**2017-2018 Annual Program Assessment Report**

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to [james.solomon@csun.edu](mailto:james.solomon@csun.edu), Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by September 28, 2018. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. **Please identify your department/program in the file name for your report.**

**College: Health and Human Development**

**Department: Kinesiology**

**Program:**

**Assessment liaison: Teri Todd**

* **Please check off whichever is applicable:**

**A. \_\_\_\_X\_\_\_\_ Measured student work within program major/options.**

**B. \_\_\_\_X\_\_\_ Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options.**

**C. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options.**

**D. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Focused exclusively on the direct assessment measurement of General Education Natural Sciences learning outcomes**

* **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet,provide a brief overview of this year’s assessment activities, including:
* an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, application, or GE assessment) that it enacted
* if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
* if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year’s analyses and past and future assessment activities
* if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
* if your program implemented **option D**, exclusively or simultaneously with **options** **A, B, and/or C**, identify the basic skill(s) assessed and the precise learning outcomes assessed, the assessment instruments and methodology employed, and the resulting scores
* in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university’s commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
* any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments
* **Preview of planned assessment activities for 2018-19.** Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

Overview of Annual Assessment Projects:

The primary assessment project was to assess the relationship of prerequisite classes and two high DUF courses (KIN 345, KIN 346) in the KIN core, a second project was undertaken in conjunction with the College of HHD SLO2 as described in the HHD SLO alignment, and a third project was to continue assessment of the graduate program in Kinesiology.

KIN 345 and KIN 346

While 4 and 6-year graduation rates for the Department of Kinesiology are in-line with the College of HHD and even exceed Northridge campus for the 6-year rate the faculty shares an interest in the CSU graduation initiative. KIN 345 and KIN 346 are 2 courses in the Kinesiology core with high DFW rates; therefore it was interested to investigate these courses.

Graduation rates

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CSU Northridge | College of Health and Human Development | Kinesiology |
| 4-year | 13% | 11% | 11% |
| 6-year | 51% | 54% | 56% |

\*data from CSU Student Success Dashboard

All students majoring in Kinesiology have to take several prerequisite courses and a common core as outlined below

### A. Lower Division Prerequisite Courses (20 units)

#### 1. Lower Division Science and Math Requirements (14 units)

Note: 8 of the 14 units double count in General Education and the major.

BIOL 101/L General Biology and Lab (3/1)  
[BIOL 211](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/biol/courses/biol-211/)/[212](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/biol/courses/biol-212/) Human Anatomy/Laboratory Studies in Human Anatomy (2/1)  
[BIOL 281 Human Physiology (3)](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/biol/courses/biol-281/)  
[MATH 140 Introductory Statistics (4)](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/math/courses/math-140/)

### B. Upper Division Core (21 units)

[KIN 300 Foundations and Analysis of Human Movement (3)](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/kin/courses/kin-300/)  
[KIN 305 Historical and Philosophical Bases of Kinesiology (4)](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/kin/courses/kin-305/)  
[KIN 306 Socio-Psychological Aspects of Physical Activity (3)](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/kin/courses/kin-306/)  
[KIN 345/L Biomechanics and Lab (3/1)](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/kin/courses/kin-345l/)  
[KIN 346/L Physiology of Exercise and Lab (3/1)](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/kin/courses/kin-346l/)  
[KIN 377 Motor Learning and Control (3)](https://catalog.csun.edu/academics/kin/courses/kin-377/)

Prerequisite courses were chosen to provide students with foundational knowledge on which the upper division core courses can build. KIN 345 Biomechanics has a non-passing rate of 20% and ranges between 18-26% for individual years. Approximately 515-530 students take KIN 345 each academic year. KIN 346 Physiology of Exercise has a non-passing rate of 26% for all years, ranging from 23-32% in individual years. Enrollment over the past three academic years has been 562-564 students per year. The impact of the non-passing rates is high and effects students’ ability to graduate in a timely fashion. The lab portion of the classes have non-passing rates of 6% and 7%. All data were obtained from the CSU Student Success Dashboard.

It is of interest to explore why KIN 345 and KIN 346 have a high non-passing rate. Biomechanics and Physiology of Exercise are in the expertise of faculty in the options of Exercise Science and Applied Fitness, therefore discussion was initiated with faculty in these options to decide upon assessment that would provide meaningful information on which to base curricular decisions. Faculty were interested in exploring the relationship between prerequisite course performance in Biology (BIOL 101) and human physiology (BIOL 281) and grades in KIN 345 and KIN 346. It should be noted that these classes can be taken at junior colleges and many transfer students come into the program with these completed. Therefore, grades from courses that transferred from a junior college and met the requirement of BIOL 211 and BIOL 281 were used for transfer students. A request for this data was made to the Office of Institutional Research, grades for the four courses for each student were requested for five semesters: Spring 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017, Fall 2017, and Spring 2018.

The following were identified as questions of interest for exploring the data:

1. What is the relationship between BIOL 101 and KIN345 and KIN346?
2. What is the relationship between BIOL 281 and KIN345 and KIN346?
3. Is BIOL101 (IV) a good predictor of KIN 345 (DV); KIN346 (DV)?
4. Is BIOL 281 a good predictor of KIN345; KIN346?
5. Are both foundation courses good predictors of KIN345; KIN346?
6. Do FTT students do better in KIN 345 compared to FTF?
7. Do FTT students do better in KIN 34 6 compared to FTF?

Statistical analysis of grades from 1221- 1479 students was performed using SPSS 24 software.

**Relationship between BIOL 101, BIOL 281 and KIN 345, KIN 346**

Correlation and predictive analyses

Student letter grades were converted into GPA. Spearman rho was used to explore the correlation between the variables of interest (refer to Table 1 below). All correlations were positive, moderate and statistically significant.

Table 1: Correlation Matrix

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | KIN345 | KIN346 |
| BIO101 | .408\*\*(1221) | .365\*\*(1293) |
| BIO281 | .499\*\*(1359) | .490\*\*(1431) |

*Notes.* \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Values inside the parenthesis denote sample size

Separate simple linear regression analyses were calculated to explore if the two foundational courses (BIO101 and BIO281) are good predictors of success in two major upper division courses (KIN345 and KIN346).

*BIOL 101 and KIN 345*

GPA scores obtained in BIOL 101 and KIN 345 were moderately positively correlated, *r*(1221) = .41, *p* < .001. A significant regression equation was found (*F*(1, 1220) = 226.31, *p* < .001 with a *R2* of .16 indicating that BIOL 101 is a good predictor of KIN 345 and accounts for 16% of the variance in grades for that course.

*BIOL 101 and KIN 346*

GPA scores obtained in BIOL 101 and KIN 346 were moderately positively correlated, *r*(1359) = .50, *p* < .001. A significant regression equation was found (*F*(1, 11358) = 458.01, *p* < .001 with a *R2* of .25 indicating that BIOL 101 is a good predictor of KIN 346 and accounts for 25% of the variance in grades for that course.

*BIOL 281 and KIN 345*

GPA scores obtained in BIOL 281 and KIN 345 were moderately positively correlated, *r*(1358) = .50, *p* < .001. A significant regression equation was found (*F*(1, 1357) = 314.27, *p* < .001 with a *R2* of .25 indicating that BIOL 281 is a good predictor of KIN 345 and accounts for 25% of the variance in grades for that course.

*BIOL 281 and KIN 346*

GPA scores obtained in BIOL 281 and KIN 346 were moderately positively correlated, *r*(1401) = .49, *p* < .001. A significant regression equation was found (*F*(1, 11358) = 458.01, *p* < .001 with a *R2* of .23 indicating that BIOL 101 is a good predictor of KIN 346 and accounts for 23% of the variance in grades for that course.

Summary: Both prerequisite classes, BIOL 101 and BIOL 281 are good predictors of grades in KIN 345 and KIN 346, with BIOL 281 being a slightly stronger predictor. Presently there is not minimum grade requirement for BIOL 101 or BIOL 281 to enter KIN 345 and KIN 346; this may be considered to ensure students have the necessary skills to complete the upper division courses.

**Comparison of FTF and FTT success in KIN 345 and KIN 346**

A Pearson Chi-square analysis was carried out to compare grade outcomes of FTF and FTT students in the two core courses. It was reasoned that FTT students would take the prerequisite classes (BIOLogy and physiology) at junior college before they transfer to Kinesiology. A linear by linear relationship was used to compare the grades in KIN 345 and KIN 346 between FTT and FTF as the DV data are ordinal in nature.

KIN 345: There was a significant difference between the grades for FTF and FTT students in KIN 345 with FTT students scoring higher. Pearson chi-square 2 36.77 (1, n=1401) , p <.001).

KIN 346: There was some difference between the groups but the grade difference was not significant (Pearson chi-square 2 21.31 (1, n=1479), p = 0.030).

**Summary**: Full time transfer students score higher grades than full time freshman students in KIN 345. There is no significant difference between the two groups for KIN 346.

Information about the relationship between prerequisite courses BIOL 101 and BIOL 281 and upper division core classes KIN 345 and KIN 346 will be shared with faculty. The statistics can help inform decisions in regard to the prerequisite courses for these two high DFW classes.

Assessment of HHD SLO 2 Cultural Competence

Assessment liaisons were asked to complete a Comprehensive Assessment Plan of HHD college SLOs. One class and assignment were identified for each SLO. The internship team suggested assessing HHD SLO 2 as i) it is important when working with the public, ii) the learning activity was new and effectiveness was not known, iii)preceptors had indicated strong cultural competence in interns in the past and we wanted to compare that to interns’ self-perception.

HHD SLO 2: Cultural Competencies: Students will actively engage in diverse local and global communities, demonstrating knowledge and awareness of multi-cultural differences and disparities of the health and well-being of individuals and families.

Cultural Awareness:

2.1 Recognizes and acts upon cultural factors that affect health and well-being of others.

2.2 Demonstrates ability to interact effectively with people of different cultures.

In discussion with faculty is was recognized that one part of being culturally aware was to develop one’s knowledge of personal biases and how this might affect behavior in different settings. This is in agreement with the concept of Cultural competence as defined by the National Center for Cultural Competence (NCCC).

Cultural competence is partly defined by the NCCC as

* Have a defined set of values and principles, and demonstrate behaviors, attitudes, policies, and structures that enable them to work effectively cross-culturally.
* Have the capacity to (1) value diversity, (2) conduct self-assessment, (3) manage the dynamics of difference, (4) acquire and institutionalize cultural knowledge, and (5) adapt to diversity and the cultural contexts of communities they serve.

The internship course was identified as the course for assessing HHD SLO2 in the Spring 2018 Comprehensive Assessment Plan. Students in Kinesiology have the opportunity to complete a 1 to 6 unit internship. Internship students enroll in KIN 494A (1 unit) or 494B (2 units) or combination, students may take up to 3 units in one semester. One option, Applied Fitness requires one unit of internship while the course is an upper division elective for the other options. In addition to completing hours at the internship site two assignments must be completed during the semester.

Cultural competence is an important aspect when working with the public, which is a large part of our discipline, it was also identified as a topic of interest by students at the first internship meeting. A two part on-line assignment was created for meeting two. The assignment consisted of having students complete i) watch “Unpacking and Transforming Biases” a Tedx video, ii) complete one Harvard Implicit Bias test, and iii) create a video reflection or paper in response to the following prompt:

* Identify which bias test you completed. Did the result surprise you? Knowing the result can you relate that to your actions on non-action in different situations?
* How do you believe an individual might go about addressing their own personal biases?
* In the future, when you have graduated, how will this knowledge assist you?

Responses were recorded via YouTube or written paper and uploaded to Canvas.

A rubric was created to assess the responses of students on their cultural awareness and attitudes and recognition of personal bias (Appendix A). The rubric was tested on 10% of responses with the KIN 494 instructor team, responses were compared and the rubric revised slightly. Inter-rater reliability was 83%. It should be noted that the instructor team does not evaluate student work for the course, faculty mentors are responsible for assigning grades. The rubric was designed to indicate if a student demonstrated cultural awareness during the prompt response or not, therefore there were two classifications, aware (1 point) and lacKINg awareness (0 points) for each category. One hundred and fifty-three students out of the 160 students enrolled in the internship course completed the assignment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Aware | Lacking Awareness |
| Cultural awareness | 130 (84.9%) | 23 (14.1%) |
| Recognition of bias | 143 (93.5%) | 10 ( 6.5%) |
| Cultural attitudes | 124 (81.0%) | 29 ( 9.0%) |

The majority of students recognized that a) they have implicit bias and b) that this bias can influence interactions with other people. Approximately 60% of the students expressed some surprise at the results of the implicit bias test. A few students acknowledged that they had biases but explained that they were not interested in exploring their biases or changing anything they do in response to information that biases can impact interactions.

Nearly 85% of the students were reflective of how their attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities, often acknowledging the numerous cultures that are part of our landscape. Many students (81%) expressed interest in learning about other cultures.

The multi-media assignment appears to be effective in increasing awareness of implicit bias and cultural awareness. Some students recognized that they had biases but did not deem it important to be aware how their actions might affect their interactions with others. This assignment was designed to create awareness not change, though it is unfortunate that some students do not want to address their biases they do realize that they exist. Overall the assignment was successful and will be repeated in the future. Students in the internship course demonstrated cultural competence as outlined by HHD SLO 2.

**KINESIOLOGY GRADUATE PROGRAM**

The Department of Kinesiology has a vibrant graduate program with an average of 68 students each academic year. SLO 3 was evaluated during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle.

Kinesiology Graduate SLOs

1. Demonstrate a comprehensive and theoretical understanding of Kinesiology through oral and written expression.

2. Synthesize and apply theoretical concepts from the Kinesiology research literature to the student's chosen area of study.

3. Conceptualize, plan and conduct a scholarly research or professional project based on a review of appropriate literature and utilizing appropriate methodologies.

An assessment tool was implemented six years ago to assess progress throughout the program and evaluate the three SLOs. The assessment tool (Appendix B) is used to assess student work during a required course (gateway course) KIN 605 Research Methods, and assess the written thesis and oral defense presentation (capstone project). The assessment tool consists of two rubrics, one for written projects and one for oral presentations. There are six components for each rubric. Each component is evaluated on a scale from one to six with one being needs improvement and six outstanding.

SLO 3 coincides with assessment of the graduate thesis or graduate project, the same assessment tool is used for both.

Average scores for each component during the past nine academic years are presented for the written thesis/project.

One hundred and fifty-three students completed the Master’s program since 2009. data has been collected on forty-six of the students, representing 30% of the 153 graduate students who completed the program.

**Graduate Thesis/Projects**

All categories have a maximum score of 6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Abstract** | **Research question** | **Methodology** | **Supporting Evidence** | **Conclusions**  **/implications** | **Writing** |
| 2009-10 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.9 |
| 2010-11 | 5 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 5 |
| 2011-12 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 5.6 |
| 2012-13 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 5.2 |
| 2013-14 | 4.8 | 5 | 5 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 4.2 |
| 2014-15 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.5 |
| 2015-16 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 6 | 5.7 | 6 |
| 2016-17 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.7 |
| 2017-18 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 5 | 4.7 |

Scores remain stable, with scores beteen 4.2-6/6, over the nine year period indicating that students meet SLO 3. The strongest category is Research Question and weakest categories are Conclusion and Writing. Overall there is little variation in scores. An online assessment system may be helpful in collecting more evaluations. Presently the paper assessment sheets are only turned on for less than 50% of graduating students. This information will be shared with faculty.

**Planned Assessment Activities for 2017-2018**

Kinesiology is presently writing a 7th year review document, part of this process is to create a multi-year assessment plan. At the moment, this topic is under discussion.

Results of the relationship between grades in prerequisite courses BIOL 101 and BIOL 281 with final grades for KIN 345 and KIN 346 will be presented to faculty for discussion.

HHD SLOs are currently being revised and we anticipate developing an instrument to assess the revised HHD SLOs through preceptor surveys and direct assessment. KIN SLO3 will be assessed using the rubric piloted in 2018-2019 in a gateway and capstone class.

Appendix A Cultural Competence Rubric

Cultural Competence Rubric

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Aware | LacKINg awareness |
| Cultural Awareness | Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. | Expresses attitudes and believes as an individual from a one-sided view. Is indifferent or resistant from what can be learned from diverse communities and cultures. |
| Recognition of Bias | Articulates the influence of one’s own assumptions, judgments, and/or biases during interactions with one’s own cultures and the culture of others. | Demonstrates little or no awareness of one’s own assumptions, judgements, and/or biases about self and others. |
| Cultural Attitudes | Expresses interest in learning about other cultures, seeks information on history, values, communication styles, beliefs, and/or practices. | States minimal to no interest in learning more about cultures other than their own. |

Resources: Weber State University Cultural Competency Rubric

www.weber.edu/wsuimages/SAAssessment/Rubric

Appendix B: Department of Kinesiology Thesis Rubric

