



SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS FORMS
Institutional Program Review
Report to the Board of Regents

UNIVERSITY:	USD
DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL:	School of Education
PROGRAM REVIEWED:	Kinesiology & Sport Management (KSM)
DATE OF REVIEW:	3/20/2018
TYPE OF REVIEW:	Institutional Program Review

University Approval

To the Board of Regents and the Executive Director: I certify that I have read this report, that I believe it to be accurate, and that it has been evaluated and approved as provided by university policy.



President of the University

5/7/2019

Date

1. Identify the program reviewers and any external accrediting body:

Dr. Tim Gavin, Professor and Department Head, Health & Kinesiology, Purdue University
Dr. Jon Miller, Professor, College of Health and Human Services, Troy University

2. Items A & B should address the following issues: mission centrality, program quality, cost, program productivity, plans for the future, and assessment of progress.

2(A). Describe the strengths and weaknesses identified by the reviewers

Mission Centrality: The reviewers felt the division currently services too many outside programs and we should work to streamline programming and resources towards our core mission. The reviewers noted that KSM is in the process of re-developing our mission statement and strategic plan, which they felt should be made more central moving forward. In particular, the reviewers felt that an increased focus on building a distinctive brand, core mission, and academic culture would improve overall success of KSM.

Program Quality: The reviewers lauded the program quality, noting that value of an enthusiastic faculty and multiple opportunities for student practical experiences. They further noted the value of the division's recent course load reduction for tenure track faculty, which they felt would allow for increased research productivity and higher profile for KSM faculty. However, the reviewers were concerned about the use of adjunct faculty in core major courses and suggested several possible solutions to address this situation. Finally, the reviewers suggested areas for curricular development, but noted that limited faculty resources were an important consideration in such strategic planning.

With regard to perceptions of quality, the reviewers noted the threat of a competitive major being added on campus (i.e., Sport Marketing and Media).

Cost: The reviewers recognized financial and structural limitations for the KSM program, including a need for an increased understanding and transparency in the

strategic budgeting process, at multiple levels across the university. Thus it was noted that, achieving excellence in higher education, “requires financial resources sufficient to support a high-quality learning environment.” The reviewers noted the need for increased financial resources to improve programming. In particular, the reviewers noted the importance of financial resources in the recruitment and retention of quality faculty members. They further noted that recruitment and retention of quality faculty over time is pivotal in developing a strong academic culture in the division.

Program Productivity: The reviewers noted the relative youth of faculty and newness in positions as a limitation to overall productivity, given that only the Chair has tenure and no other faculty member has completed a 3-year review. However, the reviewers indicated that the division’s recent investment in reduced course loads and research related equipment were positive steps that provided opportunity for increased productivity.

Plans for the Future: The reviewers appreciated the development of a new strategic plan and strongly encouraged increasing its centrality in the division. Reviewers similarly praised the recent development of a new assessment plan, as well as several curricular changes already being planned, including a split of the KSM division into two distinct majors (i.e., Exercise Science and Sport Management). Reviewers applauded the optimism and enthusiasm of the young program in panning for the program’s future-noting the current review as an opportunity to develop the division according to a shared vision.

Assessment of Progress: The reviewers noted a current lack of assessment activities, but praised the division for its recent development of a new assessment plan. They emphasized the importance of formalized Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s) with regularly collected measures or progress for each.

2(B). Briefly summarize the review recommendations

Mission Centrality: The reviewers suggested the division’s mission be made more central to its day-to-day activities. They noted that this would provide a more cohesive image for the program and provide a set of common goals for faculty and staff to accomplish.

Program Quality: The reviewers emphasized a need to “right-size” the division’s offerings to match resources- which they felt would help improve quality for core programs. That is, the reviewers felt that resources were spread too thin, necessitating an over reliance on adjunct faculty. By eliminating ancillary programming or increasing faculty resources, the reviewers felt the division could deliver higher quality programming, while still developing research capacity and productivity. In particular, the restructuring of faculty resources would allow the division to offer additional courses, which are common in similar programs nationally, that are not currently available.

Cost: The reviewers felt that the program currently lacked sufficient resources. As previously noted, they suggested a reallocation of resources to core programming to reduce overall cost. The reviewers also noted the importance of recruiting and retaining quality faculty as an important component of developing a strong academic culture. This, they felt, would require significant financial investment and a strategic “right-sizing” process to address salary and teaching load concerns which have contributed to high faculty turnover. Further, the reviewers encouraged increased divisional involvement in the overall strategic budgeting process, which they felt lacked transparency. This, they

noted, would allow for better strategic decision making regarding the “right-sizing” of divisional resources and offerings.

Program Productivity: The reviewers appreciated the recent emphasis on research productivity in the division. They suggested a continuation of this policy, including the recently reduced course load for tenure-track faculty, with an additional course release for first year faculty. The reviewers also noted a need for increased clarification of research expectations and emphasized appropriate comparison to peer institutions.

Plans for the Future: The reviewers applauded the future focus of the faculty in the division, noting this as an opportunity for development. In particular, the reviewers suggested a few core areas of improvement, including: increased mission centrality, more rigorous student learning and operational assessment, and a focus on strategic planning and budgeting processes.

Assessment of Progress: The reviewers encouraged the division’s increased emphasis on assessment. In particular, they commended the recent development (and encouraged implementation) of new strategic planning materials related to student learning and operational assessment.

2(C). Indicate the present and continuous actions to be taken by the college or department to address the issues raised by the review. What outcomes are anticipated as a result of these actions?

Based on this review process, the division has developed plans to improve the program as follows:

Mission Centrality: The division will focus on centralizing the recently redeveloped new mission statement, student learning outcomes, and strategic plan. Thus, the division will seek to make its mission statement more visible, in course syllabi and on all web and marketing materials. Further, faculty will be encouraged to share this important vision with students in class. Finally, we will explore options for posting physical signage outlining core values in the KSM office suite.

Important to increasing mission centrality is an emphasis on assessment. Therefore, the division will continue to develop its assessment plan to ensure curricular alignment, student achievement, and faculty development are all progressing with respect to the goals outlined in the strategic plan. This assessment plan should be developed and implemented during the 2018-19 school year.

Focus on “Right Sizing” and Resource Allocation. In line with the recommendations of the external reviewers, the division will begin a process of evaluating current use of resources and look to streamline and 'right-size' wherever possible. This process will focus on decreasing the division's reliance on adjunct faculty, particularly with respect to core/major courses (i.e., those in Sport Management). Further, the division will review current offerings and make decisions about future offerings of courses outside of our core areas. In particular, reviewers noted that the division currently provides courses which largely service other majors across campus. Such courses, therefore, may be reduced or eliminated to allow faculty resources to be reinvested into core programs. Further, this reorganization of faculty resources would allow for additions to current course offerings, in line with similar programs nationwide.

The reviewers suggested several changes to program offerings. First, consistent with reviewers' comments, the division will seek to separate the Exercise Science and Sport Management programs into two separate majors. Further, the reviewers suggested the Physical Education (PE) program be removed from the division, with those faculty resources then being focused on delivery of Exercise Science/Sport Management courses. Thus, the division will work with the School of Education to explore the transfer of this program to a more appropriate department. Finally, minor programs not directly related to core programs, may also be evaluated for possible deletion, again allowing for the reinvestment of resources into core programs and reduction of adjunct faculty size.

The KSM division understands, however, that it exists within the larger context of the School of Education and the USD community. Thus, discussions regarding such cuts/reallocations will take place with relevant stakeholders to explore alternate possibilities, including shared responsibility or additional resources to continue important (but non-core) offerings. To this end, the division will seek to increase communication with the School of Education and other relevant stakeholders to increase transparency in the budgeting and resource allocation process. Better understanding of the budgetary implications of such changes will allow for improved strategic planning and decision making. Through a more transparent accounting process for financial resources, the division will be better positioned to address long term concerns in an effective, responsible manner.

Policy Communication: The reviewers suggested that importance of increased communication regarding program policies and procedures, for which several options will be explored. For example, the division will conduct information sessions/meetings for majors at the start of each semester. These meetings, which were piloted during the 2016-17 school year, primarily serve to outline major expectations, policies related to practical experiences, rationale and university policies related to student fees, and discuss important trends in students' areas of interest. The division will develop an on-line portal to house all policy and curriculum documents. Practical experiences, by nature, involve a large amount of paperwork (e.g., memorandums of understanding and Internship Handbook). Thus, the proposed web portal will house these documents, as well as detailed instructions for majors. Given university requirements, this portal will be developed in conjunction with IT and the School of Education advising offices.

External Partnerships and Experiences. Reviewers suggested a continued emphasis on relationship development in the community to allow for experiential learning opportunities for students. Among opportunities to be explored, there may be opportunities for field trips to local/ regional sport and exercise facilities, invitation of guest speakers, and increased use of campus resources (e.g., libraries, wellness center, athletic facilities etc.). Further, increased development of such relationships will continue to offer high quality practical experience (i.e., Practicum and Internship) opportunities for students.

Internal Threat: The reviewers noted the creation of a directly competitive major on campus as a threat to the KSM program (Sport Marketing & Media). However, given that the program already exists, there is little that can be done. Thus, the KSM division will explore ways to co-exist and work together, where possible, with this major.