Expected Outcome 1: Professional Knowledge

Full Description of Expected Outcome:

Upon completion of students Doctoral program in Kinesiology, they will demonstrate proficiency in their ability to: (a) know their content; (b) apply their content; (c) know how to work with diverse learners; (d) Contribute to collaborative learning communities; (e) Demonstrate a commitment to diversity.

Key Assessments:

Advanced Inventory of Candidate Proficiencies

Assessment Method Description

Students work is assessed across four criteria including: (a) know their content; (b) apply their content; (c) know how to work with diverse learners; (d) Contribute to collaborative learning communities; (e) Demonstrate a commitment to diversity. Each criteria is assessed across four levels of proficiency: (1) Exemplary, (2) Competent, (3) Approaching Competence, and (4) Not Approaching Competence. Each level is described with program specific indicators (rubric). The assessment is completed faculty in the program. The following link provides access this specific key assessment:

http://education.auburn.edu/files/assessment/key_assessment_ugrad/icp_exercise_sci.pdf (see Figure A).

Figure A: Inventory of Candidate Proficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Proficiencies</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent Professionals</td>
<td>Poor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. KNOW THEIR CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the content they practice within their profession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Demonstrate up-to-date knowledge and ever-evolving understandings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Understand and communicate relevant connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Professionals</td>
<td>Poor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. APPLY THEIR CONTENT KNOWLEDGE IN PRACTICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create learning experiences that make the content they practice meaningful for individuals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate knowledge of pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foster clients’ capacities to reason and engage in inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create learning experiences appropriate for scope and sequence including interdisciplinary learning experiences when appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider clients’ prior knowledge, experiences, developmental stages, and common misconceptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide multiple explanation and paths to learning as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make appropriate decisions regarding resources and materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. KNOW HOW TO WORK WITH DIVERSE LEARNERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand how individuals differ in their approaches to learning and create instruction or implement other professional practices adapted to this diversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treat learners equitable, are sensitive to and considerate of differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accommodate different learning styles and performance modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider wide-ranging modifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with major federal disabilities legislation and adhere to IEPs when applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborate with other professional to meet diverse needs of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committed Professionals</th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>Approaching Competence 2</th>
<th>Competent 3</th>
<th>Exemplary 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Contribute to COLLABORATIVE learning communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seek multiple perspectives and respect individual differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Model and foster collaboration within the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to strengthening and supporting professional organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with others to examine and hone professional practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjust actions and dispositions as needed to establish and strengthen collaborative efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrate a COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Show respect for, strive to better understand, and seek to meet the learning needs of all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Display open-mindedness, confront own biases, and consider different perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create safe, inclusive learning environments for all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate in ways that show a sensitivity to diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings Summary**

Findings are based on an individual program offered by the School of Kinesiology. At the completion of their program, faculty rate graduates on specific proficiencies that they should demonstrate in and outside of the classroom.

According to the results of the Inventory of Candidate proficiencies, Knowledge of working with diverse individuals and Contributing to the Collaborative Learning Community are areas for increased attention. This is due to the percent of candidates performing at exemplary or competent level. For a detailed assessment of the results, please refer to table 1a-1d.
Table 1a: Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral programs. (By performance category: Content Knowledge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Not Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>3 25.00%</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1b: Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By performance category: Apply the Content)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Not Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>1 9.09%</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1c: Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By performance category: Knowledge of Working with Diverse Individuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Not Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>1 8.33%</td>
<td>1 8.33%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1d: Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By performance category: Contribute to Collaborative Learning Communities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Not Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>1 9.09%</td>
<td>1 9.09%</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 1:** Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By performance category: Demonstrate a Commitment to Diversity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Demonstrate a Commitment to Diversity</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Not Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 75.00%</td>
<td>3 25.00%</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Improvement**

During the 2012-13 academic year, the findings suggest that attention needs to be given to the areas Knowledge of working with Diverse Individuals and Contributing to a Collaborative Learning Community.

Table 2 provides a description of actionable steps that have been taken by program based on the data presented from the Inventory of Candidate Proficiencies.

**Table 2:** Use of Findings for Program Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Related Doctoral Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First, it should be noted that the performance of our graduates on these metrics is quite good, but there is room for improvement. With regard to the area of diverse individuals and the collaborative learning environment, as the metrics is worded specifically for learning environments and it is possible that the raters are not considering the entirety of the doctoral program and are focusing only on the capstone experience (the dissertation). This metric will be reviewed with the faculty to insure that the raters are taking a global consideration when responding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expected Outcome 2: Program Impact

Full Description of Expected Outcome:

During students Doctoral program, they will demonstrate their ability to demonstrate their unique impact when working with diverse individuals. Four indicator will be evaluated including (a) planning, (b) implementation, (c) reflection, and (d) analysis on specific descriptions related to their program.

Key Assessments:
Advanced Professional Work Sample

Assessment Method Description

Candidates work is assessed across four criteria including: (a) Planning (b) Implementation, (c) Reflection and (d) Analysis. Each criteria is assessed across four levels of proficiency: (1) Exemplary, (2) Competent, (3) Approaching Competence, and (4) Not Approaching Competence. Each level is described with indicators (rubric). The assessment is completed by university faculty. The following link provides access this specific key assessment: [http://education.auburn.edu/files/assessment/key_assessment_ugrad/pws_undergrad_generic.pdf](http://education.auburn.edu/files/assessment/key_assessment_ugrad/pws_undergrad_generic.pdf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Not Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Performance is far below expectations.</td>
<td>Performance meets expectations but is inconsistent.</td>
<td>Performance far exceeds expectations; consistency is evident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Candidate provides insufficient details about learning outcomes, materials/procedures, and assessment. Important features of the learning environment and the students are omitted from the response. Decisions lack insight and/or are not based on best practices. Response lacks examples and relies on generalizations. Response is unclear and/or contains several grammatical and usage errors.</td>
<td>Candidate provides some details about learning outcomes, materials/procedures, and assessment, but fails to explain their relationships. Some features of the learning environment and the students are shared. Some decisions lack insight and/or are not based on best practices. Response is supported by some examples but seems contrived. Parts of the response lack clarity and contain some grammatical and usage errors.</td>
<td>Candidate provides details about learning outcomes, materials/procedures, and assessment and also explains their relationships. Features of the learning environment and the students are discussed. Decisions are based on best practices. Response is supported by examples. Response is clear, organized and free of major grammatical and usage errors.</td>
<td>Candidate provides substantial details about learning outcomes, materials/procedures, assessment and also effectively describes their relationships. Important features of the learning environment and the students are carefully considered and addressed. Decisions reflect insightfulness and are based on sound professional judgment and best practices. Response is supported by many relevant, original examples. Response shows an exceptional command of written language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Candidate has difficulty communicating content and relevant connections. Many activities, materials and/or strategies are inappropriate for content and students. Candidate fails to convey a passion for learning and students are not engaged in much of the lesson. Candidate often fails to monitor learning, respond to students’ insights/confusions, and/or make adaptations for diverse learners.</td>
<td>Candidate has some difficulty communicating content and/or relevant connections. Not all activities, materials, and/or strategies are appropriate for content and/or students. Candidate fails to convey a passion for learning, and/or students are not engaged in parts of the lesson. Candidate periodically monitors learning, responds to students’ insights/confusions, and/or makes appropriate adaptations for diverse learners.</td>
<td>Candidate communicates content and relevant connections. Activities, materials, and/or strategies are appropriate for content and students. Candidate conveys a passion for learning, and students are engaged in the lesson. Candidate monitors learning, responds to students’ insights/confusions, and makes appropriate adaptations for diverse learners.</td>
<td>Candidate clearly and effectively communicates content and relevant connections. Activities, materials, and/or strategies are exceptionally well-suited for content and students. Candidate conveys a passion for learning, and students are highly engaged in the lesson. Candidate consistently monitors learning, thoughtfully responds to students’ insights/confusions, and makes appropriate adaptations for diverse learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Candidate has difficulty facilitating a discussion about learning and teaching. Candidate’s observations and insights are inconsistent with others’ perspectives. Candidate fails to provide examples to support reflections. Candidate fails to convey a commitment to meeting the learning needs of students and does not draw upon an understanding of teaching/learning theory to support comments or to suggest changes in future teaching. Candidate fails to share appropriate ways that technology might be used. Candidate does not communicate ideas clearly.</td>
<td>Candidate has some difficulty facilitating a discussion about learning and teaching. Candidate’s observations and insights are not generally consistent with others’ perspectives. Candidate provides few examples to support reflections. Candidate conveys some commitment to meeting the learning needs of students but fails to draw upon an understanding of teaching/learning theory to support comments or to suggest changes in future teaching. Candidate shares basic ways that technology might be used. Some of the candidate’s ideas are not communicated clearly.</td>
<td>Candidate facilitates a discussion about learning and teaching. Candidate’s observations and insights are generally consistent with others’ perspectives. Candidate provides examples to support reflections. Candidate conveys a commitment to meeting the learning needs of students and draws on an understanding of teaching/learning theory to support comments and to suggest changes in future teaching. Candidate shares appropriate ways that technology might be used. Candidate clearly communicates ideas.</td>
<td>Candidate successfully facilitates a productive discussion about learning and teaching. Candidate’s observations and insights are consistent with others’ perspectives. Candidate provides specific, relevant examples to support reflections. Candidate conveys a deep commitment to meeting the learning needs of all students and draws on a broad understanding of teaching/learning theory to support comments and to suggest changes in future teaching. Candidate shares specific and logical ways that technology might be used. Candidate clearly and effectively communicates ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate provides a poorly organized and/or incomplete summary of data. Data sources, analysis, and/or interpretations are questionable. Conclusions are not supported by data and other sources of information. No mention is made of how data are used to understand learner differences. Candidate’s account of how data are used to inform instruction lacks examples and/or detail.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portions of the data summary are incomplete or unclear. Data are presented but not analyzed or interpreted accurately. Some conclusions seem invalid and/or are not supported by data or other sources of information. Little attention is given to how data are used to understand learner differences. Candidate’s account of how data are used to inform instruction seems contrived or scripted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provides a clear, complete summary of data. Data are presented, analyzed, and interpreted appropriately. Conclusions seem valid and are supported by data and other sources of information. Candidate explains how data are used to understand learner differences. Candidate includes a complete account of how data are used to inform instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provides a well-organized, comprehensive, and seemingly accurate summary of data. Important data are presented clearly, analyzed carefully, and interpreted in a meaningful way. Conclusions are insightful and are supported by relevant data and other pertinent information. Candidate clearly articulates how data are used to understand learners’ differences. Candidate includes a detailed, vivid account of how relevant data are used to inform instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Findings Summary

For Health Related Programs within the COE at the Doctoral level, a relative weakness for 2012-13 was identified as the planning and reflection for Kinesiology. The results are based on the percentage of candidates performing at the exemplary level and relative means for those items. The program goal is for candidates mean to be at a level of 3.80 or higher. (See Table 3a-3d)

**Table 3a:** Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By performance category: Planning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Planning Category</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Not Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3b:** Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By performance category: Implementation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Implementation Category</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Not Approaching Competence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3c:** Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By performance category: Reflection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Implementation Reflection</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Approaching Competence</td>
<td>Not Approaching Competence</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3d:** Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By performance category: Analysis of Student Learning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Implementation Analysis of Student Learning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Approaching Competence</td>
<td>Not Approaching Competence</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Improvement**

During the 2012-13 academic year, the findings suggest that attention needs to be given to the area of planning and reflection. Students are assessed by university faculty.

Table 4 provides a description of actionable steps that will be taken by program based on the data presented from the professional work sample.

**Table 4: Use of Findings for Program Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Related Doctoral Programs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>More data is needed to be sure that the raters are applying the rubric correctly to the doctoral students. Since the doctoral students in Kinesiology are not using planning or reflection to drive a lesson or teaching, but rather research, the faculty will be asked to review the rubric and apply the rubric to the capstone experience of the dissertation. In addition, the faculty will be polled to identify what deficits they have noted in the performance of the doctoral students. At this time, more data is needed before a plan can be developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Expected Outcome 3: Graduate Survey**

**Full Description of Expected Outcome:**

Students will be satisfied with academic challenge, course requirements and sequences, preparation to teach and carry out research.

**Key Assessments:**

Graduate Survey for Program Completers (Office of Institutional Research and Assessment)

**Assessment Method Description**

Students work was assessed across four items under review (a) my graduate program was academically challenging, (b) course requirements and sequences for my graduate program were effective, (c) my graduate program prepared me to teach, and (d) my graduate program prepared me to carry out research. For each statement students were asked to respond to the extent to which they agree with the statements about their graduate program from (a) strongly disagree, (b) disagree, (c) agree, and (d) strongly agree. (see Table 5a-5d).

**Findings Summary**

Items were assessed by students self-reporting. Based on the results the program goal for mean performance is set at 3.50. Thus, relative areas for increased attention include course requirements and sequences and graduate program prepared me to teach. See Tables 5a-5d for program specific strengths and weaknesses.

**Table 5a:** Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By category: Academically Challenging)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Academically Challenging Category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>9 (52.94%)</td>
<td>8 (47.06%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5b:** Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By category: Course Requirements and Sequences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Course Requirements and Sequences Category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>7 (41.18%)</td>
<td>9 (52.94%)</td>
<td>1 (5.89%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 5c:** Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By category: Program Prepared me to Teach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Program Prepared me to Teach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5d:** Frequency and Percentages of individuals in Health Related Doctoral Programs. (By category: Program Prepared me to Carry out Research)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Program Prepared me to Carry out Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Improvement**

During the 2012-13 academic year, the findings suggest that attention needs to be given to “Course Requirements and Sequences” and “My Graduate Program Prepared me to Teach.” The results are based on a survey of program graduate self-reported ratings.

Table 6 provides a description of actionable steps that will be taken by program based on the data presented from the professional work sample.

**Table 6: Use of Findings for Program Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Related Doctoral Programs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Kinesiology</td>
<td>The School of Kinesiology has gone through some dramatic changes and these doctoral students and those graduating in the next 2 years have been part of the transition from a new building, from a department to a school, and with the hiring of 5 new faculty members. As a result, the course requirement and sequencing responses are not surprising. However, as we progress through the transition process, this metric will be closely watched to see if this low rating persists, or is a function of the transition. With regard to the poor rating of teaching preparation it should be noted that the program does not have a teaching preparation component. In addition, based on previous feedback, it has been reported that the fear of the unknown is often the reason for the lack of teaching confidence. Perhaps a more in-depth question would help to tease out the reason for the lack of confidence. To address this issue in the short term, the faculty mentors will be asked to confer with the doctoral candidates to gauge the students feelings toward teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>