The Department of Kinesiology and Health Science has ongoing assessment activities in each of its four programs: Athletic Training, Exercise Science, Health Science and Physical Education. Each program has a coordinator and a faculty committee that meets regularly during the academic year to discuss issues concerning the program including assessment. This past year, each of the programs emphasized a particular assessment activity. Below this activity is described for each program using one or more of the three options given for the annual assessment report.

**Athletic Training Education Program (ATEP) – Report Option 2 and 3**

The ATEP is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE). The last accreditation visit took place in the spring of 2006. As a result of this visit, the ATEP at Sac State was awarded accreditation through 2012. As part of the ongoing accreditation process, ATEP is required to submit an annual report to CAATE. The 2007-2008 ATEP annual report is attached in Appendix 1 (Option 3).

While there are a number of assessment activities ongoing for ATEP, this year the faculty decided to examine a particular aspect of the program; the performance of the student in the Athletic Training Practicum. Using option 2, the following questions were addressed.

1. **What questions or issues were you addressing with this activity?**

Students in the ATEP program complete five phases (semesters) of an internship in a supervised athletic training clinical setting. Four of these phases (KINS 195D – Practicum in Athletic Training) are supervised athletic training experiences in the athletic training room under the direct supervision of a Certified Athletic Trainer. These Certified Athletic Trainers are also Approved Clinical Instructors (ACI) who, as part of their supervision duties, evaluate each student at a midpoint in the semester and at the end of the semester during phase II, III, IV and V. The evaluation form used (ACI evaluation of the AT Student) is attached in Appendix 2. There are three sections to the form and thirty seven items evaluated. Students must achieve a minimum score to advance to the next phase (see form) and must have no more than a total of five ratings of “1” (needs remediation). Twice a year, the ACI meet to discuss these evaluations forms for each student. At one of these meetings, the individual student’s performance is discussed. At the second meeting, programmatic issues are addressed based on the student’s performance. Based on these two meetings, changes to the program may occur.

The question addressed this year with regards to assessment dealt with this process.
2. **What data did you collect to address this question or issue?**

The data collected was the results of the mid-year and end-of-year evaluation form (ACI evaluation forms). All thirty seven items were collected and are now being entered into a spreadsheet for statistical analysis to look for trends, strengths, areas to improve, etc.

3. **What did the data tell you?**

At the time of this report was written, the data has been collected but not yet completely entered and analyzed. A sample look at the data initially indicates that our students are doing very well; however, a more detailed analysis is needed. In past semesters, individual evaluation forms were discussed by the ACIs as described above. It is our desire to look at the group data to look for trends; that is the purpose of this assessment activity. The analysis of this data will be reported in next year’s KHS annual report.

4. **As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?**

The ACI meet with the Program Coordinator at least twice each semester. At these meetings, a number of issues are discussed. During the fall 2008 meeting, the data will be discussed by this group. Based on these discussions, adjustments to the curriculum, internship, etc. may be made.

5. **What assessment activities are planned for the upcoming academic year?**

During the 2008-2009 year, assessment activities will include the analysis of the data discussed above. In addition, assessment activities will focus on the clinical sites using a site evaluation form (Appendix 3). This will also include an evaluation of the clinical instructors using an evaluation form (please see Appendix 3).

**Health Science (HLSC) – Option 2**

An important aspect of the HLSC program has to do with the internships all students are required to participate in; in their senior year, each student takes 3 units of HLSC 195. This culminating experience serves an important purpose by giving our students practical experiences at work sites, under the supervision of professionals in the field. An access database has been designed by the HLSC faculty to track important information concerning the student internship process (see Appendix 4). The database contains information about the students, the sites, supervisors, and forms used in the process. Also included is data generated from an internship evaluation form (see Appendix 4, pages 19-21).

This past year, the HLSC faculty focused their assessment activities on the internship experience.
1. **What questions or issues were you addressing with this activity?**

Each student intern is evaluated twice by an outside site supervisor using the internship evaluation form; one midterm evaluation and one final evaluation. This form is used to get feedback on the students and to give the HLSC faculty insight into strengths and weaknesses of the students. The general program assessment issue addressed was: how are our students performing in their internships. In addition, is there a change from the midterm evaluation to the final evaluation?

2. **What data did you collect to address this question or issue?**

The data collected came from the evaluation forms described above. There are nine major areas of evaluation including the following:

- Professional Attitude
- Perception of Responsibility
- Aptitude
- Cooperation
- Dependability
- Communication Skills
- Reasoning Ability
- Emotional Maturity
- Personal Appearance and Conduct

Each major area of evaluation contains a number of items that the site supervisor evaluates. All of the data were entered into the access database and statistically analyzed.

3. **What did the data tell you?**

The descriptive statistics for the data are attached (Appendix 4). A Mann-Whitney was also used to compare the interim vs. final evaluation, indicating that there was no statistical significant difference in performance measures between the final and interim evaluations. An analysis of the descriptive statistics tells us that our students are performing very well. The average scores for the nine major areas of evaluation ranged from a low of 4.45 in emotional maturity to a high of 4.71 in both aptitude and cooperation. On the scale used a 4 is Very Satisfactory and 5 is Outstanding. Based on this, we conclude that our students are doing very well. Feedback from professionals in the field indicates that our students are well prepared for the profession. Comments include:

- “… is an inquisitive, conscientious intern.”
- “… has been an exceptional intern.”
- “A pleasure to have an intern who is quick to catch on and a great researcher.”
- “… overall performance as an intern with the organization overall has been terrific.”
- “has consistently performed in an outstanding manner.”
- “She combines passion for her work with keen intelligence and the ability to think creatively.”

The intern site comments are very encouraging; telling us that our seniors, whom are about the graduate, are meeting expectations of professionals in the field. In addition, the comments confirm that the curriculum has prepared the students for entry into the health profession.

4. **As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?**

The HLSC faculty discussed the results and determined that no changes will be made to the HLSC program based on these data alone. The program appears to be working very well with regards to preparing our students for the profession.

5. **What assessment activities are planned for the upcoming academic year?**

As a result of this year’s assessment activities and other issues the program is interested in, the 2008-2009 assessment activities will focus on developing an assessment strategy for evaluating writing skills of HLSC 98 students. This will entail the inclusion of a writing assignment to assess student entry level skills and track their academic progression through the duration of the course.

**Physical Education (PE) – Option 2 and 3**

The PE Program is currently under accreditation review by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). During the 2007-2008, the KHS department worked on revisions requested by the CCTC (see Appendix 5); these revisions were submitted in June of 2008 to the CCTC (option 3). In addition, the College of Education is preparing for a CCTC review which includes assessment activities in KHS. I have attached our submission to the College of Education; see Appendix 6 (options 3). The following documents are attached to this report:

- KHS submission to the CCTC on subject matter accreditation which includes the KHS response to Standard 7 (Assessment of Subject Matter Competence), appendix 7.2 (Disposition Rubric), appendix 7.3 (Subject Matter Competency Check List), appendix 7.4 (advising handbook), and appendix 7.5 (PE Committee Policy and Procedures).

- KHS submission to the College of Education for their submission to the CCTC. Included in this are the key assessments used in KHS:
  - CSUS 2042 Midterm and Final Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form for the Elementary School Placement
  - CSUS 2042 Midterm and Final Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form for the Secondary School Placement
While there are a number of assessment activities ongoing for PE, this year the faculty decided to examine a particular aspect of the program; the performance of the students placed in the schools doing their required student teaching. Using option 2, the following questions were addressed.

1. **What questions or issues were you addressing with this activity?**

   In KINS 198A and KINS 198B student teachers discuss content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, opportunities for physical education to be introduced to individuals who may be disabled physically, mentally, emotionally, or who may lack English-speaking skills. Student teachers also discuss the unique needs of diverse populations and how to meet those needs by designing cooperative learning environments, planning developmentally and age-appropriate lessons and utilizing a variety of teaching methodologies and assessment strategies.

   These student teachers are placed in school sites under the supervision of cooperating teachers and a university student teacher supervisor. Each student teacher is observed and evaluated by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor using the 2042 evaluation form (see Appendix 8).

2. **What data did you collect to address this question or issue?**

   The data collected was the result (Appendix 8) of two evaluations performed by the cooperating teachers and two evaluations perform by the faculty supervisors at the elementary and secondary student teaching experience. The 2042 evaluation forms rate the student in the following areas:
3. **What did the data tell you?**

The data suggests that the student teachers, evaluated by university supervisors and the cooperating teachers, are meeting the criteria set forth by the Teacher Preparation Program and the 2042 evaluation by all student teachers receiving 3’s and 4’s on the evaluation. These data indicate that students graduating from the Physical Education Program are prepared for teaching based on the credentialing criteria set by the State of California. No major weaknesses appeared in the data.

4. **As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?**

The two PE Coordinators analysis of the results indicates that the steps currently outlined are assisting the students to meet the items outlined on the 2042 evaluation form. These coordinators are members of the PE Committee which meets regularly to discuss the program including assessment activities. As the Coordinators work towards incorporating the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), the embedded assessments within PACT will prove to be helpful in indentifying program changes that will need to be made. For example, within PACT a teaching performance assessment consists of the Teaching Event and Embedded Signature Assessments (ESAs). The Teaching Event measures the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), which are teaching standards for California student teachers. The customized ESAs, measure selected Teaching Performance Expectations developed by each program.

5. **What assessment activities are planned for the upcoming academic year?**

As a result of the assessment activities for the 2008-2009 academic year, assessment activities will be used to assist the faculty with the infusion of Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), which is schedule to take affect in the 2009-2010 academic year. Within PACT the Teaching Event will be used to measure the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE’s). The Teaching Event consists of 1) Context for Learning, 2) Planning Instruction & Assessment, 3) Instructing Students & Supporting Learning, 4) Assessing Student Learning and 5) Reflecting on Teaching & Learning. The specific aspects of each Signature Assessment, which will be used to address the Teaching Event, are currently being redesigned for the upcoming year as a result of
PACT and the new CA Model Content Standards as well as the new CA Framework for Physical Education.

**Exercise Science (ES)**

At the beginning of the 2006-2007 academic year, the ES program had no defined goals for learning objective/outcomes. The assessment activity that year centered on initiating an assessment process for this program. Activities that year included creating and charging an Exercise Science Committee and appointing an ES Coordinator for the program. During the 2007-2008 academic year, the ES Committee and Coordinator met on a regular basis discussing a number of programmatic issues including assessment. Through these discussions, two possible courses of action were proposed for creating an assessment plan. The first included the creation of Goals and Objects for the ES Program bases on the existing curriculum (see Appendix 9). In addition to these goals and objectives, a matrix was created to identify which courses contained a particular goal and/or objective (see Appendix 9). The second plan focused on external accreditation path. The American College of Sport Medicine is now accrediting ES Programs (see Appendix 9). The group discussed the advantages and disadvantages of both options but was unable to make a decision by the end of the spring semester. During the summer of 2008, the ES Coordinator continues to work on the two proposals including meeting with the universities Faculty Assessment Coordinator. As a result of these activities, the ES coordinator has recommended developing and using a mock exit exam for a random sampling of students in the Capstone Course, KINS 153, as a primary measuring tool for learning objectives and goals for the existing course curriculum. The data collected from this exam, will be used to complete our Assessment Report, which will include 1) goals and objectives/learning outcomes, 2) assessment of learning outcomes, 3) necessity of program change, and 4) future assessment activities planned for upcoming years. The ES coordinator also recommends further investigation to the feasibility of accreditation from ACSM. Once data are collected, a cross comparison between our current learning objectives to those of ACSM will be made and discussed in our Assessment Report, specifically within parts 3 and 4.