tended to have a higher level of mastery for PLO 1 (*Describe the relationship between physical activity participation and health, wellness and quality of life*) than PLO 6 (*Critically evaluate research related to physical activity and its impact on health and chronic disease*). Please see the tables below.

PLO 1: Describe the relationship between physical activity participation and health, wellness and quality of life

Grade	Level of understanding	# of groups	% of presentations
A	Exceeds expectations	4	36
B	Meets expectations	5	46
C	Approaches expectations	1	9
D, F	Does not meet expectations	1	9

Based on the presentations reviewed, 82% of students who were enrolled in KIN 325 for AY 2020-2021 met or exceeded the expectations for understanding PLO 1.

PLO 6: Critically evaluate research related to physical activity and its impact on health and chronic disease

Grade	Level of understanding	# of groups	% of presentations
A	Exceeds expectations	3	28
B	Meets expectations	2	18
C	Approaches expectations	3	27
D, F	Does not meet expectations	3	27

Based on the presentations reviewed, 46% of the students enrolled in KIN 325 for AY 2020-2021 met or exceeded the expectations for understanding PLO 6.

The large difference between the percentage of students who reached an acceptable level of understanding of PLO 1 and PLO 6 suggests that future KIN 325 classes should involve more opportunities to refine the students' ability to critically evaluate research. One way to address this would be to develop more in-class activities or assignments centered around critical evaluation of research prior to completing the presentation. Greater insight to the results of the assessment were obtained by discussing the results with the faculty member who taught the course, as well as, the entire department. The main points of discussion can be found in the next section: *Disbursement of Findings to KIN Faculty*.

Disbursement of Findings to KIN Faculty

The assessment report was shared with the faculty in the kinesiology department on October 6, 2021, and was discussed at the faculty meeting on Thursday, October 21, 2021, where faculty were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the results. Faculty members offered the following comments which we feel give further context to the results and help with their interpretation:

- There are several assignments within any course that will address the same PLOs. Thus, evaluating a single assignment in a given course may not adequately address mastery of all components for a given PLO.
- The assignment that was evaluated happened in the middle of the course, at which point the students were still developing the skills required to meet PLO 6. This PLO was assessed again towards the end of the course with a written paper. Therefore, while some students did not demonstrate mastery of this PLO in this particular assessment, it is likely that many of those students will have demonstrated mastery of this PLO by the time they got to the end of the course.

Additionally, faculty discussed how students tend to perform on this type of assessment in other courses, which is often structured in a similar way:

- The assessment of PLO 1 was covered by the Introduction and Methods sections of the presentations, whereas PLO 6 was assessed by the Results and Discussion sections. Typically, students find it more challenging to critically evaluate the Results and Discussion sections for an assignment compared to simply describing the Introduction and Methods. The inherent difference in the level of understanding that is required for PLO 1 (“describe”) compared to PLO 6 (“critically evaluate”) may partially explain the difference in the performance of each PLO assessed.

Overall, the department believes this assessment process has been successful. In particular, the clear and detailed assessment criteria that were developed were helpful in allowing all faculty within the department to participate in the scoring of the presentations and resulted in good consistency between scorers. Additionally, discussing and identifying the limitations of the report as a department allowed for meaningful conversation about the impact that assignment timing and expectations can have on evaluating students’ mastery of content associated with each PLO. We plan to build on the findings of this report by assessing the four other PLOs that are covered by this same class over the next two academic years. We will use the results of this report to help inform the decision of which assignments from the class to evaluate to ensure we get a fair and complete representation of the students’ performance on those PLOs.

Department Response to 2020 Assessment Report

Feedback from the 2020 assessment report was overwhelmingly positive, and we were grateful that our efforts in developing a strong report were recognized (e.g. *“Your department's efforts to utilize assessment results for program improvements are among the most thorough in the College!”*). The faculty as a whole appreciated the positive feedback. As a department, we continue to discuss various methods to teach and assess student understanding of the PLOs.