Part A

1. Graduate program PLOs are collectively decided upon through frequent discussion in the graduate committee meetings and subsequent department-wide faculty meetings. Over the past three years, the PLO objectives for the graduate program have been a constant agenda item and numerous small modifications have been made so that the revised PLOs accurately reflect program objectives and outcomes. In addition to the PLO revisions, the graduate program coordinator has developed a rubric that can be used in the Plan B evaluation in order to collect more meaningful PLO assessment outcome data.

List of Kinesiology Graduate Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Upon completion of the Master’s degree program in the Department of Kinesiology, students should be able to:

1) Demonstrate the ability to conduct and critique research using theoretical and applied knowledge. [Demonstration of PLO 1 through successful completion of the Plan A /B culminating experience and/or successful completion of final term papers in KIN 250/251]

2) Interpret and apply research findings to a variety of disciplines within Kinesiology. [Demonstration of PLO 1 through successful completion of the Plan A /B culminating experience and/or successful completion of final term papers in KIN 250/251]

3) Effectively communicate essential theories, scientific applications, and ethical considerations in each student's Kinesiology program concentration. [Demonstration of PLO 1 through successful completion of the Plan A /B culminating experience and/or successful completion of final term papers in KIN 250/251]

4) Interpret and apply research findings through acquired skills in order to become agents of change to address issues in Kinesiology through the application of knowledge and research. [Demonstration of PLO 1 through successful completion of the Plan A /B culminating experience and/or successful completion of final term papers in KIN 250/251]
2. **Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULGs)**

During the 2013---2014 academic year the former graduate coordinator (now department chair) attended several GAPE/GS&R presentations that discussed mapping PLOs to ULGs. In Fall of 2014, the current graduate coordinator attended a GUP meeting of all the SJSU graduate coordinators/heads in which Kathy Roe discussed WASC and how it related to assessment. Initial mapping was conducted for WASC accreditation in 2013-2014, and slight changes in the PLO language were made to address the minor gaps in assessment identified by the WASC assessment task-force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULG</th>
<th>Program Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLO # 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>PLO # 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>PLO # 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>PLO # 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>PLO # 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>PLO # 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>PLO # 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>PLO # 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>PLO # 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>PLO # 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Alignment – Matrix of PLOs to Courses**

Kinesiology Graduate program PLOs are assessed in one or more of the following core classes:

**Core Classes**
- KIN 250
- KIN 251

**Culminating Experience**
- KIN 298 (Project)
- KIN 298 (Thesis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIN PLOs</th>
<th>KIN Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Demonstrate the ability to conduct and critique research using theoretical and applied knowledge.</td>
<td>KIN 250, KIN 251, KIN 298 or KIN 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Interpret and apply research findings to a variety of disciplines within Kinesiology.</td>
<td>KIN 250, KIN 251, KIN 298 or KIN 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Effectively communicate essential theories, scientific applications, and ethical considerations in each student's Kinesiology program concentration.</td>
<td>KIN 250, KIN 251, KIN 298 or KIN 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Interpret and apply research findings through acquired skills in order to become agents of change to address issues in Kinesiology through the application of knowledge and research.</td>
<td>KIN 250, KIN 251, KIN 298 or KIN 299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Planning – Assessment Schedule**

Please indicate a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that describes PLO assessment and improvement of achievement, as well as other assessment activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Student Experience**

PLOs are presented to students through several formats including the Kinesiology website (http://www.sjsu.edu/kinesiology/learning_outcomes/) and all graduate syllabi. By presenting this information in a consistent manner through all undergraduate course work we endeavor to make students aware of the PLOs. In the coming year we will work to highlight the ways that ULGs are also addressed within our curriculum. In the future, we will solicit graduate student representation at the graduate committee meeting and will incorporate student feedback in future PLO discussions.

**Part B**

The following items 6-9 will be embedded in the Department of Kinesiology’s Undergraduate Program Assessment and are available on the IEA website.

6. **Graduation Rates for Total, Non URM and URM students (per program and degree)**

7. **Headcounts of program majors and new students (per program and degree)**

8. **SFR and average section size (per program)**

9. **Percentage of tenured/tenure-track instructional faculty (per department)**

In AY 2014-2015, two new tenure-track faculty members were hired to begin in AY2015-2016. While one replaces a faculty that has left the department, the other is a new hire who, given his current research agenda, will be able to step in immediately and mentor graduate students. In fact, in Spring 2015, he assisted in mentoring a KIN 298 graduate student.

**Part C**

10. **Closing the Loop/Recommended Actions**

In order to close the loop, the graduate program coordinator has created a rubric to be used on the evaluation of PLOs for the KIN 298 plan B projects. The intent is to provide a more accurate and
more efficient way to collect assessment data. Since the KIN298/299 experiences are necessarily cumulative in nature, graduate faculty feel as though they are ideal for assessing PLOs. Starting in Spring of 2013 and continuing into 2015, faculty have specifically added PLO evaluation mechanism to the plan B KIN 298 project evaluation process. These pointed PLO evaluation conversations have helped to pin-point and highlight successful achievement of PLOs. In addition, beginning in Fall 2014 and continuing through Spring 2015, the rich dialogue that occurs during the collective evaluation process of the KIN 298 project was also used to inform assessment. This process was useful as an assessment tool because with new faculty mentoring graduate students, any taken-for-granted assumptions faculty might have after having participated in the process since its inception in 2001 can be (and were, in fact) challenged by faculty newer to the process. One example from the Fall 2014 Plan B evaluation meeting was particularly notable, in that instead of using the rubric as originally intended and outlined (i.e., remedial through mastery), one faculty in his first Plan B meeting instead gave a 1-5 numerical rank for each of the four 298 components, and then an overall total numerical score for each project. This new idea prompted a conversation about whether a more quantitative rubric, with points assigned by faculty, would be a clearer way to determine whether a project passed or failed. The graduate committee will further discuss the proposed rubric changes in Fall 2015, but suffice to say the evolving evaluative process has yielded a much tighter way of assessing student success via the 298 projects.

A more challenging part of “closing the loop” in the assessment process is the use of the two core classes, KIN 250 and Kin 251, for program level assessment. In one sense, 250 and 251 are ideal classes to gauge student attainment of program outcomes since all graduate students must take each of the core classes; however, the committee has yet to implement an efficient and consistent measure of program assessment in each class. The goal in the 2016-2016 academic year is to further discuss and streamline better assessment strategies in each of these classes. One specific issue that will be discussed further is how to ensure that course content is more similar across instructors of the KIN 250 course. For KIN 251, the two instructors responsible for teaching or co-teaching the course every semester use similar assignments and virtually all of the same course readings.

11. Assessment Data
Data was collected for PLO 4 in Fall 2014, as well as Spring 2015. In general, faculty relied on the evaluation of KIN 298 projects to evaluate program learning outcomes, as there were few theses defended during the 2014-2015 academic year. The KIN 298 evaluation process presents a perfect opportunity time to engage in the assessment process, as multiple faculty evaluate the projects using a rubric that has been improved upon multiple times since the inception of KIN 298 projects in 2000. In Fall of 2014, while only 1 out of 12 Plan B projects required modifications, this number is misleading. At the beginning of the semester, over 15 students registered for KIN 298, and having talked with students and faculty, it was clear that students who would have gone forward with their presentations in past years now understand that the level of rigor is such that anything other than top-level projects will not receive favorable evaluations, and perhaps even fail. This “self-selection” on the part of students should be taken as a positive indication that the rigor of the KIN 298 Plan B
process has improved, and is now clear to students and faculty.

In Spring of 2015, a record number (n = 31) of Plan B 298 projects were presented. Again, it is worth noting that four students pulled out before the defenses. Thus, 30 out of 31 projects ultimately passed, with one having to come back in December.

12. Analysis
The data gathered from the KIN 298 plan B project evaluation in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 clearly indicate that our faculty are committed to student learning and that, with two exceptions, students are able to effectively communicate essential theories and scientific application of program concentration through the presentation of their final culminating projects. In addition, students in both KIN 250 and 251 are required to consider ethical dimensions of research in each of these core classes. In KIN 250, for example, students much successfully complete on-line human subjects training module, and in the final paper for KIN 251, students must explicate how participant confidentiality would be maintained in a mock-research study. In addition, exam questions in both KIN 250 and 251 specifically address issues of ethics in research environments.

Proposed changes and goals (if any)
During the deliberation sessions, faculty created a short list of suggestions to enhance the Plan B process, including: 1) Clearer expectations (e.g., page number requirements) for the deliverable portion of the projects, 2) More information for faculty who are new to advising KIN 298 students, and 3) A more equal distribution of seasoned and newer 298 faculty advisors across the two Plan B sessions. (Note: Due to the large number of projects, projects were divided into two sections) These changes will be implemented in Fall 2015. Other proposed changes for the next year include the consideration of further development of Plan B rubrics that can be used in the assessment process, continued discussion of the aligning PLOs and ULOs, “best practice conversations” about how to better integrate program outcomes across the curriculum, and making a final determination on the process of collecting meaningful assessment data in KIN 250 and 251. Finally, the graduate coordinator is in the process of developing a very brief exit survey, to be administered in Fall 2015, that all thesis and project students would complete when they submit their final papers. It will involve an assessment of how much students relied on the two core courses (250 and 251) for their final theses and projects, and how much they relied on their overall coursework during their culminating experiences. Ideally, students would obviously rely heavily on the two research methods courses, in particular, but it will be helpful to know if this is the case, and to what extent.