Kinesiology Self-Study
Spring 2018

Program: Bachelor of Science in Kinesiology
Department of Kinesiology, School of Science & Technology, Sonoma State University
Concentrations:

1. Exercise Science (Pre-Physical Therapy)
2. Interdisciplinary (Pre-Occupational Therapy)
3. Lifetime Physical Activity - Fitness and Wellness

Respectfully submitted by Bulent Sokmen on behalf of the faculty of Kinesiology

I. Program Overview

a. Program distinctiveness and mission

Of the 21 CSU campuses that offer bachelor's degrees in kinesiology, only four house kinesiology within the natural sciences (Sonoma, Cal Poly SLO, Cal Poly Pomona, and CSU San Bernardino). At Sonoma State, kinesiology is a STEM program whose graduates go on to become physical and occupational therapists, strength and conditioning professionals, athletic trainers and coaches, and for those who also complete a credential program within the School of Education, physical education teachers.

Mission Statement: Kinesiology is a multidisciplinary field dedicated to the study of complex interactions among physiological, biomechanical, psychological, sociological, and developmental aspects of human movement in health and wellness. The mission of the Kinesiology Department is to advance and apply knowledge through teaching, research, applied student experience, and service programs that promote lifelong physical health and wellbeing in our community.

Vision Statement: The Department of Kinesiology seeks to be a highly regarded undergraduate program in the CSU system through innovative practices in teaching, research, and service to the community. The Department of Kinesiology realizes this vision through:

1. Building a practice of identifying and utilizing the latest developments in teaching and research in the field of kinesiology;
2. Integrating experiential learning throughout the curriculum, ensuring students have multiple hands-on experiences;
3. Developing quality research laboratories with state of the art equipment that supports student and faculty research, presentation and publication;
4. Graduating students equipped with the skills and knowledge to successfully pursue the next stage in their development as lifelong learners who will contribute to kinesiology as leaders, scientists, educators, and professionals;
5. Engaging community partners in response to local and regional needs.

b. Program alignment with university vision, values, and outcomes

Our department mission and vision reflect the university's through the lens of scientific inquiry in human health and wellness *(see above).* We have demonstrated our commitment to achieving the university's vision of excellence in undergraduate education by increasing faculty/student research, refocusing our curriculum and program, and emphasizing teaching effectiveness.

c. Serving regional and state needs

The department serves students in the Sonoma State service area and admits California students from beyond the area as space permits. We serve regional health industry needs by providing trained students to serve as interns and employees. Many of our graduates remain in the region to build their careers in kinesiology. The department also provides service to the community through SHIP internships for local high school students, the Ticket to Success program for local low-income elementary students, 3-WINS community health program, health testing for low-income families, the Saturday Sidekick and Cycle Without Limits programs for children with special needs, and other outreach programs.

d. Program goals and learning outcomes

Our program goals are expressed in the department vision, which we revised and ratified in November 2017. In Fall 2017, we also reviewed and revised the student learning outcomes for kinesiology.

SSU Kinesiology Program Learning Outcomes

Learning Outcome # 1
Our graduates have knowledge of the history and broad content within the disciplines of kinesiology and can demonstrate the ability to synthesize concepts across disciplines.

Learning Outcome # 2
Our graduates demonstrate proficiency in the Core Competencies across the subareas of kinesiology through their academic work and practical application.
(WSCUC Core Competencies: written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and information literacy)

Learning Outcome # 3
Our graduates can apply concepts, theories, and methods in kinesiology in professional and scholarly activities.

Learning Outcome # 4
Our graduates can apply evidence-based practices to the practice of kinesiology.

Learning Outcome # 5
Our graduates demonstrate professional responsibility and ethical decision-making when applying knowledge of kinesiology.

e. History/overview of the program

Kinesiology as a course of undergraduate study has evolved in the United States over the last 30 years. While kinesiology programs in the late 20th century often focused on preparing physical education teachers for the K-12 setting, kinesiology programs now prepare students for emerging professional opportunities in healthcare disciplines such as physical and occupational therapy and physician's assistant, as well as opportunities in areas that focus on physical fitness and athletic development, both educational and sports-related. In light of this trend, our department and the programs we offer are evolving to recognize and meet emerging needs.

Kinesiology is one of nine departments in the School of Science & Technology. We currently have 6 tenure-line faculty members (3 professors, 2 associate professors, and 1 assistant professor), 1 administrative coordinator, and 1 instructional support technician. In addition, in Spring 2018 we have 6 academic lecturers (1.77 FTE) and 10 KIN 101 activity lecturers (1.99 FTE). Five of the 16 lecturers have 3-year contracts. As of Spring 2018, the department serves 396 majors.

The department's faculty of professional scientist-scholars and its dedicated administrative and support staff strive to provide an excellent educational experience to our students. While historically the faculty practiced a teacher-first model, we are now developing a teacher-scholar model that embraces active participation in teaching and scholarship, with significant student involvement in faculty-supervised research, to create and maintain a vibrant learning environment.

The Department of Kinesiology offers programs leading to the Bachelor of Science degree. All students take a group of lower division support courses in other departments and an upper division KIN core, which examines the historical, physiological, sociological, psychological, and biomechanical bases of physical activity, sport, and human movement. Beyond the support and core courses each student selects a concentration, which focuses on the student's special interests. The three concentrations within the B.S. are designed to meet a variety of students' needs and interests.

The three concentrations are:

Exercise Science (Pre-Physical Therapy): Students are prepared to enter graduate study for an advanced degree and certification as a physical therapist or other exercise-science-related career.

Interdisciplinary (Pre-Occupational Therapy): Students develop a concentration curriculum tailored to meet their special interest, such as pre-occupational therapy or related areas.

Lifetime Physical Activity - Fitness & Wellness: Students are prepared for careers in the fields of fitness/wellness and coaching, such as strength and conditioning specialist, personal trainer, and coach.

II. Outcome of the Previous Program Review

a. Recommendations from previous review

The previous self-study process did not result in a set of recommendations approved by the department, dean, and academic affairs, as the program review process was in flux. Both the self-study and the external review noted two strengths: faculty commitment and student perception of program quality. Concerns and recommendations for action, based on the self-study and the external report, are outlined below.

- The previous external review, as well as the review from 2006, identified the department's facilities and educational technology resources as outdated and inadequate. The 2013 external reviewer compared the SSU resources to CSU standards and found Sonoma State's kinesiology resources to be "in dire need of upkeep and expansion."
- The external review affirmed that curriculum revisions proposed in the self-study should be implemented. These included: 1) Eliminate KIN 460 from the core, 2) examine the role of KIN 201, 3) eliminate CS 101 from support requirements, 4) consider eliminating the Adapted Physical Education (APE) Concentration and developing an APE minor, 5) find a solution for needed coursework no longer offered by other departments, such as Nutrition, 6) consider adding a comprehensive exam as a non-thesis option for completing the master's.
- The self-study and the external review both noted the low number of graduate students as a concern, especially because the graduate program requires a large amount of department resources.
- A concern about faculty being overextended was noted. Ideas for addressing this included adding more full-time faculty and increasing release time for departmental work.
- The need for continual on-going assessment was identified, with student learning outcomes and graduate and employer surveys noted in particular. The self-study stated that the department would need additional resources to develop consistent assessment.
- The self-study and external review recommended that the department develop better RTP guidelines to support faculty development and advancement.

b. Changes since the last program review

Since the last self-study, there have been numerous changes in our undergraduate and graduate programs, proposed changes to departmental RTP guidelines, and little or no movement regarding tenure-track hires and facilities improvement.

- Following external review suggestions, the department undertook the following revisions to alleviate impaction, eliminate unnecessary course requirements, and improve efficiency in faculty loads.
    - We eliminated KIN 460 from departmental requirements and offerings, eliminated CS 101 as a support course and PSY 425 as a requirement, and reduced two required courses (KIN 301 and 315) to the choice of either one.

- We have offered summer courses over the last 5 years to reduce the waiting list in impacted courses: KIN 301, 305, 315, 350, and 360.
- The department developed a new offering, KIN 317 Nutrition for Physical Activity, to replace a discontinued BIO nutrition course.
- KIN 201 is still a work in progress regarding its role in the major.
- We implemented stronger GPA requirements, specifically for entry to the pre-physical therapy exercise science concentration.
- The department eliminated the Adapted Physical Education (APE) concentration and the Physical Education (PE) concentration with the departure of their major advisors, Elaine McHugh and Rebecca Bryan.
- We added a new concentration, Lifetime Physical Activity – Fitness & Wellness, to meet the needs of strength and conditioning trainers and coaches.

- The department is concluding the discontinuation of the graduate program in kinesiology. After considering several approaches to saving the program while addressing its heavy impact on resources, continued low enrollment and lack of program distinction contributed to our conclusion that the program did not conduce toward our departmental goals. We stopped accepting new students in Fall 2016 and are near the end of the teach-out for continuing graduate students.
- The department was hit hard by the loss of two tenure-line faculty members. We hired one new tenure-track faculty member in the field of exercise science for Fall 2015. We are down one tenure-line faculty from our 2013 self-study.
- As the department underwent significant curricular challenges and changes, we did not make progress with a practice of and plan for assessing student learning outcomes. The department recently reviewed and revised its mission and visions to align with the university's. We are now developing a plan for continual on-going assessment of the newly adopted program learning outcomes.
- The department continues to work on developing RTP guidelines to support faculty development and advancement.
- While both the previous self-study and external reviewer noted that department facilities were outdated and inadequate, with the laboratories *"in dire need of upkeep and expansion,"* almost nothing has been done to improve the condition of facilities.

III. Student Profile

a. Program enrollments

Since our last program review in 2012-13, the number of majors has risen from 372 in Fall 2012 to 421 in Fall 2017 (see Table 1). Specifically, KIN saw a 7% decline from F12 to F13, then a 6 to 11% increase each year until F17, where we saw a small (3%) decrease from F16. The overall trend is an increase, with total majors in F17 11.6% greater than in F12. In F17, roughly 25% of KIN majors were unidentified for a concentration; 43% were in Exercise Science; Interdisciplinary and Lifetime Physcal Activity-Fitness and Wellness each had approximately 15%; and Lifetime Physical Activity-CoachEdu, in the process of discontinuation, had 2% of total students. An overall trend of increase was present in the Interdisciplinary (Pre-Occupational Therapy)

and Exercise Science (Pre-Physical Therapy) concentrations. The largest concentration increases from F12 were seen in Interdisciplinary (Pre-Occupational Therapy), with an overall 51% increase, and Exercise Science (Pre-Physical Therapy), with an overall 24% increase. Changes in the overall Lifetime Physical Activity concentrations were minimal.

We were surprised to discover that 25% of our students do not have a concentration. Since students are required to identify their KIN concentration choice when they enter SSU, we believe there may be a gap in this information being collected or being entered into the sytem. We will work with staff to determine if we can correct this internally to the KIN department. Having a concentration supports the assignment of an appropriate faculty advisor and helps students plan their educational path.

We are currently in the process of teaching out the MA in Kinesiology; we have not accepted any applicants into the graduate program since Fall 2016. The MA discontinuation will be finalized in Spring 2018. We had 14 students in F12, and that number steadily dropped to 5 in F17 (see Table 2). Our goal is to ensure that the current 6* students in the graduate program complete all their course work and thesis submission with their faculty by Spring 2019. (*One student was not registered for classes when the F17 census was completed.)

Table 1. Number of students in BS program and in each concentration, F12-F17.

Kinesiology Majors by Concentration	F12*	F13	F14	F15	F16	F17	% of F17
Unidentified	**119**	66	84	82	98	**106**	**25.2**
Exercise Science (Pre-Physical Therapy)	**138**	152	162	175	194	**182**	**43.2**
Interdisciplinary (Pre-Occupational Therapy)	**30**	41	54	69	75	**61**	**14.5**
Lifetime Physical Activity–Fitness & Wellness	**0**	22	32	40	51	**63**	**14.9**
Lifetime Physical Activity with CoachEduc	**0**	7	13	13	14	**9**	**2.1**
Lifetime Fitness	**74**	42	15	7	0	**0**	**0.0**
Adapted Phys Ed (discontinued)	**1**	4	1	1	1	**0**	**0.0**
Phys Ed (discontinued)	**10**	11	6	3	0	**0**	**0.0**
Total	**372**	345	367	390	433	**421**	**100.0**

*Data from our last program review Fall 2012-Spring 2013.

Table 2. MA students, F12-F17.

Kinesiology Graduate Students	F12	F13	F14	F15	F16	F17
Masters	14	12	17	18	8	5

b. Degrees conferred in the program

The Kinesiology Department filed for impaction in the 2009-10 academic year to better manage enrollment in the major and to ensure students could complete their degree in a timely manner. Fall 2010 was the first semester in which we limited the number of

majors admitted. This change is reflected in the slowly decreasing number of students graduating from 2010-11 to 2014-15. Since then the number of graduates has been steadily increasing, with higher numbers anticipated for 2017-18.

Of the 361 KIN BS degrees awarded since 2013-14, 52.7% were in Exercise Science, 16.4% were in the Interdisciplinary concentration, and 27.5% were in the combined concentrations of Lifetime Physical Activity-Fitness and Wellness, Lifetime Fitness (discontinued), and Lifetime Physical Activity with Coach Education (discontinued). The remaining 3.8% were in Physical Education and Adapted Physical Education, both of which have been discontinued. Our target is to have approximately 400 majors per year (currently this number is 421) and to graduate 100 students each year.

Table 3. BS degrees conferred 2012-13 to 2017-18, and concentrations.

Kinesiology Graduates by Concentration	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18 *ytd	Total
Unidentified	**1**	0	0	0	0	**0**	**1**
Exercise Science (Pre-Physical Therapy)	**41**	47	36	43	48	**20**	**235**
Interdisciplinary (Pre-Occupational Therapy)	**11**	6	18	12	19	**8**	**74**
Lifetime Physical Activity–Fitness & Wellness	**0**	2	3	10	14	**7**	**36**
Lifetime Physical Activity with CoachEduc	**0**	2	3	4	2	**5**	**16**
Lifetime Fitness	**32**	24	8	8	0	**0**	**72**
Adapted Phys Ed (discontinued)	**1**	2	1	0	0	**0**	**4**
Phys Ed (discontinued)	**4**	3	4	1	1	**0**	**13**
Total	**90**	86	73	78	84	**40**	**451**

*Year to date, Fall 2017 graduates only

Since 2012-13 we have awarded 20 MA degrees. Our goal is to teach out the remaining 6 students and have them all complete successfully by Spring 2019.

Table 4. MA degrees conferred AY 2012-13 to AY 2017-18.

Kinesiology Graduate Degrees Conferred	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18 *ytd	Total
Masters	3	2	6	1	5	3	20

*Year to date, Fall 2017 graduates only

c. Student demographic trends

The Kinesiology Department has traditionally been populated by more females than males. In 2012, our student population was 61.6% female. By 2017, it was 66.3%. These data reflect to some extent the overall SSU population, which is 63% female. The ratio of female to male KIN students steadily increased from 1.56 in F13 to 1.96 in F17. In contrast, our MA program had more male than female students. The program averaged around 65.6% males and 34.4% females. As noted above, the graduate program is in teachout since Fall 2016.

Table 5. KIN students by gender, undergraduate program

	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Totals
Male BS	134 (39%)	138 (37%)	148 (38%)	158 (36%)	142 (34%)	720 (37%)
Female BS	209 (61%)	231 (63%)	242 (62%)	277 (64%)	279 (66%)	1238 (63%)
Totals	343	369	390	435	421	1958
Female : Male	1.56	1.67	1.64	1.75	1.96	1.72

Table 6. KIN students by gender, masters program

	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Totals
Female MA	3 (25%)	6 (33%)	8 (44%)	3 (38%)	1 (20%)	21
Male MA	9 (75%)	12 (67%)	10 (56%)	5 (63%)	4 (80%)	40
Total MA	12	18	18	8	5	61
Female : Male	0.3	0.5	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.5

Our 2012 self-study did not document KIN students' racial/ethnic backgrounds. This study tracks demographic changes from F13 through F17; we see a strong increase in Hispanic students, from 21.3% in 2013 to 34.4% in 2017, which is slightly higher than the overall SSU percentage (35% in 2017), and smaller increases over the same period for Asian and Black students. The percentage of KIN students who are White decreased from 53.6% in 2013 to 39.7% in 2017.

Table 7. KIN students by race/ethnicity, undergraduate

	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Totals
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	1	3	3	**7**
Asian	16	22	26	32	26	**122**
Black/African American	7	7	11	9	12	**46**
Hispanic of any race	73	83	102	128	145	**531**
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	2	2	2	2	2	**10**
Non-Resident Alien	0	1	1	0	0	**2**
Race and ethnicity unknown	45	30	25	36	34	**170**
Two or more races	16	24	32	30	32	**134**
White	184	200	190	195	167	**936**
TOTAL	**343**	**369**	**390**	**435**	**421**	**1958**

Table 8. KIN students by race/ethnicity, masters program

	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Totals
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Black/African American	0	1	1	0	0	**2**
Hispanic of any race	2	1	1	0	1	**5**
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Non-Resident Alien	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Race and ethnicity unknown:	6	9	8	7	2	**32**
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
White	4	7	8	1	2	**22**
TOTAL	**12**	**18**	**18**	**8**	**5**	**61**

Our student population is also increasingly diverse with respect to socio-economic status and first-generation college student status. The total number of Pell Grant recipients and the total number of those who are the first in their family to attend college increased each year since 2013, with the exception of first generation in 2016. In 2013, 4.1% of KIN students were first generation, and that has increased to 13.5% in 2017. The percentage of KIN students who were Pell Grant recipients increased from 24.5% in 2013 to 25.9% in 2017. See Table 9, below.

In reflecting upon the increase in diversity among the KIN undergraduate population, we believe that our secondary application process, adopted for applicants in 2010-11 as a consequence of program impaction, has had a positive effect. The secondary application prioritizes applicants from our designated service area, which includes Lake, Marin, Sonoma, Napa, and Mendocino counties, and gives importance to factors including first-generation and EOP status. Generally speaking, our KIN student body is slowly but steadily beginning to better reflect the demographics of high school graduates in the north bay and surrounding areas.

Roughly 1/5 of our undergraduates come from our local service area. While that was 20% in F13, we saw a small drop in the last three years, to 18% in Fall 2015 and 16, and to 17% in F17. Although we have prioritized local area applications, this number seems to be decreasing. We might attract more local students by introducing and advertising our program in the local high schools, establishing regular visits to high schools, and/or bringing high school students to our lab and SSU for a first-hand look at the SSU education and college lifestyle. Most of our master students were from the local area, and while numbers went from 83% in F13 to 100% in F17, this might be due to not accepting new applicants and teaching out our current students.

Table 9. Undergraduate KIN students by first generation and low income/Pell Grant recipient

	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
First Generation*	14	28	44	41	57
% FG/Total	4.08	7.59	11.28	9.43	13.54
Low Income/Pell Grant	84	98	104	105	116
% Low Income-Pell/Total	24.49	26.56	26.67	24.14	27.55
KIN-BS	343	369	390	435	421

*Totals may not be 100% accurate, as parent education level is an optional question in the CSU application process. These totals reflect students that reported parent education levels of No High School, Some High School, or Graduated High School for both parents during the application process.

Table 10. Percentage of students from Sonoma State's North Bay service area

	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
KIN-BS	20%	21%	18%	18%	17%
KIN-MA	83%	82%	93%	100%	100%

d. Educational trends

Our incoming student population has fluctuated since the last review, from 87 students in F13 to 125 in F16, to 92 in F17. This fluctuation is reflected across categories in FTFT, transfer, and change of major. Although there is no apparent trend in percent of incoming FTFT, transfer, and change of major, the averages across 6 years were 62% for FTFT, 17% for transfer, and 21% for change of major.

Table 11. Incoming students: first-time full-time (FTFT), transfer, and change of major

	Fall 12	Fall 13	Fall 14	Fall 15	Fall 16	Fall 17	Averages
FTFT	69	62	74	67	55	57	**64.0**
Transfer	16	12	24	21	22	14	**18.2**
Change major	14	13	15	25	48	21	**22.7**
Total	**99**	**87**	**113**	**113**	**125**	**92**	**104.8**
FTFT %	69.7	71.3	65.5	59.3	44.0	62.0	**61.9**
Transfer %	16.2	13.8	21.2	18.6	17.6	15.2	**17.1**
Change Major %	14.1	14.9	13.3	22.1	38.4	22.8	**21.0**

e. Why students choose kinesiology

The self-study process has spurred a series of initiatives the department has undertaken to better understand our students and our program. Junior and Senior KIN students recently responded to a survey that asked about their learning experiences in central courses, their academic advising experiences, and their reasons for choosing

this major. Of the 73 students responding, 74% identified career goals as one of their reasons for choosing the major, 67% identified an interest in the subject matter, and 8% said program reputation was a factor.

f. Student and alumni achievements

The department also surveyed its recent alumni to better understand their perspectives on their student experience as well as to track their success in graduate studies and career goals. Additionally, the department is developing a system to track its student and alumni accomplishments. To that end the department has launched a LinkedIn page, created a departmental email address, and reached out to alumni to encourage them to stay in touch.

The alumni survey was emailed to those who graduated with a BS in KIN from 2013 through 2017 and for whom an email address was available. We had a response rate of 22% (57 completed surveys). Of the respondents, 60% reported they were employed, and of this group 62% were employed in a field related to kinesiology. Over 80% of respondents indicated that graduate work is part of their path: 13 reported a plan to do graduate work, 22 are currently engaged in graduate studies, and 11 had completed a graduate program. Only 11 alumni (19%) had no plan to do graduate work. On a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being poor and 6 being excellent, the average rating of the alum's overall experience of the KIN program was 5.07. The average rating of how well they felt the program prepared them for their current path was 4.46%, using the same scale.

One of the most significant achievements since the last program review is a strong increase in the number of undergraduate students participating in research. Since 2013, more than 50 students have actively engaged in research projects led by KIN faculty mentors, and received more than $20,000 in SSU Source, Koret, McNair, and Water Agency grants. This is significant, since in previous review cycles the recognition of student research was slim or not evident. Students tend to do research as juniors and seniors; with approximately 10 students doing research each year, this number is equivalent to about 10-15% of the graduating class. All student research projects have been presented at the annual SSU symposium, which has provided great visibility for our KIN department. In Fall 2017 we offered for the first time an applied research methods class, KIN 311, to further engage our students in critical thinking and hands-on research. This is similar to capstone courses offered in other departments, in which students produce research questions following a literature search, prepare a methodology to test their hypotheses, and present their findings following statistical analysis of their results through a poster presentation.

Our students are also involved in hands-on, community-based programs. These include the 3-WINS program, run by Dr. Kurt Sollanek, that supports community members to improve their health and well-being through physical activity and nutrition advice, and community-based health testing provided to low-income families during Cezar Chavez day with the help of the local Head Start Program and other community non-profit organizations. We know we can continue to improve and increase these opportunities to

an even greater extent to prepare our students with much-needed hands-on experience prior to graduation.

IV. Faculty Profile

Kinesiology has been down to 6 fulltime tenure-line faculty members from 7 since 2016-17. We lost two faculty in Physical Education, one due to retirement and the other to a position at SUNY Cortland. We gained one faculty member in Exercise Science in 2015-16. Although we find a drop in 3-year lecturers from 8 in F13 to 5 in F17, there has been an increase in temporary lecturers from 4 in F13 to 9 in F17. See Table 12, below.

a. Demographic trends

Our fulltime tenure-line faculty are 50% women and 50% men. Five of the tenure-line faculty are White, one is Asian-American (a woman) and one is of middle-eastern descent and a non-native speaker of English (a man). Two of the tenure-line faculty were of the first college-going generation in their families. Kinesiology actively values faculty diversity across all position types and as a community of teaching scholars we respect each other's expertise and background. Our ability to become more diverse depends partly on the availability of newly open or newly created positions, as well as on our commitment to increase inclusion with respect to ethnicity, race, gender, religious background, physical ability, age, and sexual orientation.

Table 12. KIN faculty

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
Permanent	7	**7** (37%)	**7** (32%)	**7** (32%)	**6** (27%)	**6** (30%)
Full	4	4	3	3	3	3
Full-FERP	0	0	1	1	0	0
Associate	0	0	1	2	2	2
Assistant	3	3	2	1	1	1
3-Year Lecturers	n/a	**8** (42%)	**8** (36%)	**8** (36%)	**9** (41%)	**5** (25%)
Temporary	n/a	**4** (21%)	**7** (32%)	**7** (32%)	**7** (32%)	**9** (45%)
Total		**19** (100%)	**22** (100%)	**22** (100%)	**22** (100%)	**20** (100%)

b. Faculty with terminal degree

All of the tenure-line faculty have a doctoral degree. The 3-year lecturers have master's degrees in an appropriate field, and our temporary faculty hold a mix of bachelor's and master's degrees in relevant fields, as well as appropriate expertise.

c. Faculty specialization and alignment to program curriculum

Our 6 tenure-line faculty teach core KIN classes in our 3 concentrations of (1) Exercise Science (Pre-Physical Therapy), (2) Interdisciplinary (Pre-Occupational Therapy), and (3) Lifetime Physical Activity – Fitness & Wellness. These 3 tracks prepare students for

competitive movement science and health promotion careers that require a set of discipline- and concentration-specific skills and knowledge.

Table 13. KIN tenure-line faculty with specialization

Faculty Member	Specialty Area
Wanda Boda	Biomechanics
Ellen Carlton	Sport & Exercise Psychology
Lauren Morimoto	History, Philosophy, & Sociology of Sport
Bulent Sokmen	Exercise Physiology – Graduate Coordinator
Kurt Sollanek	Exercise Physiology
Steven Winter	Athletic Training – Department Chair

d. Assessment of teaching effectiveness

Assessment of teaching effectiveness in the Department of Kinesiology currently mirrors school and university practices. Each faculty member is evaluated through student evaluations of every class they teach each fall and spring semester. Tenure-line faculty in their probationary years and during promotion cycles are evaluated by two faculty peer observations. We are anticipating adopting additional means to encourage continual improvement in teaching effectiveness once these practices are established at the school and university level.

The department faculty expect and support a reflective teaching practice. Since the last review period, Dr. Lauren Morimoto was nominated for the SSU excellence in teaching award 3 times, receiving the award in August 2016.

e. Faculty scholarship, professional practice & development, and service

Since our last review, KIN faculty have been very active in publication and presentation. Dr. Lauren Morimoto published 6 book chapters, 1 peer-reviewed journal article, and added 6 conference presentations. Dr. Bulent Sokmen published 3 peer-reviewed journal articles arising from research undertaken in the Human Performance Laboratory at SSU, and delivered 3 American College of Sports Medicine presentations. Dr. Kurt Sollanek published 13 peer-reviewed journal articles, 3 of which arise from research in the Human Performance Laboratory at SSU.

The department received $80,000 in internal and external grants. Among these Dr. Kurt Sollanek received $35,000 in external grants and more than $7,000 in internal grants directly to faculty or as faculty advisor to student research. Dr. Bulent Sokmen received $16,000 in internal grants directly to faculty or as faculty advisor to student research. Dr. Lauren Morimoto secured more than $20,000 in funding for her leadership in the social justice and related lecture series and conferences, international faculty reception, and a national summer institute event.

Faculty have been very active in serving the Sonoma State community and our local communities. Faculty have served on more than 10 Sonoma State search committees

since the last review. Each tenure-line faculty member serves on senate or university committees. KIN faculty actively participate as a Safe Zone Trainer, on the Annual Women's Reception planning committee and as its treasurer, as 3WINS Fitness Program faculty advisor, on the Athletic Advisory Council, Institutional Review Board, SST RTP committee, Graduate Studies Subcommittee, Health Advisory Committee, University Program Review Subcommittee, Graduate Equity Fellowship Selection Committee, and Academic Freedom Subcommittee.

V. Assessment

a. Curricular map

CURRICULUM MAP **Department of Kinesiology** **Sonoma State University**

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES / COMMON COURSES	BIO 110 / 115	CHEM 105/110/115AB	BIO 220	BIO 224	MATH 165	KIN 201	KIN 317	KIN 301 / 315	KIN 305	KIN 350	KIN 360	KIN 410	KIN 430
Our graduates have knowledge of the history and broad content within the disciplines of kinesiology and can demonstrate the ability to synthesize concepts across disciplines.													
Our graduates demonstrate proficiency in the Core Competencies across the subareas of kinesiology through their academic work and practical application.													
Our graduates can apply concepts, theories, and methods in kinesiology in professional and scholarly activities.													
Our graduates can apply evidence-based practices to the practice of Kinesiology.													
Our graduates demonstrate professional responsibility and ethical decision-making when applying knowledge of kinesiology.													

PREREQS

SUPPORT COURSES

CORE COURSES

Developing: students are beginning to learn and building learning (understanding, practice, vocabulary)
Developed: Sound fundamentals and good concept (relationship between concepts)
Mastering: confident application and practice (critical evaluations and synthesis)

Student learning level	DEVELOPING	DEVELOPED	MASTERING

b. Public dissemination of KIN PLOs

We had hoped to publish the newly revised Kinesiology Program Learning Outcomes and map in the Sonoma State University 2018-19 catalog, but did not make the copy deadline. They will be featured on the department website as it is updated following

migration to the new web content management system (Drupal) and in accordance with published university web standards. They will appear in the 2019-20 catalog. In the meantime, we are working on incorporating PLOs into our syllabi (see V.c below).

c. Integrating WSCUC Core Competencies

Kinesiology Program Learning Outcome # 2 specifically incorporates the WSCUC Core Competencies into the discipline-specific education of the kinesiology student. All KIN students are expected to demonstrate written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, and information literacy skills through and in their KIN coursework and assignments.

d. Integrating PLOs and curriculum map into student experience

The faculty are revising departmental practices with respect to syllabi to ensure that KIN students can understand how each course is a building block within the major and concentration, and how the KIN degree is more than an accumulation of course units. Students can also take greater responsibility for their learning when they understand what they are expected to learn and demonstrate. We are working together to develop syllabus templates that clearly present both the course-specific learning outcomes and PLOs that students will engage in each course. Individual faculty remain responsible for determining the learning experiences and the assignments that demonstrate achievement toward the learning outcomes. We are working to help students recognize the KIN PLOs and curriculum map, so they can better understand how the courses and the sequence work together to build their education. The syllabus-based alignment of course-specific learning outcomes and PLOs is intended to be a foundation of the KIN assessment plan as we develop it.

e. Analysis of student learning

Currently, KIN faculty are working on developing ways to collect and evaluate student achievement toward the PLOs. This concept has not been implemented before and it is very new to the KIN department. The current self-study has resulted in a KIN faculty commitment to develop the processes and instruments we will agree to use to measure student achievement in PLOs. We are hopeful that we will establish a strong methodological approach to collect student evidence, evaluate it as a department, and use the results to inform program development and improve program teaching-learning effectiveness.

f. Curriculum changes

The Department of Kinesiology implemented several important curriculum changes since the last program review (see section II.b). During the current self-study process, we have officially terminated our graduate program (March 2018) with suggestions from our last KIN self-study and KIN faculty. We eliminated the struggling Adapted Physical Education and Physical Education concentrations. We combined Lifetime Fitness and Lifetime Physical Activity with Coach Education into the new Lifetime Physical Activity-Fitness and Wellness.

We adjusted several course requirements to eliminate bottlenecks and to better reflect trends in post-degree study and professional opportunities as well as to support the evolution of our concentrations. See section II.b for a detailed list of course changes.

g. Assessment plan

As noted above, the department focused on major curriculum changes, including structural and curricular changes to the concentrations, and discontinuation of the graduate program, following the last review. Having no prior assessment expertise within the department, our initiatives were focused elsewhere.

However, the self-study, following closely on the newest WSCUC recommendations for the institution, has galvanized the department. Academic Programs is supporting assessment development through school assessment coordinators, an effective and purposeful UPRS, and assessment support personnel in Academic Programs and in the Faculty Center. We now have two surveys underway (upper-division students and recent alumni) to supply indirect evidence of program effectiveness. We have revised our mission and vision, redesigned our PLOs, and agreed upon a curriculum map. Our next major undertakings are to (1) align syllabi with the map and use the syllabi to clarify and support the educational path, and (2) determine where, how, and how frequently we will evaluate student achievement in each of the PLOs. The second project will require that we develop direct assessment instruments for each PLO and continue to develop and refine our surveys as indirect assessment instruments. We will also develop a multi-stage assessment plan to achieve full assessment of PLOs, and make changes based on results of assessment, within each program review cycle.

VI. Program Quality and Integrity

a. Program demand

The table below indicates an overall growth trend in student numbers. Given that we have 6 tenure-line faculty, and that faculty take their mentoring role seriously, we will need to address how many student advisees each faculty member can realistically mentor.

Table 14. KIN undergrad enrollment F12-17 by class level (Fr, So, Jr, Sr)

Class level/Fall	F12	F13	F14	F15	F16	F17
Freshman	110	104	108	110	116	111
Sophomore	52	72	73	75	95	99
Junior	68	55	78	85	90	86
Senior	141	112	110	120	134	125
Total	**371**	**343**	**369**	**390**	**435**	**421**

The program's faculty are committed to helping students graduate in 4 years. The number of FTFT and transfer students varies each year. FTFT applicant numbers ranged from 221 in Fall 2013 to 451 in Fall 2018. The program tends to admit about 72% of FTFT applicants, though in Fall 2016 we admitted only 45%. We admit on average about 14% of transfer applicants. Of those FTFT admitted, on average 34% enroll; for transfers, the percentage of admitted who enroll averages out to 68%. In other words, we might expect one-third of FTFT admits to enroll, and two-thirds of transfer admits to enroll.

Table 15. Applications, admits, enrollments (FTFT, Transfer)

	First-Time Full-Time				Transfer				
	Applications	**Admit (% Appl)**	**Enrolled (%Admit)**	**% of Total Enrl**	**Applications**	**Admit (% Appl)**	**Enrolled (%Admit)**	**% of Total Enrl**	**Total Enrolled**
Fall 2012	254	182 (72%)	69 (40%)	**81**	163	22 (13%)	16 (73%)	**19**	85
Fall 2013	221	158 (72%)	62 (39%)	**84**	200	18 (9%)	12 (67%)	**16**	74
Fall 2014	284	223 (79%)	74 (33%)	**76**	195	33 (17%)	24 (73%)	**24**	98
Fall 2015	312	226 (72%)	67 (30%)	**76**	196	36 (18%)	21 (58%)	**24**	88
Fall 2016	366	165 (45%)	55 (33%)	**71**	214	31 (14%)	22 (71%)	**29**	77
Fall 2017	272	201 (74%)	57 (28%)	**80**	172	22 (13%)	14 (64%)	**20**	71
Fall 2018	451	N/A	N/A	**NA**	121	N/A	N/A	**NA**	NA

b. Disciplinary shifts

As an academic discipline, kinesiology involves the study of human physical activity and its impact on health, society, and quality of life. It includes, but is not limited to, such areas of study as exercise science, sports management, athletic training and sports medicine, socio-cultural analyses of sports, sport and exercise psychology, fitness leadership, physical education-teacher education, and pre-professional training for physical therapy, occupational therapy, medicine and other health-related fields. These areas have evolved over time (see Section I.e), with an emphasis shifting from K-12 physical education to lifetime fitness and wellness, and physical activities, practices or treatments prescribed for health-related circumstances. The department's three concentrations arise from and respond to emerging areas of kinesiology. Our three concentrations provide concrete career tracks in relevant areas of study that prepare students to graduate in four years if they begin as FTFT freshmen.

In 2010, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* published a report citing occupational therapy as one of the top 10 majors in 15 years. It speculated that there would be 33.5% job growth in occupational therapy by 2020. The interdisciplinary concentration specifically prepares student for this profession. Currently 14.5% (see Table 1) of students choose the interdisciplinary concentration; the department believes this concentration is an important one, as it offers students the background knowledge needed for graduate study and a career in occupational therapy.

The largest group of students, roughly 43%, come into the department aspiring to become physical therapists (see Table 1). The new Fitness and Wellness emphasis within the Lifetime Physical Activity concentration provides a route for those who want to work in the fitness sector, such as personal trainer and strength and conditioning specialist. Our concentrations provide streamlined paths to graduation that are designed to prepare our students for their future careers in kinesiology-related fields.

c. Retention and graduation of students

The FTFT retention rate in KIN exceeds the SSU retention rate, except for the F13 cohort. The transfer persistence rate also exceeds the SSU rate. It should be noted that our rates reflect the non-persistence of only 1 to 3 transfer students, out of 19 to 28. Our goal is to retain all transfer students.

We have developed several approaches to improve retention in transfer students: (1) we consistently offer summer class to decrease the impaction rate, (2) we eliminated several redundant courses in our core and support (i.e., KIN 460 & CS 101), (3) we now offer 2 sections of KIN 201, and we combined KIN 301 and KIN 315 to improve course offerings in bottleneck courses, and (4) we have asked students to do early advising with faculty in the concentrations. We might consider how to further refine our already strong faculty advising practices to support the 100% retention goal for transfer students.

Interestingly 25% of KIN students do not have a concentration, which often means that they have not met with an advisor to choose one. We need to do a better job in terms of informing this quarter of our student body to see an advisor in KIN program. We believe that faculty advising is one of the reasons our students make academic progress and succeed in completing their degree and moving on to graduate work or starting on a career path. Ensuring that all students are regularly meeting with their faculty advisor might be helpful with respect to adjusting our curriculum, since it will give us a more complete sense of how to plan course scheduling. We need to do more with respect to communicating with students who do not yet have a concentration, by sending emails or texts to remind them to see a KIN advisor to determine their concentration so that they are on a track with a plan.

Table 16. Retention rate for FTFT students, 1st year to 2nd year

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Incoming FTFT	76	73	81	69	83
Returned next fall	68	56	68	61	72
KIN Returned %	**89%**	**77%**	**84%**	**88%**	**87%**
SSU Returned %	**84%**	**81%**	**82%**	**80%**	**79%**
Did Not Enroll	8	17	13	8	11
Did Not Enroll Percentage	11%	23%	16%	12%	13%

Table 17. Transfer persistence after 2 semesters

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Incoming transfers	21	19	28	22	25
Returned next fall	20	18	25	20	22
KIN Returned %	**95%**	**95%**	**89%**	**91%**	**88%**
SSU Returned %	**83%**	**85%**	**87%**	**88%**	**87%**
Did Not Enroll	1	1	3	2	3
Did Not Enroll %	5%	5%	11%	9%	12%

The FTFT 4-yr graduation rate (considered 100% of normative time to graduation) ranges from 21.9% to 31.9%, with the lowest being the most recent cohort (2013). The ten-percentage-point decrease in 4-yr grad rates may be the result of grappling with impaction and bottleneck courses, which we believe we are addressing. The 6-yr grad rate (considered 150% normative time to graduation) shows a significant upward trend, ranging from 52.7% to 67.1%. In recent years we have been able to graduate 60% or above of our students within 150% time. The SSU 2010 cohort's 6-yr grad rate was 61% (see SSU institutional report); KIN exceeded that value by 4.5% in 2010, 6% in 2011, and 2% in the 2012 cohort, for which data is not yet complete. Although we have met SSU's 6-yr grad rate, we still have a high percentage of students who did not have their degrees after 8 years. This ranges from 33% to 43% among 2008 to 2012 cohort.

Table 16. First-time full-time students' time to graduation

Year	Cohort	4 Years	% 4-yr grad	6 Years	% 6-yr grad	Non-grad	% non-grad
2008	55	16	**29.1**	29	**52.7**	24	**43.6**
2009	69	22	**31.9**	42	**60.9**	27	**39.1**
2010	70	21	**30.0**	46	**65.7**	23	**32.9**
2011	73	17	**23.3**	49	**67.1**	24	**32.9**
2012	76	19	**25.0**	48	**63.2**	28	**36.8**
2013	73	16	**21.9**	NA	**NA**	NA	**NA**

The SSU transfer student 4-yr grad rate (150% time) is 79% for the 2012 cohort. As with many SSU departments, we have had greater success at graduating our transfer students in recent years. While the transfer student 4-yr grad rates were 51 to 65% in 2008-10 cohorts, these numbers went up significantly to near or above 80% in the 2011-13 cohorts. The number of non-graduates after 8 years ranges widely; in recent years these rates dropped to 15.4% in 2011, and increased 19% in 2012, and 21% in the 2013 cohort.

Table 17. Transfer students' time to graduation

Year	Cohort	2 Years	% of 2-year graduates	4 Years	% of 4-year graduates	No degree yet	% of non-graduates after 8-year
2008	32	7	**21.9**	21	**65.6**	8	**25.0**
2009	29	6	**20.7**	15	**51.7**	13	**44.8**
2010	26	6	**23.1**	16	**61.5**	10	**38.5**
2011	13	8	**61.5**	11	**84.6**	2	**15.4**
2012	21	8	**38.1**	17	**81.0**	4	**19.0**
2013	19	9	**47.4**	15	**78.9**	4	**21.1**

g. Student perceptions of the program

The recent Junior/Senior survey indicated that students are very satisfied with the program. Out of 73 responses, 39 identified the faculty as a strength and noted their dedication.14 of them identified the curriculum and with the variety of course offerings as strength, 11 students noted the smaller class size, 9 of them said advising was a program strength, and 3 of them identified hands-on learning through research projects as a program strength.

Kinesiology students rated highly the quality of KIN core classes, ranging from 3.48 for KIN 410 to 5.38 for KIN 301 on a scale of 1 to 6. The 3.48 response for KIN 410, averaged over the 58 students who had taken the class, was slightly below average.

Table 18. How would you rate the quality of the core coursework in Kinesiology?

Course	KIN 301	KIN 305	KIN 315	KIN 350	KIN 360	KIN 410
Averages (scale 1-6)	5.38	4.13	5.26	4.03	5.23	3.48
# response (73 total)	26	31	34	29	43	58

The averages for the quality ratings of KIN support courses offered by the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, and Kinesiology ranged from 2.97 for BIO 224 to 5.23 for BIO 220. The average rating among the 59 students responding for BIO 224 was the lowest of all courses and below the average values. Students wrote specific suggestions in the areas asking for comment, and KIN faculty will use these suggestions to consider how to improve the educational experience.

Table 19. How would you rate the quality of the support coursework in KIN?

Course	BIO 220	BIO 224	CHEM 105/115A & B	KIN 201	KIN 311/317
Averages (scale 1-6)	5.23	2.97	3.95	5.08	4.68
# response (73 total)	64	59	63	64	31

The averages for the quality ratings of concentration and elective courses ranged from 3.56 for KIN 446 to 5.78 for KIN 403. The number of responses was significantly lower for KIN 403, 404, and 446, each having fewer than 10 responses out of 73 surveys.

Table 20. How would you rate the quality of the concentration & elective coursework in KIN?

Course	KIN 241	KIN 242	KIN 403	KIN 404	KIN 426	KIN 427	KIN 430	KIN 446
Averages (scale 1-6)	3.93	5.00	5.78	5.57	5.53	5.42	4.81	3.56
# response (73 total)	14	29	9	7	17	19	37	9

The student response to a question about how helpful KIN advising averages out to 4.49 (on a 1 to 6 scale); 58 out of 73 rated the helpfulness as 4 or above. Among respondents, 48 out of 63 who entered as FTFT met their advisor within their first two years (32 as freshmen and 16 as sophomores), and 6 of 10 who entered as transfers met their advisor within their first year at SSU.

h. Supporting student goals

Our preliminary analysis of the junior/senior and alumni surveys has revealed areas of consideration for enhanced support of student goals. Both surveys included open-ended

questions about how the program might be improved, and the alumni survey asked how the program might have better prepared them for their post-graduation path. In also considering the strengths cited in the survey, we recognize that students and alumni value hands-on, experiential learning, both in the classroom/lab and in the community. Based on desired path, alumni also noted particular perceived gaps in the curriculum that might be addressed through expanded elective offerings and focused advising. The need for better access to required classes (both seats and scheduling) was clearly expressed by both current students and alumni, and is something we can and must address.

Knowing that kinesiology continues to evolve in inter- and multi-disciplinary ways, we will create a plan for yearly surveys of senior KIN students and for improving communication and feedback between the department and its alumni.

VII. Instruction, Advising, and Resources in the Program

a. Kinesiology in General Education

We offer one lower division general education course, KIN 217, taught by Dr. Wanda Boda and Dr. Kurt Sollanek. We have one designated writing intensive course that fulfills students' Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement, KIN 301, taught by Dr. Lauren Morimoto.

b. Pedagogical methods

The Department of Kinesiology embraces face-to-face teaching methods that include hands-on laboratory experience, critical thinking projects, and interactive classroom environments; different classes offer these experiences to different extents, but it is the heart of the Kinesiology education. We use exams, written assignments, and powerpoint presentations to measure student achievement in course learning objectives. With this in mind, our curriculum is designed to meet students' need for a meaningful and coherent education as well as the state's needs for professionals in health promotion, health and wellness, and teaching. The major revisions over the last review period have not changed the program's focus on keeping faculty and students immersed in the active learning of movement science, found only by engaging at the leading edge of teaching, research, and professional activities.

c. Experiential learning outside the classroom

Each KIN student must complete 135 hours (3 units) of KIN 430 Field Experience in their concentration area. The field experience is structured as a contract course, and must be arranged with approval of the student's advisor and the supervisor of the internship/job site. Students may do up to 12 units of field experience if they so choose.

Since our last review, we have observed an important change in the involvement of KIN students in research projects. Sonoma State has emphasized undergraduate research in recent years, and our faculty and students have responded enthusiastically to new critical thinking/hands-on learning experiences outside the classroom. In the 2017-18

academic year, approximately 30 of our undergrads received 9 different research grants. Faculty have also mentored 7 McNair scholars during the last review period. However, it has not been easy to schedule research protocols with our limited space (700 sf Exercise Physiology Teaching Laboratory) rather than the CSU laboratory norm, which is multiple discipline-specific lab spaces. The KIN department is in dire need of larger lab spaces to provide adequate research settings to meet student and faculty needs.

Since our last self-study, several students have taken advantage of studying abroad. But this opportunity still does not appear to be an important or viable part of KIN student choices. We might encourage our students to pursue this to a greater extent.

d. Comparison of program curriculum and resources

Across the CSU, kinesiology programs range in size, with many larger or smaller than Sonoma State's. We have looked at 3 programs for curricular comparison: Humboldt, Cal Poly Pomona, and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo (SLO). Pomona and SLO have slightly higher kinesiology FTES compared to SSU's, and Humboldt has significantly lower FTES. All three have a mission, department learning outcomes, and structured concentrations and course offerings similar to ours.

Table 21. Comparison of concentrations

Sonoma State	Humboldt State	Cal Poly Pomona	Cal Poly SLO
Exercise Science (pre-Physical Therapy)	Pre-Physical Therapy	Exercise Science	Exercise Science
Lifetime Physical Activity: Fitness & Wellness	Exercise Science/ Health Promotion	Health Promotion	Health Promotion
Interdisciplinary (pre-Occupational Therapy)	Physical Education Teaching	Pedagogy	Sport Science

Both of the polytechnic campuses have greater course offerings in their core curriculum, such as pathophysiology of exercise, introduction to research in kinesiology, motor learning and control, movement anatomy, sports medicine, exercise testing and prescription, exercise metabolism, and a capstone course. As our program has limited resources, we have developed our curriculum specifically to support our students in their career objectives and to satisfy the prerequisites for continued study in Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy, to support graduate study in health professions including nursing and medical school.

When comparing physical resources, Sonoma State's KIN program is extraordinarily underdeveloped compared to all three of these other CSU programs. Our total area for the exercise physiology, exercise biochemistry, and biomechanic laboratories is less than 1700 sf. Humboldt has only half of our FTES but more than twice as much lab space. Pomona and SLO have similarly large research labs. The table below illustrates the current difference in lab area (square feet). The data on FTES and FTEF are from the CSU Chancellor's Office Applications website (http://www.calstate.edu/es/intranet/applications/aa/apdb/apdb_discipline-report-by-

campus.shtml) and only report through 2013, which is when our current review cycle began.

Table 22. Comparison of student & faculty FTE, S:F ratio (2013) and lab space (2018)

	FTES	FTEF	S:F Ratio	Lab Sq Ft 2018
Sonoma	235.1	14.3	16.5	1700 sf
Humboldt	127.2	7.2	17.6	>4000 sf
Pomona	521.4	20.6	25.4	>4000 sf
San Luis Obispo	528.8	14.2	37.2	>4000 sf

Source and date: CSU 2013; lab space via personal communication 2018

e. The faculty human resource

Our department has 6 tenure-line faculty members and 16 lecturers: 6 academic and 10 activity lecturers. The ratio of lecturer to full time faculty is 2.67 lecturer for each tenure line faculty.

1. Student-faculty ratio for teaching and advising

In 2017, there were 426 graduate and undergraduate students and 6 fulltime faculty. Among these tenure-line faculty, the department chair has 9 units waived for the chair role and for being athletic director, and 2 faculty members have 3 units each waived, one for being director of excellence in diversity and one for being director of CFA. These are important roles within the university, but it means that the total teaching load covered by our tenure-line faculty is 4.75 FTE. The ratio of tenure-line faculty-to-students for advising is 1:71. If we were to meet our student population target of 400, the ratio would be 1:66.67.

While each of the 6 tenure-line faculty are extensively involved with advising, some have greater advising loads than others. Since both advising and teaching loads are part of the faculty contract, we need to determine how to distribute both fairly across the faculty. Additionally, we might improve student success and address some of the advising load issue by doing group advising for freshmen and students without a chosen concentration.

2. Analysis of advising

KIN faculty share the departmental advising load; the department coordinator assigns students to each advisor based on faculty expertise in the concentrations. However, we are not successfully reaching all KIN majors, in particular freshmen who have not declared a concentration. We discovered this during the current self-study, and the department as a whole is trying to develop appropriate mechanisms to provide faculty advising to freshmen who have not chosen a concentration. We have very few at-risk students; the department chair and individual faculty advisors work with them to maintain good academic standing. Early in their major work, students take KIN 201 Foundations of Kinesiology, which includes lectures and discussions on potential

careers in the discipline. Faculty discuss career options and preparation with students during academic advising. Additionally, students may use campus career services to seek information about other careers.

f. Library, information, and technology resources

The Sonoma State Library has adequate resources to support our program. We also have a designated librarian, Loretta Esparza, for KIN students and faculty.

We have limited teaching space in the KIN Department (see below) but projector-equipped classrooms are available in other buildings. Accommodating student research is more and more challenging due to limited lab space; most of our research includes some kind of hands-on experience and physiological testing. Our single exercise physiology laboratory does not have adequate technology to support our students' research demands.

g. Instructional space and facilities

1. Classroom space: We have 3 classrooms in the KIN building. PE 33 has 3 installed projectors and seats 30 students; PE 38 seats 40 and has a projector on a cart; and PE 15 seats 30, doubles s a conference room, and a projector must be brought into the room.
2. Instructional laboratories and studios: The department has one lab space for teaching exercise physiology laboratory classes, and one shared lab space for the biomechanics and athletic injuries laboratories, a space they also share with the laundry room.
3. Research/scholarship laboratories: We are developing former storage space into a new exercise biochemistry laboratory for research and scholarship.
4. Faculty offices: Each tenure-line faculty member has an individual office in the KIN building.
5. General office space: PE14 houses one shared administrative office.
6. Student study spaces: Students can use PE 15 when it is unscheduled.
7. Access to instructional technology in classrooms: Classrooms have varying projection capabilities: one has 3 built-in projectors, one has a computer and a projector on a cart, and the other requires a portable projector. An additional computer designated to PE33 could improve the set-up time between classes. The department has a computer and a projector for PE 15 teaching assignments.

h. Staff support

We have one instructional support technician for classroom help and all other instructional technology needs for the department, and one administrative coordinator.

i. Operational budget needs and trends

The department urgently needs an applied research laboratory as a shared space for faculty research and professional development, as the current exercise physiology laboratory is over-scheduled with lab sections and student research. The department

needs a biomechanics laboratory separate from the laundry room and sports medicine athletic training laboratory. We need to expand the current biochemistry laboratory to serve our students better.

VIII. Summary and Conclusion

A major strength of the Department of Kinesiology continues to be student appreciation for faculty, which we learned from our junior/senior and alumni surveys. Several other strengths worth mentioning include the curriculum as strength, strong advising, and the value of a tight-knit program with small class sizes. We believe as a faculty that we have a strong curriculum, and we are working to develop and offer additional movement science classes, aligned with our program learning outcomes and relevant for our students' prospective professional development.

While many students identify advising as a strength, many also identified opportunities to improve advising. Our self-study has shown us that we need to reach out to all KIN majors as soon as and as often as possible, for meaningful and timely advising. This approach may increase the retention of FTFT and improve our students' time to graduation.

The department responded strongly to meet many of the prior program review recommendations. We eliminated the graduate program and the physical education concentrations due to limited resources and declining student interest.
We eliminated some courses and addressed scheduling bottlenecks that were keeping our students from timely graduation. However, while we have made numerous changes in our undergraduate and graduate programs, we have seen little or no movement regarding tenure-track hires and facilities improvement.

We need to provide students with more seats in required courses throughout the year to improve on-time graduation, and we need at least one additional faculty hire. Despite declaring impaction and making adjustments to better align number of majors with faculty and department resources, our student numbers are increasing and we are down one tenure-line faculty position from our previous self-study.

Both the previous self-study and external reviewer noted that department facilities were outdated and inadequate, with the laboratories "in dire need of upkeep and expansion," yet almost nothing has been done to improve the condition of facilities.

We have recently revised our mission, vision, and program learning outcomes to reflect who we currently are and our aspirations. We know that we must now development and implement an assessment plan for program goals and PLOs.

Five-year action plan

We have several aims over the next five years: 1) prioritize department goals, 2) Improve our laboratory spaces to support student and faculty research, 3) Improve time to graduation and provide more seats and better schedules for students, 4) Develop and implement a program learning outcomes assessment plan, and 5) Aim for uniform excellence in advising. The aims are described in more detail below. They are interdependent; clearly establishing the priority of our goals will enable us to develop a calendar for the next five years, and we can measure our progress against the calendar.

(1) **Prioritize department goals.** As a department we strive to provide better learning experiences for our students and to accomplish our program goals. Some department goals require additional resources, including meeting the need for research space and returning to 7 tenure-line faculty. Some require all-faculty efforts, including developing and implementing both an assessment plan and strategies for excellent advising for all KIN students. Others are ongoing projects, including continued curriculum development to support student learning, on-time graduation and student goals, and engagement of our alumni.

(2) **Improve our laboratory space.** A major weakness preventing us from achieving the program's mission and vision is the inadequacy of our research facilities. Our department has the smallest and most obsolete laboratories in the Cal State system. It is crucial to improve our facilities as we seek to improve student learning outcomes through hands-on, experiential activities such as research and classroom projects. We have one Exercise Physiology Teaching Laboratory, which cannot support the current levels of undergraduate student interest in research. In 2017-18, 30 undergraduate and 4 of our remaining graduate students have been involved in at least 10 research projects. It is very nearly impossible to schedule data collection and testing protocols. We have had to use a locker room for a SOURCE grant study on fall prevention. Additionally, our Biomechanics lab appears to be from the 1970s and shares space with a laundry room and the sports medicine lab.

(3) **Improve time to graduation.** The department must develop and implement multiple strategies to improve students' time to graduation. Some areas to be addressed immediately include reducing the number and percentage of students without a declared concentration; providing more robust advising early in the program, to our freshmen and sophomores, possibly through group advising; developing better class scheduling in our core classes to eliminate scheduling conflicts and respond to student scheduling needs; and providing more seats in required classes and/or offering summer sessions to eliminate bottlenecks within the program.

(4) **Develop and implement a PLO assessment plan.** The faculty as a whole will need to work together to develop and implement an assessment plan for our PLOs. We know what some of the steps are: (a) build rubrics for each PLO to measure student achievement, (b) determine where in the curriculum students produce appropriate evidence to be assessed, (c) assess the evidence as a whole faculty to understand the

extent to which our students achieve what we believe we have designed our program to do, and (d) analyze and use the results to make any needed curriculum adjustments.

(5) **Aim for uniform and consistent excellence in advising.** To work toward this goal, we will need to describe what excellent advising is; for that we need to understand our own (faculty) perspectives as well as the multiple student perspectives. How might excellent advising be different for students who are FTFT versus those who are transfers? For those in different concentrations? For students of different backgrounds? For those who plan to go directly to graduate school versus those who plan to begin their careers immediately? We know, as a faculty, that we need develop a multi-step plan and multi-pronged approach to achieve excellence in advising.