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PLO 1. Develop a critical understanding and the ability to apply theoretical and scientific knowledge from the sub-disciplines in kinesiology for personal fitness, healthy lifestyles, sport, and/or therapeutic rehabilitation.

Faculty teaching the following courses contributed to this report: KIN 70 (2 sections), KIN 100W, KIN 155, KIN 165, KIN 191B, and KIN 194.

Initial Evidence of Student Learning:

KIN 70: The second exam tests students’ knowledge and understanding of and ability to apply theoretical and scientific knowledge across the kinesiology subdisciplines of history, sociology, philosophy, motor behavior, psychology, and biomechanics of sport and exercise. In Spring 2012, 72% of students who took this exam scored 70% or higher.

KIN 70: This is the first semester for data collection (spring 2012). In final exam, students answered a culminating essay question concerning the broad domain of kinesiology and its sub disciplines and how the sub disciplines contribute to practice. Sixty-nine percent of the students achieved a score of 70% or greater.

KIN 100W: Students submitted an APA formatted annotated bibliography of 10 scholarly sources published within the past 10 years. At least 3 of these sources illuminated multicultural considerations.
of their topics. In addition, students also included 3 .gov or non-profit websites summaries. For each source, students included a correct APA reference citation and provided a paragraph of 5-8 sentences that: 1) summarized the main argument of the source; 2) outlined the topic and scope; 2) overviewed the methods and critical results; 3) relayed the implications of the research; and 4) explained how the source will be helpful in developing their research topics.

Students were graded on their abilities to: (a) write with brevity and precision of expression, (b) recognize and produce different styles and levels of writing, (c) locate and effectively use appropriate resources, (d) perform effectively the essential steps in the writing process (prewriting, organizing, composing, revising, and editing), (e) express (explain, analyze, develop, and criticize) ideas effectively, (f) use correct grammar (syntax, mechanics, and citation of sources) at a college level of sophistication, (g) use (locate, analyze, and evaluate) supporting materials, including independent library research, and (h) express (explain, analyze, develop, and criticize) ideas effectively, including ideas encountered in multiple readings and expressed in different forms of discourse.

KIN 155: PLO1 was evaluated during the Spring 2012 semester via student completion of lab reports, lab examinations, and lecture examinations. In terms of the lab reports, 71% of the students received a letter grade of a C or higher with 29% of the students receiving a letter grade below a C, primarily because they did not complete the lab reports for grading. In terms of the lab examinations, 77% of the students received a letter grade of C or higher with 23% of the students receiving a letter grade below a C on the lab examinations. In terms of the lecture examinations, 74% of the students received a letter grade of C or higher with 26% of the students receiving a letter grade below a C on the lab examinations. In terms of evidence of overall student learning in the course, 30% of the students received a final letter grade of an A, 21% received a letter grade of a B, 33% received a letter grade of a C, 11% received a letter grade below a C, and 5% withdrew from the course. KIN 155

KIN 165: This is the first semester for data collection (spring 2012). In the final exam, students answered a culminating essay question concerning motor development across the lifespan and the connection with the four developmental domains described in the text. Fifty-five percent of the students achieved a score of 70% or greater.

KIN 191B: Students will achieve a C or better on their final oral/practical exams if they effectively demonstrate knowledge of application principles and how to determine injury and proper rehabilitation based on their critical thinking skills of evaluation procedures. 52 out of 55 students scored a C or better.

KIN 194: Students will achieve a C or better on their final rehabilitation design if they incorporate critical thinking and problem solving skills to design a therapeutic exercise/rehabilitation program for an injury from the time of injury until the patient returns to activity.

Summary: Assessment of student learning was primarily conducted through examinations and papers, with one class using an oral/practical exam. There was a significant range in evidence of student learning with some classes reporting that as few as 55% of students scored at 70% or better, to a high of 94% of students achieving at 70% or better. It appears that when students were assessed using oral and
practical exams the passing rate was considerably higher. Overall approximately 70% of students were assessed as demonstrating a passing level in classes across the major.

Change(s) to Curriculum or Pedagogy:

KIN 70: Changes in the lectures will involve including more examples of applying theoretical knowledge in practical settings.

KIN 70: Greater emphasis in lecture and class discussions/activities emphasizing connection between sub disciplines in kinesiology and professional practice.

KIN 100W: Special focus has been placed on how to develop a scholarly research paper (literature review) in stages, by directing assignments toward teaching students the steps to develop sound research writing and skills. Student grades, on related assignments assessed with SLO#1, indicate that this focus on research process, has improved student overall understanding and abilities to comprehend and analyze research in Kinesiology-related disciplines.

KIN 155: In terms of future changes to the curriculum, greater emphasis will be placed on preparing students for the lab and written examinations by placing emphasis on key concepts and points during labs and lecture. Also, students will receive greater encouragement to complete the lab reports. Student performance on lab reports, lab examinations, and lecture examinations appear to be currently satisfactory.

KIN 165: Greater emphasis in lecture and class discussions/activities emphasizing the link between cognitive, motor, physical and social development and motor development across the lifespan.

KIN 191B: Course changes included 3 more scenario-based lab assignments to improve students’ critical thinking/problem solving skills. Students were given injury/patient scenarios and asked to develop an evaluation strategy and determine the clinical diagnosis. Also, I implemented scenario discussions in lecture to help students gain a better understanding of how to apply the evaluation principles.

KIN 194: Changes in the course included lab assignments and assigned lab time to practice designing rehabilitation protocols and incorporation of software to aid in the design of therapeutic rehabilitation.

Summary: Most faculty identified that emphasizing certain elements of the assignments in class would be the primary change to their pedagogy. By focusing on what is required of students it is hoped that students will be better equipped to be successful at executing assignments.

Evidence of Student Learning after Change:

As this is the first round of assessing the PLOs in the department most faculty reported that they would continue to assess the learning outcomes in their courses. Below are a few additional comments from faculty.

KIN 70: More students should score at or above 70% on their second exam. I will evaluate this next semester.
KIN 100W: Students are demonstrating better understandings of how to search for, collect, and summarize scholarly research. The entire class passed the course, an improvement on student grades and pass rates between Spring 2011 and Fall 2011. On the assignment assessed here, 24% of students scored a B+ and above in meeting SLO#1 objectives; 72% scored between B - C; and only .08% scored C- and below.

KIN 165: 48 out of 50 students scored a C or better on the final oral/practical exam and demonstrating a better understanding of how to apply their knowledge of evaluation/assessment of the body to aid the patient in proper care and rehabilitation.

KIN 194: Not only did the students show improvement in their final design scores overall, but all but 5 of the 55 students scored a 'B' or better on their final rehabilitation design.

Summary: Faculty will continue to assess how modifications impact student learning. In as much as faculty were able to "close the loop" and make modifications within the semester it appears that the changes had a positive impact on student learning.

In coming semesters we will continue to assess PLOs. As we make the second round of assessments we will be able to reflect more fully on how changes in the curriculum or class design have impacted student learning.

Overall Summary:

In the Spring of 2012 the Department of Kinesiology began a systematic approach to assessing the 5 departmental student learning objectives (SLOs). Previous reports reflected the assessment of PLO5. Each semester 1 PLO is assessed across the department with faculty reporting their assessment procedures for their classes. After the Spring 2012 semester data were collected for 7 classes. In the Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 semester data for PLO 2 and PLO3 respectively were collected. During the 2013-2014 academic year PLOs 4 and 5 will be assessed. At that point we will revisit the PLOs in order to determine if changes in student learning have occurred and how faculty have "closed the loop" to address necessary course modifications to better contribute to student learning.