

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF KINESIOLOGY AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION
2009 Annual Report

REPORT OF: Doctoral Program Review Committee

DATE OF REPORT: September 11, 2009

PREPARED BY: Waneen W. Spirduso

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Kirk Cureton, Dan Corcos, Gil Reeves; Scott Kretchmar
Consultants: Jim Morrow, Allen Jackson

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES:

1. The DPRC reviewed a draft of the AAKPE Operating Code provided for the committee by the AAKPE board. The DPRC agreed that this evaluation is one of the most important actions that AAKPE has taken, that the doctoral evaluation should be conducted on an unfailingly regular basis, and that data collection should require a minimum of time so that it will not be a burden for administrators. Our recommendations to the board were:

- Reformat the operating code statement to be consistent with others
- Eliminate the dates in the last sentence of the code
- Consider providing scholarships for the fee for schools that decline because for economic reasons.

2. Our committee reviewed the Doctoral Review Process, which involved discussing the contents of each stage of the review process: a) first letter to the chair and graduate dean; b) contents of the package containing the AAKPE president's letter with a 2-page summary of the 2005 ranks and an Instructional Guide and Verification page; suggestions of positive ways that departments and chairs can interpret the results of the review; and d) ways to facilitate and ease the transmission of data.

We concluded that the AAKPE review process and product is comprehensive, reveals our specific strengths as a discipline/profession, is objective, and will provide administrators of our departments and their central administrators with information that is not provided by other institutional rankings, such as the National Research Council Ranking. It is our recommendation that AAKPE should progress according to our schedule without regard to the schedule of the NRC, either with regard to data collection or the timing of the report and rankings.

In our review of the finances of the 2005 doctoral program evaluation, we recommended that AAKPE acknowledge these difficult economic times and reduce the evaluation fee by 20%. We recommended that the fee be reduced from \$600 to \$500, and that the difference will be made up by the anticipated increase in schools participating in the evaluation process. The budget below is based on these assumptions.

3. A was proposed to the AAKPE board based on 40 schools participating at an average of \$500 per school.

Proposed Budget

Income	\$20,000	40 schools @ 500 = \$20,000
Expenditures HK expenses	\$1,500 Entire period	\$500 for postage and mailing materials: \$20/hr staff time; Rough Estimate, as we do not know how much material and how many schools will participate
Personnel		

Morrow	\$3,500 \$3,500 \$7,000	March 2010 Summer 2010 Total	Analysis of data Supervision of data collection; additional schools; supervision of analysis; additional schools to analyze
Jackson	\$3,500 \$3,500 \$7,000	March 2010 Summer 2010 Total	Analysis of data Supervision of data collection; additional schools to analyze; supervision of analysis
Student RA \$10/hr	\$ 600 in summer 09 \$1,900 in February 10 \$2,500	Total	Set up list and verifying addresses of chair & dean; find on AKA web Analysis of data Paid directly out of Academy budget; hourly bill
Committee meetings Conference calls	\$5,000	Total	
GRAND TOTAL	\$23,000		

5. Recommended Changes in the Instrument: Faculty Data

Criteria for Inclusion of Faculty

We reviewed these criteria and revised them as follows:

To count as faculty:

- a) Teach doctoral courses; direct theses/dissertations and/or serve on Graduate Study Committees
- b) Hold a Ph.D. or equivalent and be in a tenured position
- c) Receive at least 25% of salary from the academic unit sponsoring the degree

Number of Department Publications. These will be acquired in two ways, by providing a column for each item:

1. Senior authors only. Reflects only the total number of publications produced by the department.
2. Each author counts. Reflects the total number of faculty participating in research

Only the senior author column will be counted in the total. The analysts will run the analysis using both, to determine how the total score may be affected and what additional information may be gleaned from this procedure; i.e., with all authors counting, it may provide an index of collaboration within a department.

External Funding. Change the description of this item to Competitive Internal Institutional Research Grants Expenditures. This will be defined as research grant expenditures processed through the department's budget.

National Academy Members. A point is awarded membership in the AAKPE. We changed this question to read "Number of faculty in national academies (includes AAKPE)"

Faculty Fellows in National Associations. Number of faculty elected as fellows in other national associations.

6. Recommended Changes in the Instrument: Student Data

Employment in the Field. We recommend rewording this item to read: "Enter the total number of doctoral graduates in the past 5 years who accepted full-time professional positions (strike out relevant to your doctoral program) *that required a doctoral degree.* Examples of such positions would include University

faculty positions and research positions. Positions in industry and institutes should also be included. This does NOT include Post-doctoral employment indicated above.” This item accounted for almost no variance, and if in the 2010 evaluation this item does not increase the variance accounted for by being more specific, the committee recommends delete this item and distributing the 3% item weight to other items. This item may contribute no variance because chairs do not have an efficient way of knowing where all their graduates were employed.

7. Discussions of the Analysis of Instrument Scores

Departments reporting extraordinary outliers of funding (10-30 times others). These departments force the T-scores of all others into such small units that discrimination among them is lost. When the analysts identify these outliers they will notify the chair of the DEC and inform the chair about how they adjusted (truncated) outliers. The chair of the DEC, will decide whether to involve committee, and if so, the DEC, without knowledge of outlier identities, will make decisions. First round data will be reanalyzed and committee will study the effect of truncation caused by outliers. The analysts will then analyze the data without truncation, +/- 3sd. The committee will study these results to decide whether to truncate data with huge outliers.

Large discrepancies among faculty sizes. The analysis will be run in two ways: with size of faculty adjusted and not adjusted to determine whether it makes a difference. It has been suggested that large faculties can provide more opportunity for collaboration, large equipment sharing, etc., yet when results are divided by the number of faculty, large departments and small departments appear the same.

Items that have low correlations with the test total. The analysts will provide a report of these and the committee will discuss them. The outcome of their discussion will be a report to the AAKPE board, and may result in recommendations as well.

8. Discussion of Final Report and Rankings.

Include a ranking of average vs relative ranking (to number of) faculty productivity

Report Categories ranked by faculty size

9. Updates to the AAKPE Instructions for the Doctoral Program Evaluation Instructional Guide

Several revisions were made of the instructions that we believe will enhance understanding of the document and facilitate data collection for the chairs and their staffs.

ACTION ITEMS: