1. Executive Summary

An external review of the Department of Kinesiology and Health (KH) was conducted on February 6th and 7th, 2017. The external review team members were: Dr. Damon Andrew, Dean and Professor, College of Human Sciences and Education, Louisiana State University; Dr. Sean Bulger, Associate Professor, Department of Coaching and Teaching Studies, West Virginia University; and Dr. Scott Going, Head and Professor, Department of Nutritional Sciences, University of Arizona. Dr. Andrew served as chair of the review team. The review team was provided with the Self Study report prepared by the Department of Kinesiology and Health approximately 4 weeks prior to the on-campus review.

The review team met with a number of individuals and groups during the on-site review process, including Dean Paul Alberto, Chair Mark Geil, the KH Academic Program Review Committee (Cianfrone, Doyle, Gurewicz, and Strosnider), the Health and Physical Education program faculty, the Exercise Science Program Faculty, the Sport Administration Program Faculty, the KH Staff, Undergraduate Students, and Graduate Students (MS and PhD). In addition, the review team was provided a tour of campus space assigned to KH. KH is clearly a dynamic unit at a critical juncture in its history. The following report includes a summary of KH’s contributions to the discipline, quality of the department’s undergraduate and graduate programs, quality of the department’s research culture, appropriateness of departmental goals, and the review team’s recommendations for moving forward.

2. Contributions to the Discipline

a. To which subfields of the discipline does the department make the most significant scholarly, creative, or clinical contributions?

The Department of Kinesiology and Health offers academic programs at the bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral levels across the following disciplines: Exercise Science, Health and Physical Education, and Sport Administration. Faculty in all three areas are making significant disciplinary contributions through their related research, teaching, and service activities. These contributions are reflected in the most recent results of the 2010-2014 National Academy of Kinesiology Review and Evaluation of Doctoral Programs in Kinesiology. The Ph.D. in Kinesiology was ranked 17th in the country and the feedback included in this report is intended to further improve that positioning in future rankings.

Within Exercise Science, faculty maintain expertise across a range of sub-specialties including biomechanics and rehabilitation, exercise physiology, and exercise psychology. This diversity of faculty expertise remains a programmatic strength leading to the maintenance of several active lab spaces that are used for the complementary purposes of research and teaching. Student interest and enrollment in Exercise Science at both the undergraduate and graduate level remains very high with exponential growth experienced across the last reporting period. Accordingly, the
faculty have committed a significant amount of discretionary time and effort to their instructional roles and responsibilities. The program’s continuing national recognition by the Committee on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) further substantiates its related disciplinary contributions.

The Health and Physical Education (HPE) Program has continued a long-standing national reputation in the field of teacher education. As necessitated by national accreditation and state teaching certification requirements, the HPE faculty have been challenged to maintain balanced approaches to research, teaching, and service. Their signature contributions to the discipline include the establishment of strong clinical partnerships with PK-12 schools, the development of new differentiated degree pathways to meet learner needs and increase enrollment, and the provision of leadership to important national organizations such as the Society for Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) and the National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE). The continuance of program accreditation through the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) also validates the disciplinary contributions of this group.

The Sport Administration Program is primed for continued growth in the three mission areas of research, teaching, and service. The MS program was ranked 10th best in the world and 9th best in North America in the 2016 SportBusiness International’s Postgraduate Sports Course Rankings. This international ranking is a key indicator of the program’s global reach and the strong foundation that is already in place for its new degree offering at the undergraduate level. Given the combination of faculty interests and additional resources in the form of a new doctoral concentration, geographic location in a major sports market, and its numerous community partners, the program is well positioned to emerge as a national leader in research related to urban sport policy and sports marketing. The program has not sought accreditation through the Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA: http://www.cosmaweb.org/), but preliminary discussions of moving toward the achievement of accreditation have taken place.

b. To what extent are the faculty number, composition, and diversity sufficient to support the research and educational missions of the department?

At the time of reporting, KH included 20 full-time faculty in tenured and clinical lines, 12 part-time instructors, and 15 graduate teaching assistants. In its entirety, the faculty includes representation from the following demographic groups: Black (n=6), Asian (n=5), Caucasian (n=34), and Unspecified (n=2). With respect to distribution based on gender, the faculty includes 26 females and 21 males. In addition to its tenure-track and tenured faculty lines, whose positions maintain a prioritized focus on research, the Department has developed several clinical positions with differentiated workloads targeting increased teaching and service. These clinical positions will continue to play a key role moving forward as the Department looks to further develop its programs of research and extramural funding. As such, it will be important to ensure that sufficient recognition and reward structures are developed and maintained to recognize clinical faculty for those critical contributions related to the teaching, program management, academic advising, and field placement coordination. The related administrative support team includes 1 business manager, 1 instructional technology specialist, 1 senior administrative coordinator, and 1 receptionist. All staff members were well connected to the mission of the
Department and focused on creating efficiencies that will enhance the likelihood of faculty and student success.

The diversity observed across faculty and staff in terms of disciplinary focus, demographics, gender, and differentiation of workload appears to be a Departmental strength. Given the goal of continued enrollment management and/or growth across the Department at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, it will be important to at least maintain the current level of staffing. In the case of Sport Administration, given its potential for rapid expansion at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the allocation of additional tenure-track and clinical lines might prove warranted.

c. Based on your knowledge of similar departments in the discipline, evaluate the overall strength of the department.

The most readily apparent strength of the Department is the high quality of its academic programs across content areas and degree levels. The faculty are to be commended for their efforts in facilitating the personal and professional growth of the diverse group of learners whom they serve. The related degree programs continue to generate a high degree of student interest, which helps to support the Department’s sustainability. Growth in enrollment within Exercise Science, for example, has proven to be a net positive, and the newly implemented procedures for enrollment management are expected to restore a bit more balance to faculty workloads, allowing for the investment of additional discretionary time and effort in the area of research. The Health and Physical Education program has experienced post-recession decreases in enrollment consistent with national trends in teacher education, but the faculty have been proactive in developing alternative pathways to bachelor’s and master’s degree completion. Similarly, the new BIS in Sport Administration represents an innovative and multidisciplinary approach to development of a new degree option that is likely to attract considerable student interest while delivered in a resource efficient manner. Based on graduate student accounts, the national reputation of individual faculty members within the Department continues to provide an important attractor for highly qualified doctoral students with a broad range of research interests. This national visibility is enhanced by the disciplinary contributions of faculty as researchers and leaders within their respective professional organizations.

3. Quality of the Department’s Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

a. For each of the department’s programs, evaluate the quality and currency of the curriculum in terms of disciplinary standards and trends.

The Department offers three undergraduate programs, including a BS in Exercise Science, a BSE in Health and Physical Education, and a BIS in Sport Administration. The BIS in Sport Administration as well as new concentrations in the HPE program (Sport Coaching, Physical Activity, Health and Wellness) were initiated in the Fall of 2016 and represent recent additions to the Department. Five Master's programs are currently offered (MS Exercise Science, MEd and MAT Health and Physical Education, MS Sport Administration, MS Sports Medicine), but the MS Sports Medicine program is in the final stages of being discontinued. A PhD program in Kinesiology is offered with concentrations in Biomechanics and Physical Rehabilitation,
b. Evaluate the quality of both incoming and graduated students in the department’s programs relative to discipline-specific norms.

The mean High School GPA for KH enrolled freshmen for the 3-year review period was 3.38 and exhibited year-to-year consistency (3.41, 3.36, 3.37 for FA 2013, FA 2014, and FA 2015, respectively). The mean SAT score was 1034 and the mean Freshman Index was 2716 for the same period. As noted within the self-study, the quality of KH enrolled freshmen compare favorably to the overall GSU averages for HS GPA, SAT, and FI of 3.36, 1078, and 2754, respectively for the same review period. The review team considers these averages to be within the expectations for similar programs in identified peer institutions of Georgia State University. It is important to note that the disciplines within KH, when compared to other disciplines within academe that have comparably longer histories, often attract a large number of students who transfer into the program during their undergraduate studies. This trend is often the result of a lack of awareness of the various opportunities provided to graduates of KH programs prior to admission into a college or university.

As noted in the self-study, the large surge of student enrollment in KH was not met with an appropriate growth in administrative infrastructure, so it was particularly challenging for the Department to systematically track job placement and/or progression to graduate or professional degree programs for graduates of KH programs. Anecdotal evidence and student survey responses indicate Exercise Science students have been accepted into Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, and Physician’s Assistant programs, medical schools, and other professional programs. The HPE program in particular has been able to more accurately track the placement of their graduates, and report 100% placement of students seeking employment in education positions. The tracking of students after graduation is a widespread problem across many disciplines in academe as data now indicates that today’s students may change careers more often than the previous generation changed jobs within a career. However, the review team recommends that the KH faculty review its performance in this area and formulate new strategies to connect with its graduates. Perhaps deeper collaborations with alumni affairs units on campus and taking advantage of the opportunity for deeper connections with graduates via social media.
might advance the present status of graduate tracking. The evidence reported by KH in this regard, however, is not atypical when compared to identified peer institutions of Georgia State University.

c. Based on your professional experience, are the enrollment, retention, and graduation rates appropriate? If not, what changes might the department make to improve them?

The 3-year mean 6-year graduation rate for First-time, Full-time KH students was 56.5%, which compares favorably to the University 3-year mean of 53.6% for the same time period. KH student retention rate for the same time period was 62.7%, compared to the GSU average of 60.2%. Four-year graduation and retention rates for the Junior Cohort were 66.8% and 75.4%, respectively, compared to the Georgia State averages of 65.7% and 73.3%. KH’s performance in enrollment, retention, and graduation rates are exemplary when compared to identified peer institutions of Georgia State University. The review team considers the status of KH’s enrollment, retention, and graduation rates to be a significant strength of the Department, particularly when considering the unbridled growth that occurred within the Exercise Science program during the review period. When meeting with undergraduate and graduate students of the Department, they cited a strong “culture of caring” within KH that was not necessarily present when taking supporting coursework outside of the Department. The students noted widespread accessibility to faculty within the Department as well as a genuine concern for their the welfare and future by KH faculty and staff. Undergraduate students who had transferred into KH after initially declaring another major at GSU applauded the culture of caring compared to their previous experiences as did students who transferred to GSU from a similar discipline at a different university. Of course, when it comes to enrollment, retention, and graduation rates, there is always room for improvement, but the review team considers the recent actions taken to implement admission standards for the undergraduate exercise science program and enrollment limits for the undergraduate sport administration program to be examples of KH’s continuing commitment to improvement in this regard. Since both the occupational environment and graduate/professional program admission for KH graduates is highly competitive, these admission standards will help to ensure that graduates of KH programs are more likely to experience success in their future endeavors.

d. Are there appropriate resources and support structures for the department’s educational programs?

Demonstrated student interest in KH programs has significantly increased since the Department’s last Academic Program Review. For example, the undergraduate Exercise Science program has grown from 410 students in FY2007 to 932 students in FY2015, a 127% increase. However, the overall KH full-time faculty only grew from 18 to 20 during that time period, an 11% increase. Further, while KH has 20 faculty overall within the Department, the faculty are distributed as follows: Exercise Science is supported by 12 faculty, HPE is supported by 4 faculty, and Sport Administration is supported by 4 faculty. While the self-study did not specifically reference a major-to-faculty ratio or SCH-to-faculty ratio by program, the review team encourages the use of such metrics to make fairer comparisons to other units on campus and to identify programs that may be deficient in faculty resources. Using the referenced data above, the current undergraduate student major-to-faculty ratio for the Exercise Science program
is 78:1, which is 253% higher than Georgia State University’s overall 22:1 student-to-faculty ratio. Such an outcome clearly points to a program within KH that has been significantly under-resourced in terms of faculty resources over time. It is also an indicator that the recent steps to apply higher admission standards for the Exercise Science program, which will likely reduce the student enrollment in the program by 200-300 students, was in the best interests of the students for many reasons. Among those reasons is the potential to reduce the major-to-faculty ratio in the undergraduate Exercise Science program to the 53:1 --- 61:1 range, which would still be more than double the GSU average.

While the above data indicate human resources have been inadequate over time, perhaps the most significant impediment for KH has been space allocation. As a metropolitan campus, space will always be a particular concern for GSU. However, when discussing the appropriateness of resources and even the potential for growth in KH programs, the allocation of space must be the first consideration. The program in KH that has experienced the most significant student growth since the last APR, Exercise Science, also happens to be the most space-intensive program within the unit. As the student population surged over the past eight years, the allocation of space to KH did not increase in accordance with that growth. This trend led to the dual-purposing of laboratory space to include instructional and research purposes. Over time, the percentage of laboratory use for instructional purposes continued to increase as the student population increased, thus effectively “choking out” the time available for research. The reduced access to laboratories for research stifled the potential for significant graduate program growth and external funding opportunities. While the increased admission standards for the undergraduate Exercise Science program might allow for a reduction of the percentage of time some laboratories are used for instructional purposes, the review team acknowledges that the dual-purposing of laboratory space is not ideal for the types of specialized research that occur within KH; ideally, enough space would be allocated to KH to allow for instructional laboratories and research laboratories. In the interim, KH should prioritize the potential for laboratories to secure external funding and attempt to secure space for separate instructional laboratories to mirror the existing laboratories that could be focused solely on research. It is important to note all KH programs have differing space needs for instructional purposes. While Exercise Science has the most intensive needs, the needs for a successful HPE program are considerably less and the space needs for a Sport Administration program are even lower than HPE.

e. Evaluate the potential for growth of the department’s graduate programs.

The total number of KH graduate students averaged 198, with 176 master’s students and 21 doctoral students over the review period. These graduate students are supported by 16 tenure-track faculty, which corresponds to an overall graduate student to tenure-track faculty ratio of 12.25:1. As noted above in 3.d., it is evident that the significant surge in undergraduate student population was accommodated at the expense of the potential for growth for KH’s graduate programs. The significant space limitations, particularly as they impacted laboratory space, also contributed to the situation. The potential for growth of KH’s graduate programs is quite good, but only if the unit is provided with appropriate faculty and space to accommodate such growth. With space being a significant limiting factor, KH must keep in mind the role that space limitations play within each specific graduate program before committing additional resources to
grow that particular program. As a discipline, Kinesiology is quite broad and is composed of approximately 12 sub-disciplines. As such, the recent expansion of the PhD program in Kinesiology to accommodate five of these sub-disciplines (i.e., concentrations in Biomechanics and Physical Rehabilitation, Exercise Physiology, Exercise Psychology, Physical Education Teacher Education, and Sport Administration) is a positive step toward a more comprehensive exploration of the discipline at large.

4. Quality of the Department’s Research Culture

a. Based on your knowledge of the discipline, what is the quality of the department’s faculty?

The department has 20 full-time faculty (16 T/TE and 4 clinical instructors), plus 12 part-time instructors, 13 graduate teaching assistants, and 5 staff, who together deliver and support a BS in Exercise Sciences, a BSE in Health and Physical Education, a BIS in Sport Administration that requires students to choose two of three possible specializations (Hospitality Administration, Journalism and Public Relations, and Sport Coaching), and a new concentration in the HPE Program (Sport Coaching, Physical Activity, Health and Wellness); 5 Master’s programs (MS Exercise Science, MEd and MAT Health and Physical Education, MS in Sports Administration, MS Sports Medicine (discontinued)); and a PhD in Kinesiology with 5 concentrations (Biomechanics and Physical Rehabilitation, Exercise Physiology, Exercise Psychology, Physical Education Teacher Education, and Sport Administration). The Department has experienced remarkable growth since the last review and is a major contributor to the College’s mission, majors and SCH. Despite the significant teaching load, the faculty as a whole has maintained a solid record of scholarly contributions across all of the programmatic areas represented in the Department, a testament to their commitment and quality. Mid-rank and senior faculty are leaders in their respective areas, have national/international reputations, and several are providing distinguished leadership and service in their professional organizations. Early career faculty are strong and have good potential for important impacts in their disciplines.

b. From a disciplinary perspective, what is your assessment of the research areas in which the department is already strong, and areas with potential for further growth?

The Department has individuals who are strong in each of the areas represented. There is particular strength within Sport Administration and Exercise Science, especially within Biomechanics and some areas of Exercise Physiology. The PhD program in Kinesiology has been ranked #17 in the United States (NAR 2015 Review and Evaluation of Doctoral Programs in Kinesiology). The MS program in Sport Administration was ranked 10th best graduate sport management program in the world and 9th best in North America in the 2016 Sport Business International’s Postgraduate Sports Course Rankings. Given the strength of the faculty and the opportunities in the Atlanta area and elsewhere, this is certainly an area of growth potential. In terms of potential for research funding, the biomechanics group is well positioned for collaboration with other units and competition for extramural support from federal agencies and foundations. There is certainly a growing appreciation for the work of exercise scientists along with more federal dollars available for related research and thus there is good potential for extramural funding in the areas of muscle and cardiovascular physiology, and health benefits of
exercise and physical activity, assuming the early career faculty are adequately supported to allow them to gather the preliminary data that are needed to launch to competitive Foundation and federal grants (e.g., NIAMS, NHLBI, NICHD, CDC, USDE, USDA, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, AHA, etc)

c. What is your assessment of the support structures for faculty and student research?

The Department submits an average of 34 grant proposals per year, with an average of 82% funded. The number and percent funded is somewhat misleading as an indication of research success, as many grants are small budget proposals funded by non-profit sources that underwrite student service obligations (contracts). While they provide a means of funding students, they do not necessarily contribute substantially to the department’s research mission. External funding averaged $756,270 over the review period ($670,000-$900,000), with ~78% from foundations, etc. Federal funding has declined to zero. Much of the current funding for basic research (~$300,000) comes from the Biomechanics group, led by Dr. Geil. While the faculty was deemed motivated to seek external funding, current teaching loads and dual purposing of research laboratories for teaching present significant impediments to increasing research productivity.

Grant writing support – The faculty have faced some challenges with the existing pre-award structure housed in the College and not in the unit. We understand the College is exploring divesting pre-award activities to units or perhaps clusters of units with “embeds” with pre-award responsibilities. Such a move would likely contribute to increased grant production of a type consistent with more traditional research support, so long as the support staff are trained in the various grant mechanisms. Mentoring of early stage investigators is needed, with some of it underwritten by College and University investments, given limited discretionary funds in the department.

Travel grants – There is limited funding available in the Department for faculty and student travel; it appears faculty and students have been successful at acquiring College and University support.

Laboratories – Space is at a premium and challenging, given the realities of the GSU campus. Nevertheless, dual purposing of laboratories for instruction and research is a significant impediment to increasing research, especially if major federal funding is to be acquired. The situation is also “taxing” equipment, some of which is already in need of replacement. The dual purposing of equipment jeopardizes an investigator’s ability to fulfill the aims of funded projects.

Student funding – Student funding comes predominantly from graduate teaching assistantships and service contracts with the community. Consequently, it can be difficult for students to focus as needed on developing their independent research directions.

Administrative support – The Department Chair is fully engaged and motivated to promote a positive research culture and increase the research portfolio of the department, although he has limited discretionary funds by which to support this goal. Recent faculty hires have been strong, however, the level of initial support, particularly in the form of start-up research funding, appears
to be significantly less than needed in today’s environment to develop a laboratory, hire staff, support students and acquire the data needed to compete for research funding, especially at the federal level. The teaching expectation for early career faculty who are working to establish their research, develop preliminary data, and succeed at grant funding seems extraordinary, especially for the Exercise Science group.

d. Do you have any recommendations for improvement in the department’s research culture, productivity and results?

Although they are under-resourced in terms of space, equipment, time and dollars for operations, the Kinesiology and Health Department has managed a solid record of scholarly activity. They are to be commended for their motivation and productivity despite the challenges. They are working within areas that integrate well with the University’s and College’s goals, and for which there is significant and diverse funding. With greater support, they have strong potential for greater contributions to the research mission and significant impact on the health and wellbeing of the University’s stakeholders.

A strategic plan for space utilization and acquisition is needed to move away from dual purposing of laboratories for research and instruction. A plan and support for replacing equipment is also needed.

Clarification of research expectations, productivity measures and carry through to tenure and promotion would be helpful. There seems to be some uncertainty regarding the Department Chair’s authority to reallocate time and, if that was done, whether the redistribution would be appropriately considered in tenure and promotion deliberations outside of the department. As is often true of units with multiple concentrations, some areas have greater potential for funding (more funds available to compete for) than others, as is also true of some faculty, by nature of the areas in which they work. Research productivity would likely be enhanced by adjusting instruction and research workloads to better match the strengths of the faculty. Promising early-stage career researchers need time to develop their research.

There seem to be untapped potential for collaboration within the Department and with other units on campus. Given the focus of multiple agencies and foundations on physical activity promotion for health at all ages and the need to better understand mechanisms of response to acute and chronic exercise in difference populations, there seems to be significant opportunity for collaboration among the Exercise Science faculty and the Physical Education faculty, as well as with physical therapy, public health and other units at GSU. A planned and strategic approach for furthering collaborations would potentially lead to new and better aligned research initiatives and strengthen grant applications.

5. Goals

a. Are the goals the department has outlined in its self-study appropriate for the unit?
b. Are they in accord with disciplinary trends?
c. Are the priorities reasonable?
d. Are the resource needs realistic?
e. Are any changes or additions warranted?

The review team’s review and assessment of the goals stated by the Department in the self-study are described by each individual goal below. Overall, in our analysis of all five stated goals, the review team recommends a streamlining of these five goals into only three goals, given that the execution of goals four and five could occur within the effective execution of goals one, two, and three. Further, given the limited resources allocated to the Department, the focus on a more concise list of three goals at this time seems most reasonable. The following represents the review team’s assessment of the strengths and challenges of each goal, along with our recommendations for each goal:

**Goal 1: Enhance Research Productivity and External Funding**

**Strengths:**
- (1) Pre- and post-award support available at the College level to facilitate increased grant-related activity but some clarification needed with respect to roles and responsibilities of Department Staff.
- (2) Generous allocation of indirect dollars back to Departments to meet program needs.
- (3) Fundable area of research in biomechanics (other funding is limited to graduate research assistantships with small percentage of indirect costs).
- (4) Faculty expertise in areas where extramural funding will be available

**Challenges:**
- (1) Changing expectations for research and external funding have occurred without corresponding adjustments in teaching and service expectations creating tensions.
- (2) Some recognition of the value of variable workload based on faculty strengths but uncertainty regarding its implications for promotion and/or tenure.
- (3) Time to generate data that will lead to more competitive grant submissions is a perceived barrier by faculty.
- (4) Start-up packages (including release time) for new faculty reportedly lag behind many peer and aspirational institutions.
- (5) Limited lab space also has implications for new faculty and student recruitment.
- (6) Unclear the extent to which development efforts are targeting the unmet needs of the Department.

**Recommendations:**
- (1) Clarify faculty expectations for research and external funding as it relates to the promotion and tenure process --- there seems to be limited opportunity for differentiated work load based on individual strengths at the present time.
- (2) Determine the most fundable lines of research within the Department and focus discretionary time and effort on fewer funding priorities initially.
- (3) Communicate those areas of focus to grant support personnel at the College level to facilitate earlier notification of RFPs and more consistent submissions across funding sources.
- (4) Seek collaborative partnerships in those areas of focus with other internal and external institutions.
- (5) For those faculty with community-based lines of research, seek more attainable sources of funding from private and corporate foundations to support research --- this aligns with Goals 5 (community-based research).
- (6) Given the extensive list of community partners for purposes of field placements and internships consider other entrepreneurial activities related to contractual services (e.g., consulting, graduate student projects, program evaluation).
- (7) Develop a clear list of lab space and equipment needs that can be communicated to the University and College Development Officers.
- (8) Work with the Alumni Relations Office to establish a better process for maintaining contact with program graduates as a catalyst for future development efforts (longer-term entrepreneurial strategy).

Goal 2: Efficiently Manage Undergraduate Enrollment and Enhance the Undergraduate Experience

Strengths:
- (1) No obvious concerns with program quality across the Department --- faculty are to be commended for their efforts facilitating the growth and development of a diverse group of learners.
- (2) Growth in enrollment in exercise science has been a net positive for the Department and demonstrates its continued viability at the undergraduate level.
- (3) HPE faculty have been proactive in developing alternative pathways to degree completion including BIS in Sport Administration and HPE Non-Certification Track.
- (4) The addition of new undergraduate degree options in Sport Administration and HPE is a net positive although that increasing complexity brings with it new challenges.

Challenges:
- (1) Unmanaged growth in the undergraduate Exercise Science has strained capacity including staffing, faculty time, lab facilities, and specialized equipment.
- (2) Nationwide decreasing trend in enrollment is reflected across the College including the HPE Program.
- (3) New enrollment management plan in Exercise Science will result in displacement of a large number of undergraduate students --- the new degree options are unlikely to offset this enrollment decrease.
- (4) Course availability was raised as a potential issue at multiple levels.

Recommendations:
- (1) While increasing complexity of the undergraduate portfolio presents new opportunities it comes with some unintended consequences. Faculty will need to exercise care in making and communicating clear delineations (including career options) to administrators, advising staff, current students, and prospective students and their families.
- (2) Demonstrate greater intentionality in the development of marketing and recruitment materials for the different programs that highlight faculty, student, and alumni success stories (use of GTA to establish social media plan is a step in the right direction).
- (3) Consider how students from the recently acquired community-college system integrate and transition into existent degree programs (especially those with lower enrollment).
- (4) Increase involvement and signature experiences for under-represented students.

Goal 3: Enhance Graduate Programs

Strengths:
- (1) No obvious concerns with program quality across the Department --- faculty are to be commended for their efforts facilitating the growth and development of a diverse group of learners at the graduate level.
- (2) Enrollment in the graduate program in Exercise Science has remained steady and faculty are focused on delivery of quality program.
- (3) Addition of MAT in HPE (post-BS teaching certification option) fills an important market niche and movement of the MED fully online increases the program’s global reach (the Department’s only significant investment in its online portfolio).
- (4) MS in Sport Administration is highly prescribed (80-100 students) leading to development of an undergraduate IDS degree option.
- (5) Primary program attractors include strong reputation of the faculty.
- (6) Graduate teaching assistants are provided with good instructional support and supervision which speaks to the focus on program quality.
- (7) Graduate students were very satisfied with available library resources.

Challenges:
- (1) Due to limited external funding, continued doctoral program growth will be restricted in some areas.
- (2) Access to the equipment and lab space needed for research is a problem in some areas as well.
- (3) Mentorship of doctoral students related to the establishment of their lines of research and transition to the profession seems somewhat variable depending on chairs and seminars completed.
- (4) Funding to support doctoral student research and travel appears somewhat limited.
- (5) Doctoral students expressed an interest in and the need for additional grant writing experiences in preparation for job search.
- (6) Office work spaces for doctoral students are limited

Recommendations:
- (1) Additional flexibility in course selection with respect to cognate area.
- (2) More doctoral student interaction with faculty and students across other programs to better prepare them to function on interdisciplinary teams.
- (3) Increase funding for research and travel;
- (4) Employ systematic approaches to learning about the grant writing process.
- (5) Clarify and standardize to the greatest extent possible expectations for research benchmarks leading to dissertation defense --- seemed to be some uncertainty of process across doctoral students.
- (6) Increase involvement and signature experiences for under-represented students.
Goal 4: Increase Academic Involvement and Signature Experiences for Under-Represented Students

Recommendations:
- (1) Should be an enabling factor in goals two and three.

Goal 5: Develop Community-based Research and Service Learning Opportunities on Physical Activity and Wellness

Recommendations:
- (1) Should be an enabling factor in goal one.

6. Summary and Recommendations

a. Summarize the department’s major strengths and challenges

Strengths:
- Student-centered faculty that has creatively found ways to remain accessible to students despite an enrollment growth pattern that has outpaced resources.
- Diversity of student majors as well as a clear appreciation of diversity --- several students cited the diversity of GSU’s student body as an attractive feature.
- Progressive program/curriculum development --- KH is clearly attuned to the needs of students and the outside community and has developed curricula that allows for an upward trajectory.
- Presence of a collegial relationship between the faculty, chair, and dean --- it is clear that each party is interested in supporting the group’s overall success.
- Impressive and progressive staff in KH that has proactively responded to student needs (e.g., the development of a department-wide wait list for courses that assists in the projection of student demand could be a model for GSU to develop university-wide).
- Presence of strong leadership at the Department and College levels that can serve as advocates for the program.
- Ample opportunities for collaboration on campus and within the Atlanta metro area.

Challenges:
- Unbridled student growth has stretched the use of faculty/space/resources.
- Space limitations have curbed faculty and student research/grants and enrollment growth, particularly in Exercise Science where faculty have had to increasingly dedicate higher percentages of instructional use time for their research laboratories --- two recent space analyses have not been acted upon by senior administration in a manner that supports the maintenance and future expansion of KH.
- Need more pre-award support for grants.
- Need more support for doctoral students and faculty research, particularly in the form of seed grants and travel grants.
- Though all areas within KH do not have equal external funding opportunities, some opportunities are present, but very high undergraduate enrollment coupled with the lack
of faculty resources, laboratory resources, and specialized faculty workloads has hampered the development of consistent external funding.
- Need for better technology to support the HR/budgeting process --- much of this process is manual, particularly in regards to the appointment of part-time faculty, which has become much more burdensome over time in KH due to the enrollment growth.
- Need for optimal communication between faculty and advising support staff given the modernization of the curricula.
- Lack of clear alignment between assigned workload and job expectations --- when flexible workloads are implemented, the job expectations should vary accordingly (e.g., if a faculty member is asked to teach an additional course in return for reduced time allocated to research, the research expectations should be reduced accordingly).
- Over-reliance upon part-time faculty to deliver courses --- the department should aim for at least 50-60% of courses/SCH delivered by full-time faculty.
- Lack of reasonable professional development opportunities for staff --- university recently began charging for professional development and has not supported transportation needs for professional development (e.g., Staff Development Day).
- The evolvement of merger between Georgia Perimeter College and GSU has the potential to support the future vision and mission of KH, but these details must be strategically administered and negotiated.

b. List your recommendations.

Recommendations:
- Work proactively to secure the needed faculty, staff, and space resources necessary to bring the Department’s student-to-faculty ratio more in line with the University at large --- space is a very critical resource to consider regarding the maintenance and expansion of KH enrollment, particularly within the space-intensive Exercise Science program.
- Modify the Department’s goals as suggested previously in #5 in this report.
- In respect to development and funding, there are some great stories to tell in KH that would likely resonate with donors and legislators, but they are not presently being told.
- Move forward with the new admission standards for the Exercise Science program in Fall 2017, as they will allow for a more mission-centric focus on GSU’s strategic plan.
- Work proactively to accommodate the approximately 200-300 students who might normally target the Exercise Science undergraduate program (based on historical data) via the new undergraduate program in Sport Administration and new concentrations within the undergraduate HPE program --- due to the elimination of the Sports Medicine program and a recent retirement of a prominent HPE full professor, the opportunity to repurpose two faculty lines within KH is present; these lines need to be repurposed in the anticipated direction that former Exercise Science students will matriculate, but it will likely require more investment outside the department beyond the repurposing of these two existing faculty lines to “right-size” the Department’s programs.
- Given the presence of space limitations, consider the potential for online programming within KH --- online education opportunities are not reasonable for all programs, but they could attract incremental students to GSU (assuming the entire program could be offered online) within a space-restricted environment.
- Seek COSMA accreditation for the Sport Administration program