



Annual Assessment Report 2022-2023

BS Kinesiology Kinesiology & Health Promotion College of Science

CONTACT

Name of Program Assessment Lead Ken Hansen

Name of Person Completing Report Ken Hansen

DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION Yes

DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

How were the program's SLOs developed? (select all that apply)

- We developed them as a program/department using our own knowledge and expertise of the field.

Other than the [CPP Catalog](#) and the [Office of Assessment and Program Review website](#), where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.

- Department Website - provide URL: <https://www.cpp.edu/sci/kinesiology-healthpromotion/index.shtml>
- Course Syllabi
- Not currently published

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2022-2023

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2022-2023**. This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?

- 8

How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2022-2023?

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2022-2023 (e.g., artifact collection, scoring, closing the loop, etc.). May also have engaged in assessment planning activities unrelated to specific SLOs (e.g., modified curriculum matrix, assessment plan, etc.).

Please list the SLOs examined

- SLO #1: SLO 1 - Students will apply fundamental concepts, theories, methods, and research within the field of kinesiology and health promotion.
- SLO #2: SLO 2a - Students will use oral skills to communicate persuasively and coherently.
- SLO #3: SLO 2b: Students will use written skills to communicate persuasively and coherently.
- SLO #4: SLO 3a - Students will analyze credible and reliable data through information technologies.
- SLO #5: SLO 3b - Students will evaluate qualitative and quantitative information.
- SLO #6: SLO 4a - Students will demonstrate critical thinking within the diverse sub-disciplines of kinesiology and health promotion.
- SLO #7: SLO 4b - Students will create solutions to advance the art and science of human movement.
- SLO #8: SLO 5a - Students will defend ethical positions within health and human movement.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 1 - Students will apply fundamental concepts, theories, methods, and research within the field of kinesiology and health promotion.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning • Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework • Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used professional judgement (no rubric or scoring guide used)

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
<p>To evaluate Student Learning Outcome 1 (SLO1), students were tasked with completing seven laboratory activities, specifically covering Motion, Vectors, Kinematics, Gait, Torque, and Angular Motion. These activities involved recording lab reports as assignments. The labs were conducted in groups, and each group was provided with a minimum of two weeks to grasp the fundamental concepts and theories relevant to their assigned lab activity, as well as to carry out group activities needed to complete their lab reports. For instance, the Kinematics lab report was assigned on September 27th, with a due date of October 14th. On the day of the assignment, a Kinematics lecture was conducted, providing students with the specific knowledge required to complete the lab report. Subsequently, students worked together as a group on the lab activity. The Kinematics lab focused on analyzing projectile motion using jumping and landing techniques. Students were tasked with collecting data on jump time, jump angles, and landing angles either by utilizing provided jump videos or recording their own jumps. Based on this data, students calculated takeoff, flight, and landing times, as well as displacement and acceleration using the provided kinematic formulas. All the data collected and calculations performed were assessed, including critiques such as suggestions for improving jumping techniques. Additionally, students were expected to incorporate insights into perfect landing techniques derived from their data analysis. This lab activity aligns with SLO#1, as it enabled students to bridge the gap between fundamental concepts, theories, and definitions and their practical application in the context of real human movement, specifically in the realm of jumping, through the use of basic formulas.</p>	<p>The assessment of the lab reports hinged on three key criteria. Firstly, groups were tasked with the meticulous collection of data, emphasizing a high degree of accuracy. Secondly, the requirement included the performance of calculations on the raw data to derive kinematic parameters, constituting the data analysis aspect. Finally, groups were challenged with the interpretation of the analyzed data, applying fundamental concepts and theories pertinent to projectile motion, with a specific focus on jumping. In total, the Kinematic Lab reports encompassed eight distinct tasks, each contributing to a maximum possible score of 20 points. On average, the reports achieved a score of 17.47 out of 20, equivalent to 87%, corresponding to a B+ grade. The lowest individual score observed was 17 out of 20, equivalent to 85%, meriting a B grade. In contrast, the highest score attained was a perfect 20 out of 20, equating to 100%, warranting an A grade.</p>	<p>The results obtained from the Kinematic lab reports highlight several key observations. Firstly, it is evident that students were successful in gathering the necessary data to comprehend human motion, specifically in the context of jumping. Secondly, they demonstrated proficiency in processing the collected data, converting it into meaningful and relevant values. Lastly, students exhibited their ability to apply fundamental knowledge to real human motion, showcasing their grasp of essential concepts. This particular assignment serves as a clear illustration of its alignment with Student Learning Outcome 1 (SLO#1). It underscores how students were able to connect theoretical principles and foundational knowledge to the practical domain of human motion analysis, particularly in the context of jumping.</p>	<p>In the final task of the Kinematic lab report, which involved a critique, the instructor was genuinely impressed by the students' performance. They demonstrated a remarkable ability to provide detailed observations of human jumping, showcasing a brilliant application of the knowledge they had acquired to enhance jumping techniques. Notably, the students discerned that maintaining a jumping angle close to 45 degrees is crucial, particularly when attempting to achieve greater distance, as this angle plays a pivotal role in the projectile's trajectory. They also deduced that landing as gently as possible is essential to minimize acceleration, which, in turn, helps mitigate the risk of injuries. Their insights and analysis in this final task were commendable, reflecting their comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.</p>

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 2a - Students will use oral skills to communicate persuasively and coherently.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) Scored direct evidence of student learning Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used a rubric or scoring guide

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
<p>The grading criteria for this assignment were clearly outlined in a provided rubric, which students received at the beginning of the semester. The grading scale ranged from exceptional, worth 4 points, to failing, valued at 1 point, across eight distinct categories. Among these, four categories pertained to comprehension and content, encompassing aspects such as the introduction, content selection, organization, and conclusion. Additionally, there were four categories associated with engagement and communication, including length, eye contact, voice/posture, and audience engagement. Furthermore, the overall impression of the presentation was assessed on a scale from exceptional, earning 3 points, to failing, worth 1 point. In totality, students could earn a maximum of 35 points for this assignment, which contributed 15% towards their total grade for the course.</p>	<p>The assignment's success was evaluated using a specific rubric. Students' performance was assessed based on their ability to apply the lecture content covered in the first two modules to their family tree while utilizing Newell's model of constraints framework within the broader context of motor behavior. Students received scores out of a maximum of 35 points, spanning eight categories, along with an overall impression score. The total points out of 35 were then converted into a percentage score, reflecting the assignment's weight of 15% in the overall course grade. It's worth noting that the instructor developed this rubric over several years, drawing from resources like the oral communication rubric created during the 2017 Summer Assessment Institute to inform its design.</p>	<p>This assignment successfully achieved its Student Learning Outcome (SLO) goal of enhancing students' oral communication skills, enabling them to convey their ideas persuasively and coherently through spoken communication. Unlike lecture-based courses that may not always afford such opportunities, The instructor placed a strong emphasis on this assessment method, drawing from personal positive experiences with public speaking in education. The assignment's specific evaluative criteria, coupled with a subsequent in-class discussion, offer students valuable feedback on how to improve their persuasive and coherent speaking abilities. This feedback is particularly crucial since their performance in these aspects is reevaluated in the course's later stages when they present on a motor behavior journal article they have reviewed. Notably, the average performance in both oral presentations was excellent, underlining the effectiveness of this approach.</p>	<p>Although this group of students didn't yield any groundbreaking results in this assignment, the outcomes held significant value for the instructor in two key ways. Firstly, they provided valuable insights into the students' capacity to bridge theory and practice. Given the growing emphasis on integrating practical skills into the curriculum, the data from this assignment offered a clear perspective on how effectively students could apply theoretical concepts from the lectures to real world scenarios. Secondly, as the initial assessment in the course, these results shed light on the diverse levels of proficiency and prior experience among the students in evaluating and applying lecture content. Consequently, this information greatly influenced my teaching approach for the remainder of the semester.</p>

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 2b: Students will use written skills to communicate persuasively and coherently.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) Scored direct evidence of student learning Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used a rubric or scoring guide

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
<p>In the assessment, a total of six artifacts were evaluated. These artifacts encompassed a range of activities and reflections. Firstly, students engaged in a written discussion reflecting on the effectiveness of movement educators, providing insights into their understanding of this topic. Second, they delved into a written discussion centered on the discovery of their own learning styles, shedding light on how they approach learning. Third, students were tasked with developing a peer-to-peer teaching lesson plan tailored for visual and auditory learners, demonstrating their instructional skills. Subsequently, the assessment included the evaluation of the first teaching reflection, allowing students to critically assess their teaching experiences. Additionally, they were challenged with developing another peer-to-peer teaching lesson plan, this time for kinesthetic learners and individuals with disabilities, showcasing adaptability in instructional design. Finally, the second teaching reflection provided an opportunity for students to reflect on and refine their teaching approaches. These six artifacts collectively contributed to the comprehensive assessment of students' learning and teaching capabilities.</p>	<p>Percentage</p>	<p>Throughout the duration of the semester, students made significant strides in honing their writing skills. They actively engaged in refining their written communication by participating in discussions on the Canvas platform and providing peer responses, all with the overarching goal of strengthening the persuasiveness of their arguments. Moreover, they recognized the paramount importance of crafting lucid and comprehensible instructions in their lesson plans to ensure that their co-teachers could effortlessly comprehend and follow their guidance. This multifaceted approach not only bolstered their writing abilities but also fostered effective communication and instructional prowess.</p>	<p>As the semester progressed, students displayed noticeable enhancements in their writing skills, a trend that became increasingly evident with each assignment they submitted. These improvements were the product of their consistent dedication to the coursework and the iterative nature of academic writing. Through ongoing practice and exposure to various writing tasks, students refined their abilities to articulate ideas coherently, structure their arguments effectively, and adhere to academic conventions. Moreover, as they encountered a diverse range of assignments and writing prompts, students gained valuable experience in adapting their writing style to different contexts and purposes. The feedback provided by the continuous submission of assignments, coupled with the students' willingness to learn from constructive criticism, played a pivotal role in fostering their growth as proficient writers. Overall, these incremental developments underscored the significance of regular practice and the gradual refinement of writing skills over the course of their academic journey.</p>

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 3a - Students will analyze credible and reliable data through information technologies.,

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) Scored direct evidence of student learning. Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used a rubric or scoring guide Scored exams/tests/quizzes

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
<p>A total of ten Lab Reports and one cumulative final exam was scored.</p>	<p>Success was gauged through the calculation of a percentage out of a total of 9 points, along with an assessment of the overall comprehension and clarity exhibited in their written work. Students were required to attain either full marks or partial points in each section of their Lab Report. The Lab Report rubric served as a valuable tool in ascertaining whether each section's criteria were fully met or not.</p>	<p>The Lab Report assignment effectively fulfilled the objective of SLO 3a by necessitating students to actively engage with the Cal Poly Pomona (CPP) Library database to identify peer-reviewed articles for inclusion in the results section of the assignment. By adhering to the assignment's stipulations, students employed the CPP Library database as a tool to discern credible and dependable sources, thus exemplifying their grasp of source credibility and reliability. This was convincingly demonstrated through their skillful incorporation of these sources into the results section of the assignment.</p>	<p>Some students encountered difficulties, including unfamiliarity with incorporating APA in-text citations. Additionally, a few were not well-versed in distinguishing between primary and secondary sources. Many students faced challenges when it came to utilizing Microsoft Excel for the creation of the required graphs in the lab report's results section. However, as the semester progressed, and with the benefit of guidance, examples, and feedback, the overall quality of this assignment showed notable improvement. Moving forward, there are plans to enhance the students' preparedness for this task. The instructor intends to provide comprehensive instructions, complete with detailed examples of the Lab Report's various aspects. This will include guidance on navigating the CPP Library website, distinguishing between secondary and primary sources, and effectively creating graphs in Excel. These instructions and additional support resources will be readily accessible from the very beginning of the course, ensuring that students are well-equipped to tackle the assignment successfully.</p>

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 3b - Students will evaluate qualitative and quantitative information.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) Scored direct evidence of student learning. Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used a rubric or scoring guide

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
<p>In this assessment, the instructor incorporated four distinct artifacts as evaluation components for the students. The first artifact was the Pecha Kucha Presentation, which involved the evaluation of a single research article and was completed by 29 students. Additionally, the assessment included applied worksheets, which were categorized into three sections: Descriptive Statistics, completed by 28 students, Inferential Statistics, completed by 27 students, and Qualitative Coding, which was undertaken by 25 students. It's noteworthy that the class had a total enrollment of 30 students.</p>	<p>In this assessment, two distinct components were utilized to evaluate student performance. The first component involved the Pecha Kucha Presentation, which was assessed using a rubric that categorized performance into three levels: "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," and "below expectations." The second component encompassed the Applied Worksheets, which were evaluated based on scored worksheets. For this portion, a percentage system was employed, aligning with our standard letter grade percentages to determine students' performance outcomes.</p>	<p>In this assessment, two key components were employed to gauge student performance. Firstly, the Pecha Kucha Presentation saw a notable achievement, as 100% of the students attained a score of 'meets expectations' or higher in relation to the rubric criteria concerning qualitative and quantitative information. In this assignment, students effectively identified and interpreted the findings presented in their chosen research articles, successfully aligning with the intended Student Learning Outcome (SLO) goal. The 'exceeds expectations' category demonstrated a clear and accurate identification of research article results, providing specific details about the findings. On the other hand, the 'meets expectations' category identified research results and offered information about the findings, albeit with some minor areas of confusion. Secondly, the Applied Worksheets encompassed various tasks, including Descriptive Statistics, Inferential Statistics, and Qualitative Coding. In the Descriptive Statistics section, students were tasked with calculating various descriptive statistical tests using a standardized dataset, with a total of 15 points available. The average score for this worksheet was 81%, equivalent to a B- average, and scores ranged from 7 to 15 points. In the Inferential Statistics section, students calculated various inferential statistical tests using a standardized dataset, with a total of 8 points available. The average score for this worksheet was 82%, also corresponding to a B- average, and scores ranged from 2 to 8 points. Lastly, in the Qualitative Coding section, students conducted level 1-3 coding on an interview transcript, with a total of 20 points available. The average score for this worksheet was 91%, equivalent to an A- average, and scores ranged from 16 to 20 points. Although most students scored within the 'meets expectation' range, this assignment successfully met its SLO goal.</p>	<p>Students encountered difficulties when dealing with the quantitative applied worksheets. Although they demonstrated competence in identifying pertinent quantitative and qualitative information within a single research article, as evidenced by their performance in the Pecha Kucha presentation, they faced challenges when it came to executing descriptive and inferential statistical tests. This observation will inform the instructor's approach in future iterations of this course. The instructor intends to revise the lecture content to offer a more robust foundation in applied statistical knowledge, coupled with additional formative practice opportunities. By addressing these areas, the instructor aims to better equip students with the skills and confidence needed to excel in tasks requiring statistical analysis.</p>

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 4a - Students will demonstrate critical thinking within the diverse sub-disciplines of kinesiology and health promotion.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) Scored direct evidence of student learning. Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used a rubric or scoring guide Scored exams/tests/quizzes Used professional judgement (no rubric or scoring guide used)

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
<p>Throughout the course, students engaged in seven in-class assessments, each requiring them to respond to a follow-up question or topic directly related to the material covered that day. These assessments yielded between 1 to 3 artifacts per session and were evaluated based on both objective and subjective criteria. Objectively, they were scored based on word count, with a minimum requirement of 200 words per artifact. Subjectively, assessments were appraised for the depth of analysis provided. Regarding oral performance, two significant group projects and presentations were conducted, focusing on structural inequalities in health and sport. The first group presentation underwent evaluation based on a rubric that incorporated three artifacts, which also tied into the subsequent small group panel discussions. Objective criteria such as time management, adherence to APA format, and slide count were considered, along with subjective assessments of content quality and the depth of analysis. The second group discussion, an extension of the first presentation, was also evaluated through a rubric comprising three artifacts. Objective aspects including time management, APA format, and slide count were taken into account, alongside subjective assessments encompassing content, depth of analysis, and the overall interest and quality of the presentation. Furthermore, there was an additional element in the form</p>	<p>In assessing student performance, various methods were employed based on the nature of the assignment or activity. For assignments, exams, and papers completed as part of regular coursework, success was gauged through two primary factors: attendance in class, as assessments could only be completed by students who attended, and the average grade of their assessments. In the case of oral performances, such as presentations, defenses, or conference presentations, success was predominantly determined by the overall presentation grade. Additionally, for other activities, such as small group panel discussions addressing contentious issues related to structural inequalities in health and sport, success was measured by both attendance and participation numbers. These multifaceted assessment approaches were tailored to the specific requirements and objectives of each task, providing a comprehensive evaluation of student performance.</p>	<p>Yes. The course demanded a significant amount of critical thinking from students. This was particularly evident in their discussions of controversial and weighty subjects during class sessions and subsequent assessments. These assessments often required them to delve into the literature and contemporary media sources to gather information. Moreover, students were tasked with examining one specific structural inequality, such as race/ethnicity, disability, gender, sexuality, or socioeconomic status, and exploring its impact on health and sports. They then undertook projects focused on individuals who had overcome these structural inequalities, once again necessitating research in academic and media sources. Additionally, students were encouraged to formulate follow-up questions for class discussions, fostering further critical thinking. Importantly, these discussions and debates were conducted independently, without external assistance, challenging students to think critically and engage deeply with the topics at hand.</p>	<p>Throughout the regular coursework assignments, the instructor was pleasantly surprised by the students' remarkable level of interest and engagement with the topics at hand. Attendance and enthusiasm were notably high, particularly in comparison to previous experiences, with a significant uptick since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. This heightened engagement translated into exceptional performance on assessments, resulting in overall high grades. In terms of oral presentations, the quality was generally good, aligning with expectations. However, it was surprising to observe a notable lack of familiarity with APA formatting among students. This realization highlighted the need for further emphasis on APA style knowledge in future instruction. The small group panel discussions, focusing</p>

<p>of small group panel discussions concerning controversial questions pertaining to structural inequalities in health and sport. Following the first group presentation, each group posed a follow-up question, leading multiple small group discussions and debates. These sessions were assessed using the previously mentioned rubric, while other students involved were evaluated objectively for attendance and subjectively for participation.</p>			<p>on controversial questions surrounding structural inequalities in health and sport, revealed an encouraging increase in student participation. This experience served as an eye-opener, prompting the consideration of incorporating more of these discussions into future teaching endeavors. The enhanced participation and engagement in these settings demonstrated the potential for deeper and more interactive learning experiences.</p>
--	--	--	--

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 4b - Students will create solutions to advance the art and science of human movement.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) Scored direct evidence of student learning. Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used a rubric or scoring guide Scored exams/tests/quizzes Used professional judgement (no rubric or scoring guide used)

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
<p>In this course, students underwent a comprehensive assessment process, encompassing various components. Regular coursework involved seven in-class assessments, with students responding to follow-up questions or topics related to the day's material. These assessments generated 1-3 artifacts each and were evaluated based on objective criteria, including word count (with a minimum requirement of 200 words per artifact), and subjectively for the depth of analysis. Oral performance played a significant role, featuring two primary group project presentations focused on structural inequalities in health and sport. The first group presentation was evaluated based on three artifacts listed in the rubric, which also informed the subsequent small group panel discussions. Assessment criteria encompassed both objective elements such as timing, APA format adherence, and slide count, and subjective aspects including content quality and depth of analysis. The second group discussion also comprised three artifacts from the rubric, with objective criteria considering timing, APA format, and slide count, while subjective evaluation involved content, depth of analysis, and the overall interest and quality of the presentation. Additionally, the course included small group panel discussions that revolved around contentious questions pertaining to structural inequalities in health and sport. Following the initial group presentation, each group posed</p>	<p>In the course's assessment strategy, success was evaluated through various means tailored to the type of task. For assignments, exams, and papers integrated into the regular coursework, success was gauged by two key indicators: attendance in class, as these assessments could only be completed in class, and the average grade achieved on these assessments. In the context of oral performances, such as presentations or defenses, success was measured by the overall grade assigned to the presentation. In addition, small group panel discussions were held to engage students in conversations surrounding contentious issues concerning structural inequalities in health and sport. The success of these discussions was determined by both attendance and participation numbers, reflecting the level of involvement and engagement among students. These varied assessment approaches collectively provided a comprehensive evaluation of student performance in the course.</p>	<p>Throughout the course, critical thinking was prominently featured in the exploration of contentious and weighty subjects. Students engaged in thought-provoking class discussions, delving into these complex topics and subsequently completing follow-up assessments to consolidate their understanding. This process entailed thorough research, involving the examination of literature and contemporary media sources to gather relevant information. In the realm of oral performance, students were tasked with examining one of the five structural inequalities: race/ethnicity, disability, gender, sexuality, or socioeconomic status. Beyond merely discussing how these inequalities impact health and sports, students embarked on follow-up projects that spotlighted individuals in the realm of sports or health who had triumphed over these structural challenges. This endeavor necessitated extensive research, including a deep dive into academic and contemporary media sources. Additionally, students were encouraged to formulate thought-provoking, follow-up questions for</p>	<p>In the context of regular coursework assessments, notable levels of interest and engagement among students were observed, which was particularly striking given the circumstances related to COVID-19. Both attendance and interest levels were among the highest experienced. Furthermore, the assessments yielded exceptionally high grades, indicating a strong performance overall. Regarding oral presentations, the quality was generally at the expected standard, although it was surprising to note a lack of familiarity with APA formatting. This area requires attention and improvement in the future. The small group panel discussions centered on controversial questions related to structural inequalities in health and sport witnessed increased participation, providing valuable insights. This experience was enlightening,</p>

<p>a follow-up question and led multiple small group discussions and debates. The assessment for these discussions utilized the same rubric as mentioned earlier for the presenting group, with other students being assessed objectively for attendance and subjectively for their participation. This multifaceted assessment approach catered to the diverse aspects of student learning and engagement in the course.</p>		<p>class discussions, fostering further critical thinking and engagement. Another facet of the course involved small group panel discussions, where students grappled with contentious questions related to structural inequalities in health and sport. Importantly, they were tasked with tackling these topics independently, without external assistance, prompting them to think critically and engage in lively debates. This multifaceted approach to learning underscored the importance of analytical thinking and independent exploration of complex issues.</p>	<p>prompting consideration of incorporating more of these discussions into future course iterations, recognizing their potential to enhance student engagement and learning.</p>
---	--	--	--

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 5a - Students will defend ethical positions within health and human movement.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) Scored direct evidence of student learning. Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used a rubric or scoring guide Scored exams/tests/quizzes Used professional judgement (no rubric or scoring guide used)

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
<p>In total, 76 artifacts were assessed, encompassing 40 Mid Term Exams and 36 Philosophy Projects.</p>	<p>The average score for the Mid Term Exams in the course was 73%. These exams were designed to cover foundational material, including Lines of Reasoning and Components of Philosophy, while also introducing students to axiological, metaphysical, moral, and ethical dilemmas. The exam format was non-scantron and followed a decolonized pedagogy approach, encouraging the incorporation of authentic narratives to assess contemporary issues in sport, health, and human movement. This aligns with the achievement of Student Learning Outcome (SLO) #5, as it presented students with formatted philosophical dilemmas for analysis. On the other hand, the average score for Philosophy Project Part I was 86%. This segment of the course involved students proposing dilemmas related to health, human movement, or sport. The strong average score reflects students' success in proposing, critically thinking about, structuring arguments, researching support, and defending their positions, whether through inductive, intuitive, or deductive reasoning. Part II of the project focused on translating the argument into a properly formatted paper and presentation, constituting a dialectical exercise. This achievement surpasses SLO #5, highlighting students' ability to engage deeply with philosophical concepts and contemporary issues in the field.</p>	<p>Both assignments achieved the goal noted in SLO #5.</p>	<p>In Throughout the course, students demonstrated a significant level of engagement and commitment when delving into various moral, axiological, ethical, and metaphysical issues. Additionally, some students acknowledged the positive impact of the reading assignments and course vocabulary on their academic development. This influence extended to the expansion of their lexicon, improved grammar, enhanced knowledge of relevant issues, sharpened critical thinking skills, a better grasp of argument structure, and a heightened awareness of logical fallacies to avoid. Notably, the course encouraged students to embrace authenticity and freedom in their exploration of knowledge. This approach served to de-colonize the classroom environment, fostering inclusivity and a global perspective in the learning process, as opposed to an authoritarian and restrictive approach.</p>

IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2022-2023? Select all that apply.

- Assessment procedure changes (SLOs, curriculum matrix, rubrics, evidence collected, sampling, communications with faculty, etc.)
- Course-level changes (e.g., syllabus, content, pedagogy)
- Program curricular changes (e.g., course sequencing, changes to required curriculum, added or deleted courses)
- Personnel changes (e.g., faculty, laboratory staff, academic advisors etc.)

Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2021-2022? Select all that apply.

- Program/department faculty as whole
- A committee of program/department faculty
- Program/department assessment committee
- College curriculum committee
- College assessment committee
- Students

The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2022-2023 so that others may learn from your experiences.

It is crucial for me to enhance my diligence when collaborating with faculty members who are conducting specific Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessments within their courses. At times, there appeared to be ambiguity regarding the required criteria and the methods for collecting the necessary data. Additionally, there were challenges in obtaining these assessments from faculty members. These concerns arise from the completion of last year's assessment, and I recognize the need for further action on my part as the assessment lead. Specifically, I intend to improve communication to ensure clear expectations are established and met.

Please share how the program triangulates various data sources to determine student success. Consider assessment findings, [CPP's GI2025 markers](#), [CSU Dashboard](#), [CPP's Student Success Dashboard on Tableau](#), course evaluations, etc.

ChatGPT In the context of strategic planning, the 2021/2022 academic year saw the formation of the Diversity and Equity Committee, comprising key stakeholders including students, staff, and faculty from the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion (KHP). Subsequently, this committee has undergone restructuring to enhance stakeholder involvement, leading to its transformation into the Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) committee. The primary aim of the JEDI committee is to establish a safe and inclusive platform where all members of the KHP community, including students, faculty, and staff, can freely express, articulate, and support departmental strategies related to diversity and equity without encountering bias or marginalization. Within the scope of these initiatives, KHP has developed new Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), coupled with significant revisions to major courses. These changes have been implemented for the academic year 2022-2023. Additionally, KHP is introducing new courses to the curriculum, with a specific focus on social justice, equity, and

diversity. A central emphasis of these revisions and course additions is to foster a more cohesive KHP community that unequivocally acknowledges and embraces all forms of diversity and inclusivity.

Does the program offer a certificate or credential (e.g., teaching credential)?

- No

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found [here](#). To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

Assessment Plan - No

Curriculum Matrix - No