

PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2015-2016

Program: Kinesiology/Athletics

Division: BSBA

Date: 10/12/2015

Writer(s): Jason Craighead

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Jason Craighead

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Purpose: To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.

Time Frame: This update should reflect on program status during the 2014-15 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2016-17.

Topics: The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second and third sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes.

Scope: While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.

Instructions:

- 1) Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.
 - 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "No Changes Since the Program Planning Update."
 - 3) Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by _____.
-

Part One: Program Snapshot

A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?

If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data

Our approval of the AA-T degree is our most significant change. We are also continuing to offer the local A.S. Kinesiology degree as a LPC degree option for those who are not continuing to a 4 year. Approval of the KIN AA-T degree was originated from a State Mandate, but will also serve the needs of the students. The Introduction to Kinesiology course has gone from being offered Fall semester only and 50 students, to being offered Fall and Spring as a large lecture (currently 67 students for Fall 2015). Labor Market data has shown an increase in particular professions under Kinesiology.

Our overall enrollment in activity courses (Office of Institutional Research) declined slightly from last

year (3385 to 3184), which is good compared to the large drops in the last 4 years (4466 to 3184).

We have also had decrease in the number of full-time faculty with 2 retirements (from 6 to 4 full-time), Larry Aguiar (Spring 2015) and Geoff Smyth (Summer 2015). Our overall FTEF taught by full-time faculty is down to 49%. The State Ed Code recommends 75% by full-time faculty, as full-time faculty are more available and accessible to students, leading to overall student success.

B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2014 Program Planning Update (PPU) have been achieved and how?

- Moving most of our courses to a variable unit of 1-2, from .5-2 unit to meet C-ID requirements for the AA-T degree. This change took place over the 2013-2014 year and the course were offered during the 2014-2015 year to present.
- Approval of the AA-T degree. We are also continuing to offer the local A.S. Kinesiology degree.
- For Athletics, we have added Women's Intercollegiate Water Polo and Men's Intercollegiate Water Polo. A part-time head coach was hired for each sport.
- Approved for a classified position request, Athletic Trainer.

C. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?

Obstacles for our program have been repeatability. The creation of families has led to a specific designation for specific activity courses, and students are choosing not to take a course based on its title/description. As an example, previously a student could take Basketball 4 times, regardless of ability and progress each time. Now the course is labeled as "Beginning Basketball", "Intermediate Basketball"... Students are only taking courses based on their perceived ability, limiting the courses and options for students. Our overall enrollment in activity courses (Office of Institutional Research) declined slightly from last year (3384 to 3185), which is minimal compared to the large drops in the last 4 years (4466 to 3184).

D. What are your most important plans (either new or continuing) for next year?

- Replacement of one or both retirements.
- Begin discussion, prioritization, and planning for implementation of new sports for the future (track & field, volleyball/beach volleyball, baseball, softball, tennis, lacrosse, and golf).
- Write and revise curriculum.
- Discussion into bringing back the Fitness Center concept (revised and new curriculum).
- Secure funding to combine our two weight rooms to enhance student learning and increase productivity.

E. Do plans listed under question (D) connect to this year's planning priorities (listed below)? If so, explain how they connect.

Planning Priorities for 2015-16

- ***Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards***
- ***Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance***
- ***Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes***

- **Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.**

Full-time faculty contribute to Planning Priorities 1, 2, & 3 by assisting with self evaluation documentation and information, serving on committees that are connected to the ACCJC Accreditation process, completing training to update and create new curriculum, and create/assess SLO's for the courses taught and courses within the department.

F. Instructional programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion? yes no

(This data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/y9ZBmt>)

If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

We met the program-set standard.

G. How have students been impacted by the work of your program since the last Program Planning Update (PPU)?

Overall student success has declined 2% from the previous year (83% to 81%) and our overall enrollment has also dropped by 6% from the previous year (3384 down to 3185). This is a small, fairly insignificant change, but we have noticed confusion and complication with students understanding the leveling process (families). A decrease may not seem like an impact, but the previous year we had a drop of 16% (4025 down to 3384). Looking back past last year to our PPU, we were going to diversify our offerings and continue to create new curriculum. In doing this, we have seen very little change in our enrollment patterns. We have discussed the possibility of bringing back the Fitness Center concept, as it was highly productive and highly enrolled. We have to work through classroom space issues to make sure it is done right and offers the best possible opportunity for our students to learn and succeed.

We have looked over and discussed this issue, and we also attribute the decline in enrollment due to the increase of the ADT degrees, which do not have activity requirements on them (except for the KIN degree). Less and less students are completing the local LPC AA or AS degree which had a 1 unit activity requirement.

Part Two: SLO/SAO Assessment Review

Review your program's SLO assessment results for AY 2014-2015 and respond to the following questions.

A. Discuss how assessment results in at least one course in the program indicate success in student learning (OR) Discuss how assessment results of at least one SAO in the program indicate success in service to students.

For Flag Football 1 and Flag Football 2, the midterm exams for each course reflect knowledge of the rules and play of the game. All students scored a minimum of "above average" (80-89% proficient), and 38% of those scored at the top of proficiency (Mastery, 90-100%).

As a whole, our assessment results have indicated proficiency in most courses (92% of students score at or above competent).

B. Discuss assessment results that indicate a need for improvement.

With 92% of students scoring at or above competent, we have to look at what areas can lead to incremental improvements. Of the remaining 8%, 67 out of 205 (33%) scored a 0, which is typical of a 'W' students. We need to look at how to keep these students enrolled, engaged, and progressing. Instructors have noted areas for improvement within each course/section and equipment that would increase success in specific content areas SLO's.

The other area for improvement that is critical is getting all instructors to enter their assessments into elumen. Our recent report for the previous academic year shows that 65 out of 174 sections did not have any assessments completed. Of the missing scores, 32 sections not reported were from full-time faculty and 33 from part-time faculty.

C. Instructional Programs: For the course(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program, or someone in your program, made changes or plans to make changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment results.

Non-Instructional Programs: For the areas(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program made changes or plans to make changes as a result of SAO assessment results.

For KIN 30 (Introduction to Kinesiology), a new SLO was added "Identify a number of career options following a degree in kinesiology." After examining assessment results, a series of research assignments were created for the students to understand the disciplines under Kinesiology, identify jobs/careers available, understand the different degrees options and pathways at four-year institutions both in-state and out-of-state, so they can best prepare themselves for a career with a Kinesiology degree. A few years ago, Kinesiology was moved to a lower division course so that students could understand the discipline and be prepared for upper division upon transfer. The most recent SLO assessments indicate student learning based on the example above.

D. Instructional Programs Only: Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.

Since we have moved all courses offered to a 1 unit minimum, we have seen very little change in student success for the Fall and Spring. However, student success and retention have been poor when utilizing the 1 unit minimum. For the Summer 2015 courses, we offered all .5 unit courses (of the ones that were not updated to match C-ID), and saw an increase in student success back to prior summer levels.

E. Instructional Programs: Discuss how distance education course assessment results compare to face-to-face courses, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program has distance education courses.)

Non-Instructional Programs: Discuss how SAO assessment results for online services compare to face-to-face services, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program provides services online.)

Based on the previous academic year, we cannot make a strong comparison. We had 4 sections (91 students) of an online Personal Fitness course, with only one section of 14 students reporting scores. Of those 14, all received the highest score for achievement.

We have only one other course that is a hybrid, Introduction to Athletic Training, and no scores were reported for Fall 2014. It is only offered in the Fall.

F. Did your program discover the need for additional resources (for AY 15-16 or 2016-17) based on the assessment results? YES NO

If yes, please explain.

Our assessment results indicate a slightly lower student success rate with “families”, especially as students progress to higher levels. Prior to families, students could repeat a single course 4 times to become proficient in skills. With families, they are leveled and increase in skill as students progress. The equipment in our area (we are very equipment heavy) was bought based on the single course being repeated 4 times and multiple attempts at the same/similar skills (years prior to the change in repeatability). With the leveling, the skills are more specific, which also requires more specific equipment in most courses to increase the skill sets in a logical progression. In addition, continuing to increase the variety of our offerings creates a need for more and different equipment.

Part Three: SLO/SAO Continuous Improvement Process

A. SLO Planning through AY 2016-17

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program's plans starting now and continuing through the academic year 2016-17. Focus on how the program's SLO process will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO/SAO assessments: How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning or services? (*NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. Each program must assess at least 25% of its courses every semester. Programs with SAOs should assess at least 50% of their SAOs every year*).

Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):

- changing number of units/lab hours
- changing pedagogy/curriculum
- changing assessments
- changing service hours
- changing modes of service delivery

We are looking at changing back a portion of the course to the .5-2 unit variable in order to offer more to the students. In doing this, we will keep a small portion of courses that will have the 1-2 unit variable that will be tied into our Kinesiology ADT.

We are also looking at bringing back the Fitness Center concept with new & revised curriculum and SLO's. The Fitness Center would have multiple courses attached to the open entry/open exit format, allowing for flexibility in scheduling for the students to achieve success. We are going to add more and different assessments (pre & post) as well as separate "lecture series" topics for greater breadth and depth in content for the students.

2. Have your assessment results shown a need for new/revised SLO/SAOs? YES NO

If yes, complete the table below:

Estimated number of courses for which SLOs will be written or revised:	10
Estimated number of SAOs that will be written or revised:	

- a. What courses or SAOs will your program assess during this academic year (2015-16)?

- b. Instructional programs only: In order to budget to pay part-time faculty to work on SLOs during the academic year 2015-16, estimate the number of part-time faculty in your program who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

Number of Part-Time faculty who will participate in the SLO process (creating, assessing or discussing SLOs)	
Fall 2015	6
Spring 2016	6