

The National Academy of Kinesiology 2015 Review and Evaluation of Doctoral Programs in Kinesiology

Beverly D. Ulrich and Deborah L. Feltz

In this article we present the results of the 2015 review and ranking of U.S. doctoral programs in kinesiology conducted by the National Academy of Kinesiology (NAK) and based on data for the calendar years 2010 through 2014. This is the third consecutive five-year review and represents the only continuous effort to create rankings for the field of kinesiology today. As in previous reviews, this evaluation was built, using objective measures, on a norm-referenced survey of kinesiology doctoral programs in the United States. Of the 77 programs invited to participate, 52 provided complete sets of the required data. The raw data comprised 9 faculty indices contributing 66% of the total score, and 7 doctoral student indices, which made up the remaining 34%. Raw data for individual indices were converted to normative values by first transforming them into z-scores and then converting the z-scores into T-scores, to which weightings were applied. From the total T-scores, two sets of rankings were determined: unadjusted and adjusted to number of faculty members in each program. Rankings based on total T-scores are presented as well as T-scores for individual indices for each program. We also share raw data means and standard deviations for individual variables, organized into subgroups based on total T-scores. Finally, we compare the outcomes of this review with the previous review conducted by the NAK.

The National Academy of Kinesiology (NAK) has been conducting formal reviews of doctoral programs in kinesiology every five years since 2005 in an effort to enhance the status of doctoral education in kinesiology (Thomas et al., 2007). This is the report of the NAK's third review, using 2010–2014 program data. Although elements of the review process have changed with each round, most of the criteria have remained the same.

The process of developing an evaluation instrument began in 1996 (Thomas et al., 2007) and was eventually piloted in 2000 on data submitted by 20 volunteer programs. An exploratory factor analysis on the pilot data resulted in the final criteria of 16 performance indicators (11 faculty items and five student items), which were approved by the Academy membership in 2000. As indicated by Thomas et al. (2007), items included the following:

Faculty Indicators:

- *Productivity* (5 items: number of publications, presentations, books, AAKPE (currently NAK) members in the program, and faculty with fellow status in other professional organizations)

- *Quality Advising* (5 items: number of doctoral advisees, faculty with at least one doctoral advisee, doctoral advisees who graduate, faculty with at least one doctoral advisee graduated, graduates who found employment within the field)
- *Funding* (1 item: total external funding adjusted for faculty size)

Student Indicators:

- *GRE Scores* (2 items: verbal, quantitative)
- *Recruitment* (3 items: number of applications, % selectivity, % yield)

From the first pilot study through subsequent formal reviews, the NAK Doctoral Evaluation Committees considered comments from participating program administrators and Academy members in developing and refining quality indicators to identify the “optimal” set based on the Academy's values (e.g., excluding subjective measures and dividing faculty indicators by size of faculty) as well as efforts to avoid redundancy in items. Changes in faculty indicators include counting publications at the department level, rather than the individual faculty member level (i.e., if two or more faculty members from the same program were listed as authors, the publication counts only once); totaling external funding based on expenditures rather than award amount and research dollars weighted among federal, nonfederal external, and internal; and adding a new faculty category, titled visibility, that includes Academy and other fellowships plus membership on editorial boards. The faculty indicators of number of doctoral advisees and number of advisees that a faculty member graduated have since been eliminated

Ulrich (NAK Fellow #375) is a Professor and Dean Emerita with the School of Kinesiology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, and served as Chair of the NAK Doctoral Program Committee 2011–2015. Feltz (NAK Fellow #340) is a University Distinguished Professor in the Department of Kinesiology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, and served as Chair of the NAK Doctoral Program Committee 1999–2002 and as a member 2012–2015.

and employment placement in the field has been moved to student quality indicators. Two proposed additions were suggested several times but were not incorporated because they were determined to be unrealistic or unnecessary, given that our analyses are based on programs, not individuals. These are (a) obtaining impact ratings of the journals in which each faculty member's articles appeared and (b) calculating citation indices for each faculty member.

The student indicators have been refined more than the faculty indices. The NAK eliminated the number of student applications (this information is embedded in the selectivity item) and yield (new enrollments/acceptances) as variables, and has added employment in the field, postdoctoral positions, and doctoral student publications. The previous student indicator, yield, was replaced with the number of first-authored publications produced by doctoral students. Programs were required, for the first time in this round, to submit a bibliography of the unique faculty publications (2010–2014) for the unit being reviewed. Additionally, the program chairperson and a budget officer were required to sign and submit a grant funding verification page that confirmed the unit's research spending. The supplemental information was requested to help assure clarity among participating programs of the specific variable data being requested, given the high weighting of these variables (publications and grant funds), and to enable the analysis team to confirm that the data submitted reflect our operational definitions as written.

New to this year's review was the opportunity for programs to submit demographic information regarding the racial make-up of the doctoral students in a program's unit. These data were not included in the rankings, but reported, optionally, so that programs could use the composite data for their own benchmarking. The Doctoral Program Committee elected to use National Institutes of Health (NIH) guidelines for reporting because their definitions are broadly accepted and could be used as our operational definitions in the current as well as future reviews. To encourage programs to submit these optional data, the decision was made to "keep it simple" and limit the variables to race. To add ethnicity, by NIH protocol, would require three sets of data to clearly tease out overlapping race and ethnicity affiliations. Our race categories consisted of: American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, more than one race, and unknown or not reported.

Finally, we edited the wording defining eligibility of programs and faculty in order to assure that we were being inclusive. Although we tried to be clear that we are reviewing programs and not departments, this caused confusion for some whose departments, by title, consisted of blended groups of more typical kinesiology faculty members and other subgroups (e.g., Kinesiology and Community Health; Biokinesiology and Physical Therapy). The guidelines focused on programs with a core number of faculty with areas of scholarship overlapping currently accepted kinesiology emphases to enable individual faculty to determine if their emphases (and responsibilities) contributed signifi-

cantly to the doctoral program being reviewed. This may have been one factor that contributed to the large increase in participation over the previous rounds. But, increased recruitment and publicity also contributed.

In the following sections we share first the method by which the NAK prepared for and conducted the 2015 review, followed by the results, and finish with a discussion and summary. In addition, Appendix A lists all programs that were invited to participate, separated into participant and nonparticipant groups. Appendix B details the instructions, including item definitions, provided to participating programs.

Method

During the years following the previous review, members of the Doctoral Program Committee (DPC), in cooperation with the NAK Executive Committee (EC) and followed by open discussions among NAK Fellows at the annual conference Business Meetings, considered many issues related to the overall process. The outcomes were that one variable was replaced, definitions for other variables were refined, and a verification step was added to the submission process. In addition, programs were invited to submit optional information concerning the racial makeup of their enrolled doctoral students. Finally, during these same years the DPC and EC worked to identify all eligible doctoral programs in the United States, clarify inclusion criteria for programs and faculty members, and encourage program administrators to participate.

In July 2014 early notification letters were sent to all program chairs and their deans, apprising them of the upcoming process. To publicize the review more broadly, advertisements were placed in professional newsletters (American Kinesiology Association, National Association for Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education, and NAK) and posted on the NAK website. In November 2014 formal invitations were sent to all doctoral program chairs identified. After chairs submitted the requested processing fee to the NAK office, they were sent an instructional guide (see Appendix B), an Excel template for entering raw data, a frequently asked questions booklet, and a set of checklist and administrators' verification pages. All materials and data were submitted electronically to the NAK office by March 2, 2015. Data covered the programs' activities across the calendar years of 2010 through 2014. As the deadline for submissions approached, chairs of nonresponding programs were contacted to assure that they had received an invitation and encouraged participation. After submissions were reviewed to assure that all items requested were received by staff in the NAK office, the raw data were sent to the analyst team.

Variables Included in the Review and Their Weightings

Overall, faculty variables contributed 66% and student variables accounted for 34% of the total score. The following list provides all variables used in this round of

review and their weightings. None of the weightings changed between the previous review in 2010 and this one.

Faculty Variables (66% of Total).

Productivity (30%):

- *Journal publications (20%)*: every refereed publication for which one or more faculty members within the program were co-authors counted only one time
- *Books (5%)*: scholarly, each co-author can be counted
- *Presentations (5%)*: only national or international meetings

Funding (26%):

- *Research expenditures from federal sources (15%)*: dollars must be spent through the department(s) core to the program being reviewed
- *Research expenditures from other external sources (8%)*: some example sources include foundations and corporations
- *Research and scholarly funds awarded from internal sources (3%)*: dollars funded from units outside the doctoral programs/departments but internal to the university

Visibility (10%):

- *Editorial boards (6%)*: includes Editor-in-Chief, Associate Editor, Section Editor
- *National Academy of Kinesiology Fellows (2%)*: count only active fellows
- *Fellows in other national societies (2%)*: some example organizations are American College of Sports Medicine, Gerontological Society of America, North American Society for Sport Management, Society for Neuroscience

Student Variables (34%).

Admissions (12%):

- *Selectivity (2%)*: percent of applicants admitted
- *Mean GRE verbal and quantitative scores (5% for each)*: based on the new scoring (i.e., 130–170)

Graduate assistant support (13%): total FTE support provided during the final calendar year of the review period, 2014

Doctoral publications (2%): refereed publications as first author

Employment following degree (7%)

- *Postdoctoral fellow (4%)*
- *Employment within the field (3%)*: not in postdoctoral fellowship but working in an area for which the degree prepared them, such as faculty position, sport industry, medical device research and development

Data Analysis

The same two Academy Fellows who conducted the data analyses in the previous two reviews (Spirduso & Reeve, 2011; Thomas & Reeve, 2006) were contracted for this

review; they followed the same general procedures. They are measurement experts from an institution without a doctoral program in kinesiology and, therefore, had no conflict regarding their own institution's performance in the analysis. A third measurement expert was added to the team who had a background in kinesiology but whose home department does not have a kinesiology graduate program. As in previous reviews, the Academy determined the policy decisions regarding categories, weights, and types of analyses; the measurement experts verified, validated, and analyzed the data, and reviewed the results. They submitted their report to the Academy's DPC and EC.

The analysts began the process by selecting a random but representative sample of programs (large and small, old and new, geographically diverse) to be reviewed for verification of match between publication lists and numbers of publications reported. The sample size was predetermined by the DPC and EC to be 10%, which resulted in $n = 6$. The number of duplicates or omissions of complete reference information averaged a mean error of 1.4%, well below the criteria established (10%) for concluding an actionable error (i.e., one that was determined, by the DPC Chair, to be sufficient for the NAK President to take action with the program's administrator). Subsequently, raw data for all variables were reviewed for outliers that appeared erroneous and, if needed, follow up verification was procured via email to the program chair.

The raw data for each of the faculty and student variables were converted to z-scores. T-scores were calculated from the z-scores and weightings for individual variables were applied. The total T-score was determined by summing across weighted variables. Programs' total T-scores were then ranked in two ways: (a) adjusted for faculty size and (b) unadjusted for faculty size. T-scores for individual variables are also reported because they illustrate how each factor contributed to an individual program's total and the scores across all programs provide the information by which one can determine a program's "ranking" based on each important variable in the program's makeup. Means and standard deviations for individual faculty and student raw data variables were also calculated, based on four groupings: total T-score (a) < 40 , (b) 40–49, (c) 50–59, and (d) ≥ 60 .

The summed, weighted data for each program were ranked in two ways: adjusted and unadjusted. Adjusting for faculty size allows for a comparison of faculty productivity without the influence of faculty member numbers. Although not always true, larger faculties tend to produce higher numbers of publications and procure more grant funds, for example, based on size alone. Adjusting scores also focuses the evaluation on graduate programs, not departments or program specializations, so that a doctoral program is not penalized for having only one or two kinesiology emphases. Unadjusted scores, conversely, reflect the absolute productivity and impact of a program. They recognize the nonlinear and interactive benefits that accrue from having many faculty members

with diverse areas of specialty, thus offering a rich learning environment for students. This approach may also, in isolated cases, correct for the situation in which only one or two faculty members in a small program are highly productive, leading to a counterintuitive high ranking. One additional change was made for the adjusted data only—when z-scores were calculated, the results were truncated to ± 2.58 .

Relationships Among Evaluation Variables and Total T-Scores

To examine the relationships among individual variables and total T-scores, we ran Pearson product correlations for adjusted and unadjusted scores. As Table 1 shows, nearly all correlations were statistically significant for both faculty and student data. For faculty, the rank order of correlations, from high to low, were the same for adjusted and unadjusted methods, although the range of values was slightly wider and means slightly higher for the unadjusted method (range = 58, $M = 53.2$; range = 79, $M = 62.1$ for adjusted and unadjusted, respectively). The highest correlations emerged for publications, presentations, and editorial boards, followed closely by federal funding. The lone nonsignificant correlation arose between internal funding received and total T-scores.

Student variables produced similar rank orderings among correlations across both methods, but with a few

more small shifts in order. Of the seven variables, only selectivity was not significantly correlated with the total T-score for the two methods, while average GRE quantitative score also failed to correlate significantly with the unadjusted total T-score. Given that they accounted for less weighting, correlations were generally lower for student scores than faculty scores. The highest correlations were doctoral publications and postdoctoral positions; the lowest correlation was for selectivity.

To examine the relative impact of adjusted and unadjusted methods of determining total T-scores, we calculated the difference between these two total scores for each program. This difference score was then plotted as a function of the total T-score. In theory, if two analyses used to assess the same set of raw data are reasonably similar, the difference scores should generally hover around the mean of zero. Our scatterplot (see Figure 1) shows that this general principle holds for our two methods. Four outliers emerged, which is not unusual. They represent programs that are small but quite strong and ones that are relatively large and also strong. These are the types of programs that, in our analyses, might be expected to show the greatest shift between the two ways of looking at the data. We also ran a Pearson correlation between the adjusted and unadjusted total T-scores and found the relationship to be statistically significant ($r = .79, p < .001$). We plotted only the data with unadjusted total T-score on the x-axis because quite similar results were obtained when the adjusted total T-score was used for the x-axis.

Table 1 Correlations Between Individual Variables and Total T-Scores

Variables	Adjusted	Unadjusted
Faculty		
Publications (20%)	.78**	.88**
Books (5%)	.50**	.62**
Presentations (5%)	.64**	.82**
Federal funding (15%)	.62**	.78**
External funding (nonfederal) (8%)	.50**	.61**
Internal funding (3%)	.20	.09
Editorial boards (6%)	.63**	.79**
National Academy members (2%)	.35*	.29*
National Fellows (2%)	.57**	.71**
Student		
Average GRE-verbal (5%)	.47**	.37**
Average GRE-quantitative (5%)	.30*	.26
Assistantships (FTE) (13%)	.39**	.43**
Selectivity (2%)	.26	.18
Doctoral publications (2%)	.64**	.76**
Postdoctoral positions (4%)	.63**	.81**
Positions in field (3%)	.34*	.48**

Abbreviations: GRE = Graduate Record Examination; FTE = full-time employment.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Results

Seventy-seven programs identified as having doctoral programs in kinesiology were invited to participate. Of those, 52 responded (67.5%) by submitting all required data. Some nonparticipating programs gave reasons such as the data gathering requires too much work, they do not value rankings, and their program does not identify with the field of kinesiology. In round two (2010) of the NAK doctoral program review and ranking, 36 programs participated and all but one are represented again in this round. Thus, while 17 new programs engaged, the net addition was 16 programs, or a 44% increase over round two. The number of faculty comprising each program ranged from four to 28, with a mean of 14.65 ($SD = 5.75$) and a median of 14. These values showed minimal change when compared to the range and median obtained in the last analyses. Appendix A lists program participants and nonparticipants; for those who participated, we included university affiliation, program title, and faculty size.

Rankings Based on Total T-Score: Adjusted and Unadjusted

Table 2 reports two sets of kinesiology doctoral program rankings. In the left column, programs are ranked based on total T-scores adjusted for faculty size, while in the right column, rankings are based on total T-scores




Figure 1 — Scatterplot with data points that reflect difference between total T-scores calculated with each of our two methods plotted as a function, across the X-axis, of the program's unadjusted total T-score. Circles identify the outlier values.

unadjusted by number of faculty. Of those programs ranking in the top 10 for unadjusted scores, six also placed in the top 10 for adjusted scores, while the others remained in the top 15. The reverse was less true. Of the top 10 (11, given ties) rankings based on scores adjusted for faculty size, four dropped to ranks ranging from 26 to 40 for unadjusted scores. These larger shifts seem to reflect programs that are smaller in number of faculty but who are highly productive.

T-score Values for Individual Variables

In Table 3, the individual T-scores for each faculty variable, unadjusted for faculty size, by program, are presented. Table 4 provides the same information as in Table 3, but for student data. These tables, along with Table 2, illustrate that each program varied in its performance on individual characteristics and even the top ranked programs had at least one variable scoring below the mean of 50.

Descriptive Data for Each Variable, by Subgroups, Based on Total T-Scores

Table 5 presents means and standard deviations for individual variables, as a function of programs organized into four subgroups, based on their total T-scores. The subgroups were defined using 50 as the mean T-score and 10 as the standard deviation unit. The distribution of the number of programs falling into each group is what we might expect with a normal distribution. Subgroups are presented with scores from low to high. Given that faculty data comprised 66% of the total, for nearly all of the faculty variables,

means increased as group number increased. For student data, however, mean values varied little across groups for GRE scores and selectivity. Doctoral publication numbers increased as group number increased. Another interesting characteristic of the data is that as group number (and thus, total T-score) increased, the proportion of students who, upon graduation, pursued a postdoctoral position before assuming a job in the field also increased.

Descriptive Data on Race for Doctoral Students

In Table 6 we present our first set of race data published for doctoral students in kinesiology, by year. Across all years, White students represented, by far, the largest proportion, with Asian students comprising the next largest group represented, followed by Black or African American students. Over the five-year period, percentages for White students decreased slightly while those for Black or African American students rose from 4.6% to 6%. Although only 31 of the 52 programs submitted data for this compilation, these numbers reflect an average of 672 students per year. Further, our distribution across races reflects that published by the National Science Foundation (NSF) for doctoral students in the United States in 2010 (Fiegner, 2011).

Discussion

Focusing first on the rankings, the top program for the adjusted score rankings was the University of South Carolina (Kinesiology/School of Public Health) while

Table 2 Final Rank and Total T-Score, Adjusted and Unadjusted for Faculty Size

Adjusted for Faculty Size			Unadjusted for Faculty Size		
Rank*	University	Score	Rank*	University	Score
1	University of South Carolina	73	1	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	75
2	University of Texas at Austin	71	2	University of Texas at Austin	73
3	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	65	3	Pennsylvania State University	71
4	Teachers College, Columbia University	64	3	University of Michigan	71
4	University of Florida	64	3	University of South Carolina	71
6	Ohio State University	62	6	Ohio State University	62
6	University of Central Florida	62	7	Texas A & M University	61
6	University of Minnesota	62	7	University of Florida	61
9	Pennsylvania State University	61	9	University of Minnesota	60
9	University of Connecticut	61	10	University of Southern California	59
9	University of Virginia	61	11	University of Georgia	57
12	Texas A & M University	59	11	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	57
13	University of Michigan	57	13	University of Delaware	55
14	University of Illinois, Chicago	56	14	Auburn University	54
15	University of Southern California	55	15	Arizona State University	53
16	East Carolina University	54	15	Indiana University	53
16	University of Delaware	54	17	East Carolina University	52
16	University of Maryland	54	17	Georgia State University	52
16	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	54	17	University of Maryland	52
20	Colorado State University	52	20	Oregon State University	51
20	Syracuse University	52	21	University of Illinois, Chicago	50
22	Michigan State University	51	21	University of North Carolina, Greensboro	50
23	Auburn University	50	23	Michigan State University	49
23	Baylor University	50	23	University of Massachusetts, Amherst	49
23	Indiana University	50	23	University of Wisconsin, Madison	49
23	University of Georgia	50	26	Colorado State University	48
23	University of North Carolina, Greensboro	50	26	Iowa State University	48
28	University of Massachusetts, Amherst	49	26	University of Tennessee	48
28	University of Utah	49	26	University of Virginia	48
30	Georgia State University	48	30	University of Connecticut	47
31	Kansas State University	47	31	Middle Tennessee State University	46
31	University of Houston	47	31	University of Houston	46
31	University of Wisconsin, Madison	47	31	University of Utah	46
34	Oregon State University	46	34	Teachers College, Columbia University	45
34	University of Oklahoma	46	34	University of Nebraska, Omaha	45
34	University of Tennessee	46	34	West Virginia University	45
37	Arizona State University	45	37	Baylor University	44
37	Iowa State University	45	37	University of Oklahoma	44
39	Florida State University	44	39	Louisiana State University	43
39	University of Arkansas	44	40	Kansas State University	42
39	West Virginia University	44	40	Syracuse University	42
42	University of Mississippi	42	40	University of Central Florida	42
42	Wayne State University	42	43	University of Mississippi	41
44	Middle Tennessee State University	40	44	Purdue University	40
44	University of Nebraska, Omaha	40	44	Temple University	40

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Adjusted for Faculty Size			Unadjusted for Faculty Size		
Rank*	University	Score	Rank*	University	Score
46	Louisiana State University	39	44	Wayne State University	40
47	University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee	37	47	Florida State University	39
48	Purdue University	36	47	University of Arkansas	39
49	Temple University	35	47	University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee	39
50	University of Southern Mississippi	34	50	University of Southern Mississippi	38
51	Virginia Commonwealth University	32	51	Virginia Commonwealth University	36
52	Springfield College	25	52	Springfield College	31

*Tied ranks are listed alphabetically.

Table 3 T-Scores for Each Faculty Variable, Unadjusted for Faculty Size

University	Publications	Books	Pres.	Federal Funding	Nonfederal Funding	Internal Funding	Editors	Academy Fellows	National Fellows
Arizona State University	61	58	58	47	46	47	68	47	53
Auburn University	57	57	64	48	48	48	51	47	50
Baylor University	46	52	48	41	44	46	44	47	50
Colorado State University	46	40	49	56	47	49	47	44	50
East Carolina University	46	49	48	60	48	53	44	44	39
Florida State University	40	44	41	41	43	46	42	42	44
Georgia State University	40	65	44	49	58	48	45	44	44
Indiana University	50	65	53	45	68	50	58	49	53
Iowa State University	51	52	48	47	47	50	42	49	44
Kansas State University	47	40	45	46	45	46	53	44	42
Louisiana State University	49	42	46	41	45	46	53	44	42
Michigan State University	52	42	54	48	46	48	49	51	51
Middle Tennessee State University	42	55	47	41	52	46	52	44	53
Ohio State University	61	57	70	51	61	50	65	44	70
Oregon State University	56	52	51	54	43	47	47	44	55
Pennsylvania State University	71	92	62	65	50	50	68	60	55
Purdue University	40	42	41	42	44	49	42	47	50
Springfield College	34	40	34	41	43	46	40	42	37
Syracuse University	40	45	38	41	43	46	38	76	35
Teachers College, Columbia University	42	52	38	50	43	46	43	47	44
Temple University	37	42	34	43	47	46	41	51	46
Texas A&M-College Station	60	49	68	63	58	48	61	49	64
University of Arkansas	43	40	42	41	48	46	41	42	39
University of Central Florida	43	45	51	41	47	47	40	76	44
University of Connecticut	46	49	47	42	56	47	46	90	40
University of Delaware	47	55	54	69	51	46	46	42	55
University of Florida	55	58	53	66	49	72	56	51	50
University of Georgia	63	75	57	48	49	46	55	54	60
University of Houston	45	44	45	57	44	48	40	42	37
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	85	68	73	63	59	48	80	54	64
University of Illinois, Chicago	52	44	48	61	50	47	46	47	51

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

University	Publications	Books	Pres.	Federal Funding	Nonfederal Funding	Internal Funding	Editors	Academy Fellows	National Fellows
University of Maryland	48	49	47	47	46	49	61	54	59
University of Massachusetts Amherst	47	52	46	49	49	49	45	54	53
University of Michigan	61	58	74	72	103	48	69	54	53
University of Minnesota	59	65	53	45	46	54	71	60	81
University of Mississippi	50	42	40	41	44	46	41	42	39
University of Nebraska at Omaha	44	42	48	45	43	114	42	47	39
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	58	42	78	51	65	51	61	49	48
University of North Carolina Greensboro	47	45	49	43	44	50	58	58	62
University of Oklahoma	48	47	42	42	43	46	45	44	42
University of South Carolina	76	47	59	77	62	47	51	78	71
University of Southern California	54	49	59	73	43	48	49	44	60
University of Southern Mississippi	38	45	36	43	43	46	39	42	40
University of Tennessee	50	45	47	41	45	50	56	44	50
University of Texas at Austin	58	47	55	64	68	56	63	54	64
University of Utah	48	47	44	43	48	46	48	44	50
University of Virginia	51	49	53	47	46	58	49	47	62
University of Wisconsin-Madison	47	45	44	58	49	56	41	51	42
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	40	42	44	46	49	49	44	42	40
Virginia Commonwealth University	37	42	39	41	44	46	38	44	39
Wayne State University	42	42	44	45	50	48	45	44	53
West Virginia University	46	52	45	41	49	46	40	44	42

Note. Ranks for any school on any index may be obtained by simple sorting of T-scores for any index that is paired with column 1, university identity, or by referring to the NAK website: Doctoral Program Review, Results, <http://www.nationalacademyofkinesiology.org/results>. Pres. = presentations.

Table 4 T-Scores for Student Variables, Unadjusted for Faculty Size

University	GRE-V	GRE-Q	Assistant. (FTE)	Selectivity	Doctoral Pubs.	Postdoc	Employ
Arizona State University	47	45	46	41	48	52	47
Auburn University	44	42	53	44	46	65	61
Baylor University	49	54	51	61	39	39	42
Colorado State University	62	53	49	24	52	57	38
East Carolina University	64	54	56	58	42	49	44
Florida State University	47	45	47	40	44	47	45
Georgia State University	40	34	76	46	40	44	43
Indiana University	44	45	47	50	76	52	58
Iowa State University	55	63	44	55	44	46	44
Kansas State University	59	28	44	38	50	41	41
Louisiana State University	39	38	48	45	44	49	46
Michigan State University	48	44	50	53	51	44	71
Middle Tennessee State University	32	34	65	34	45	43	74
Ohio State University	59	48	53	53	57	57	65
Oregon State University	51	42	49	56	51	46	50

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

University	GRE-V	GRE-Q	Assistant. (FTE)	Selectivity	Doctoral Pubs.	Postdoc	Employ
Pennsylvania State University	66	63	45	59	74	73	53
Purdue University	26	71	45	57	45	46	48
Springfield College	35	30	41	24	38	39	40
Syracuse University	55	76	46	46	43	43	40
Teachers College, Columbia University	70	54	45	59	43	41	47
Temple University	55	45	46	54	44	44	47
Texas A&M-College Station	44	45	64	44	51	49	44
University of Arkansas	47	42	42	50	41	43	44
University of Central Florida	43	53	47	54	44	41	38
University of Connecticut	55	48	48	47	55	49	47
University of Delaware	51	66	52	62	44	44	44
University of Florida	62	60	53	54	59	59	60
University of Georgia	45	43	47	52	56	54	64
University of Houston	53	54	46	53	49	54	40
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	47	52	57	30	69	76	61
University of Illinois, Chicago	44	43	46	45	49	57	39
University of Maryland	62	60	51	62	53	64	50
University of Massachusetts Amherst	59	51	50	57	53	54	44
University of Michigan	55	60	44	55	63	56	51
University of Minnesota	59	54	53	57	57	59	76
University of Mississippi	33	54	42	56	44	41	45
University of Nebraska at Omaha	47	54	43	52	38	47	41
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	52	53	46	59	50	46	50
University of North Carolina Greensboro	59	51	57	59	43	46	52
University of Oklahoma	47	42	53	38	64	41	51
University of South Carolina	47	45	53	51	76	76	57
University of Southern California	61	72	45	57	54	59	44
University of Southern Mississippi	51	51	42	51	42	39	48
University of Tennessee	44	57	45	58	55	54	69
University of Texas at Austin	58	54	76	53	61	67	68
University of Utah	51	39	49	51	51	52	50
University of Virginia	44	48	46	55	52	43	53
University of Wisconsin-Madison	73	54	43	57	46	49	42
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	46	48	40	24	37	39	37
Virginia Commonwealth University	43	44	42	51	38	41	42
Wayne State University	29	42	43	57	41	39	40
West Virginia University	44	48	57	59	43	39	61

Abbreviations: GRE-V = Graduate Record Examination-Verbal; GRE-Q = Graduate Record Examination-Quantitative; Assistant. = assistantship; FTE = full-time employment; Pubs. = publications; Postdoc = postdoctoral researchers; Employ = employed in the field.

Note. Ranks for any school on any index may be obtained by simple sorting of T-scores for any index that is paired with column 1, university identity, or by referring to the NAK website: Doctoral Program Review, Results, <http://www.nationalacademyofkinesiology.org/results>.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics for Faculty and Student Variables as a Function of Total T-Score (Unadjusted)

Categories of Total T-scores	Faculty									
	Publications	Books	Presents.	Federal Funding	Nonfederal Funding	Internal Funding	Editors	Academy Fellows (All Disciplines)	National Fellows (All Disciplines)	
< 40	85.0	1.2	162.2	\$707,383	\$768,933	\$111,703	6.3	0.2	2.7	
(n = 6)	SD	1.2	72.4	\$951,839	\$861,492	\$211,780	3.8	0.4	1.4	
40-49	195.5	3.5	267.0	\$2,312,715	\$1,197,791	\$986,783	14.0	3.8	6.0	
(n = 24)	SD	2.7	91.5	\$2,660,620	\$957,254	\$2,731,653	8.3	5.4	3.5	
50-59	293.8	8.4	449.5	\$6,412,818	\$2,502,559	\$483,975	28.2	2.5	9.9	
(n = 13)	SD	5.9	171.3	\$4,678,666	\$2,497,582	\$383,120	13.2	2.0	3.8	
≥ 60	491.9	12.0	609.4	\$11,062,548	\$5,912,189	\$1,314,105	48.1	6.1	15.7	
(n = 9)	SD	8.5	159.6	\$4,819,424	\$5,304,709	\$1,592,032	14.7	4.3	5.4	
Total	258.6	5.9	359.8	\$4,666,905	\$2,290,453	\$816,762	22.6	3.4	8.3	
(n = 52)	SD	6.0	192.1	\$4,952,091	\$3,086,792	\$1,986,369	17.2	4.4	5.5	

Students

Categories of Total T-scores	GRE-V	GRE-Q	Assistantships (FTE)	Selectivity	Doctoral Pubs.	Postdoc	Employed in Field
< 40	M	150.4	9.1	.4	12.8	1.3	7.0
(n = 6)	SD	2.5	8.0	.3	12.9	2.0	4.6
40-49	M	152.4	26.4	.6	45.0	3.9	13.6
(n = 24)	SD	3.2	17.5	.2	26.9	3.4	12.0
50-59	M	153.0	43.4	.7	58.2	7.9	15.2
(n = 13)	SD	2.2	40.5	.1	41.2	4.5	8.8
≥ 60	M	154.1	59.3	.6	119.7	15.3	26.7
(n = 9)	SD	2.0	51.7	.2	44.3	6.7	11.1
Total	M	152.7	34.4	.6	57.5	6.6	15.5
(n = 52)	SD	2.7	34.4	.2	45.2	6.1	11.7

Abbreviations: Presents. = presentations; GRE-V = Graduate Record Examination-Verbal; GRE-Q = Graduate Record Examination-Quantitative; FTE = full-time employment; Pubs. = publications; Postdoc = post-doctoral researchers.

Table 6 Doctoral Student Data (Number and %) for Race, by Year

Classification	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
American Indian or Alaska Native	2 (.3%)	2 (.3%)	2 (.3%)	3 (.4%)	3 (.4%)
Asian	87 (13.9%)	88 (13.5%)	91 (13.6%)	91 (13.4%)	91 (12.4%)
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (.1%)	1 (.1%)	1 (.1%)
Black or African American	29 (4.6%)	32 (4.9%)	35 (5.2%)	35 (5.2%)	44 (6.0%)
White	458 (73.0%)	459 (70.6%)	473 (70.8%)	478 (70.5%)	522 (71.0%)
More than one race	5 (.8%)	6 (.9%)	7 (1.0%)	11 (1.6%)	13 (1.8%)
Unknown or not reported	46 (7.3%)	63 (9.7%)	59 (8.8%)	59 (8.7%)	61 (8.3%)
Total	627	650	668	678	735

Note. Number (%) of doctoral students in each race classification. Data from 31 doctoral programs were included.

the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign ranked first based on unadjusted scores. The top 10 programs in each of the two methods of rankings included three programs participating for the first time: (1) the University of South Carolina, which also achieved a three-way tie at the #3 spot in the unadjusted rankings; (2) the University of Central Florida ranked #6 in another three-way tie for adjusted rankings; and (3) the University of Southern California came in at #10 in the unadjusted rankings. Comparing the top 10 programs from the last round of review to this one shows that the majority of shifting, up or down within the top 10, occurred among those already in this cluster. Three programs that did not reach the top 10 in the last round moved into this range in both adjusted and unadjusted scores this time: University of Florida, Ohio State University, and the University of Minnesota. Because there was minimal shift in the items included in this round compared to the last round, it seems fair to suggest that these shifts in rankings reflect changes internal to the programs themselves.

For the two methods of rankings, one might expect that average faculty size would differ. For the top 10 programs in each method, the mean number of faculty members was 14.9 for the adjusted rankings and 20.6 for the unadjusted. Indeed, four of the top 10 programs in the adjusted rankings had faculty sizes under 10 while none of those in the top grouping for unadjusted had a faculty size below 16. Thus, we continue to value and believe that our two methods of rankings are useful in enabling programs that are high in quality but small in faculty number to have their strengths recognized, along with those programs that are strong and have a large number of faculty members.

The four variables that were most strongly correlated with the total T-scores, and thus the rankings, for faculty variables were: publications, presentations, editorial boards, and federal funding. This was true whether scores were adjusted or unadjusted. For students, the two variables with the highest correlations, by far, for both adjusted and unadjusted total T-scores were doctoral publications and postdoctoral positions.

The importance of having individual T-scores for each variable is that they can be used to compare programs not just by overall score but also by how they performed on each item. By using a mean of 50 for these normalized scores, each program can be seen as consisting of some higher-than-average performance areas (scores above 50) and some lower than average. These individual items suggest areas of particular strength and perhaps areas that are weaknesses, depending on how these variables align with one's own value set. A review of the top 10 ranked programs determined by both the adjusted and unadjusted methods shows that none of them were above average on every category. Further, some variables may be under a program's control more so than others (e.g., raising GRE standards vs. having more students obtain postdoctoral positions).

In the manuscript published with the results of the last round of the NAK doctoral program review (Spiriduso & Reeve, 2011) the authors compared our results with those generated by the National Research Council's (NRC) kinesiology graduate program rankings. That is not possible this time because another NRC ranking has not occurred, and most academics believe it is not likely to be conducted again, given the high cost in money and time of those administering the process. That likelihood may have encouraged some of those programs that participated in the NRC ranking last time, but not the NAK review, to participate in this round. We are disappointed that the NRC may not conduct further reviews because we appreciated their strong emphasis on data, as we also emphasize, which differs from many rankings that are founded to a greater extent on reputations and perceptions.

We were pleased that in our first attempt to gather some demographic information about kinesiology doctoral students we were able to create a baseline, with an average of 600+ doctoral students across the five-year period from 2010 through 2014. Our focus on race was a good start, but we recommend expanding to include both race and ethnicity in the next round. This will make it easier to assure that Hispanic and Latino students have the opportunity to comfortably report the group with which

they identify. We also encourage efforts to assure a larger proportion of programs who participate in the review will consent to share their doctoral students' demographic data as well. One of the goals many programs have is to enhance the diversity of people trained to teach and conduct research in our field. These baseline data show not only the possibilities for change but they also offer help in setting enrollment goals for the future. One of the factors related to the diversity of our student populations is the diversity of our faculty. Adding these data to future reports may provide useful information to those programs working toward a stronger and more diverse academic program overall.

Summary

The third NAK review of faculty, doctoral students, and research productivity of doctoral programs in kinesiology included 52 participant programs. As in our previous reviews, this evaluation was based on using objective measures in a norm-referenced survey of kinesiology doctoral programs in the United States. Raw data were submitted by program chairs or graduate program administrators. Although elements of the review process have changed with each round, most of the criteria have remained the same. We continued to report both unadjusted rankings and rankings adjusted by number of faculty members in the reporting unit. We believe these two methods are useful for evaluating programs that are high in quality but small in faculty number, along with those programs that are strong and have a large number of faculty members. New to this year's review was the opportunity for programs to submit demographic information regarding the racial make-up of the doctoral students in a program's unit. These data were not included in the ranking but submitted optionally, so that program faculty could use the composite data for their own benchmarking. We also edited the wording of information defining eligibility of programs and individual faculty members in order to assure that we were being inclusive. This allowed for greater participation. We hope that in our next review, in 2020, there will be an even greater number of programs participating.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank our analysis team for their work on this project: James R. Morrow, Jr. (NAK Fellow #341) and Allen W. Jackson (NAK Fellow #428) from the University of North Texas, and Nicholas D. Myers, from the University of Miami. All three are measurement experts. We also wish to thank Catherine D. Ennis (past President of the NAK, Fellow #381) and Maureen R. Weiss (Editor-in-Chief of *Kinesiology Review* and NAK Fellow #360) for their feedback on this manuscript. Our special thanks go to Kim Scott for her always timely and efficient assistance throughout the entire doctoral review process.

We also acknowledge the important contributions of the 2015 NAK Doctoral Program Committee (DPC) to the entire process. Members included Dr. David Bassett, Jr. (University of Tennessee; NAK Fellow #495), Dr. John Challis (Pennsylvania State University; NAK Fellow #492), Dr. Diane Gill (University of North Carolina-Greensboro; NAK Fellow #331), Dr. Stephen Silverman (Columbia Teachers College; NAK Fellow #374), and Dr. Beverly Ulrich (University of Michigan and DPC Chair; NAK Fellow #375). Dr. Waneen Spirduso (NAK Fellow #294) graciously served us as liaison from the previous DPC to our more recent one.

References

- Fiegener, M. (2011). *Number of Doctorates Awarded in the United States Declined in 2010*. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation. Available <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/infbrief/nsf12303/nsf12303.pdf>.
- Spirduso, W., & Reeve, T.G. (2011). The National Academy of Kinesiology 2010 review and evaluation of doctoral programs in kinesiology. *Quest*, 63, 411–440. doi:10.1080/00336297.2011.10483689
- Thomas, J.R., Clark, J.E., Feltz, D.L., Kretchmar, R.S., Morrow, J.R., Reeve, T.G., & Wade, M.G. (2007). The Academy promotes, unifies, and evaluates doctoral education in kinesiology. *Quest*, 59, 174–194. doi:10.1080/00336297.2007.10483547
- Thomas, J.R., & Reeve, T.G. (2006). A review and evaluation of doctoral programs 2000–2004 by the American Academy of Kinesiology and Physical Education. *Quest*, 58, 176–196. doi:10.1080/00336297.2006.10491878

Appendix A

Participating Universities and Invited Universities that Elected Not to Participate

Participating University	Program Title	Size of Program Faculty (n)	Nonparticipating University	Program Title
1. Arizona State University	Physical Activity, Nutrition & Wellness	25	1. Arizona State University	Physical Education, Teacher Education and Sport Pedagogy
2. Auburn University	Kinesiology	19	2. Ball State University	Physical Education, Sport, and Exercise Science
3. Baylor University	Health, Human Performance, & Recreation	9	3. Brigham Young University	Exercise Sciences
4. Colorado State University	Health & Exercise Science	12	4. Florida State University	Sport Management
5. East Carolina University	Kinesiology	14	5. Kent State University	Exercise Science & Physiology
6. Florida State University	Nutrition, Food & Exercise Science	6	6. North Dakota State University	Health, Nutrition, & Exercise Sciences
7. Georgia State University	Kinesiology & Health	16	7. Rutgers University	Exercise Science & Sport Studies
8. Indiana University	Kinesiology	19	8. State University of New York (SUNY) at Buffalo	Exercise & Nutrition Sciences
9. Iowa State University	Kinesiology	17	9. Texas Women's University	Kinesiology
10. Kansas State University	Kinesiology	10	10. University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa	Kinesiology
11. Louisiana State University	Kinesiology	17	11. University of Florida	Tourism, Recreation & Sport Management
12. Michigan State University	Kinesiology	13	12. University of Hawaii at Manoa	Kinesiology & Rehabilitation Sciences
13. Middle Tennessee State University	Health & Human Performance	23	13. University of Idaho	Movement Studies
14. Ohio State University	Exercise Science	18	14. University of Kansas	Health, Sport, & Exercise Sciences
15. Oregon State University	Nutrition & Exercise Sciences	21	15. University of Kentucky	Kinesiology & Health Promotion
16. Pennsylvania State University	Kinesiology	26	16. University of Miami	Exercise & Sport Sciences
17. Purdue University	Health & Kinesiology	13	17. University of Nebraska at Kearney	Kinesiology & Sport Sciences
18. Springfield College	Health, Physical Education, & Recreation	8	18. University of New Mexico	Health, Exercise, & Sport Sciences
19. Syracuse University	Exercise Science	4	19. University of Northern Colorado	Sport & Exercise Sciences
20. Teachers College, Columbia University	Movement Science & Education	5	20. University of Oregon	Human Physiology
21. Temple University	Kinesiology	14	21. University of Pittsburgh	Health & Physical Activity

(continued)

Appendix A (continued)

Participating University	Program Title	Size of Program Faculty (n)	Nonparticipating University	Program Title
22. Texas A & M University	Health & Kinesiology	19	22. University of South Carolina	Physical Education & Athletic Training
23. University of Arkansas	Health, Human Performance & Recreation	7	23. University of Toledo	Kinesiology
24. University of Central Florida	Education & Human Sciences	4	24. University of West Florida	Exercise Science & Community Health
25. University of Connecticut	Kinesiology	7	25. Virginia Technical University	Human Nutrition, Foods, & Exercise
26. University of Delaware	Kinesiology & Applied Physiology	17		
27. University of Florida	Applied Physiology & Kinesiology	16		
28. University of Georgia	Kinesiology	23		
29. University of Houston	Health & Human Performance	13		
30. University of Illinois at Chicago	Kinesiology & Nutrition	12		
31. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Kinesiology	27		
32. University of Maryland	Kinesiology	14		
33. University of Massachusetts Amherst	Kinesiology	14		
34. University of Michigan	Kinesiology	28		
35. University of Minnesota	Kinesiology	16		
36. University of Mississippi	Health, Exercise Science, & Recreation Management	11		
37. University of Nebraska at Omaha	Physical Education & Recreation	15		
38. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Exercise & Sport Science	19		
39. University of North Carolina at Greensboro	Kinesiology	14		
40. University of Oklahoma	Health & Exercise Science	11		
41. University of South Carolina	Exercise Science	18		

(continued)

Appendix A (continued)

Participating University	Program Title	Size of Program Faculty (n)	Nonparticipating University	Program Title
42. University of Southern California	Biokinesiology and Physical Therapy	20		
43. University of Southern Mississippi	Human Performance & Recreation	12		
44. University of Tennessee	Kinesiology, Recreation & Sport Studies	16		
45. University of Texas	Kinesiology & Health Education	18		
46. University of Utah	Exercise & Sport Science	11		
47. University of Virginia	Kinesiology	9		
48. University of Wisconsin at Madison	Kinesiology	17		
49. University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee	Kinesiology	12		
50. Virginia Commonwealth University	Health & Human Performance	9		
51. Wayne State University	Kinesiology, Health & Sport Studies	10		
52. West Virginia University	Kinesiology & Physical Education	14		

Appendix B

NAK Doctoral Program Evaluation Instructional Guide

This Instructional Guide provides definitions and specific instructions for completing the EXCEL file data sheets. There is one EXCEL File (NAK Doctoral Program Evaluation Data Sheet 2010-2014) with four data entry sheets:

- Faculty Data
- Program Funding Data
- Student Group Data
- Doctoral Student Demographics

The Faculty Data are entered for EACH faculty.

The Program Funding Data are entered for each YEAR by funding source.

Student Group Data are entered for the entire academic Program being evaluated.

Faculty Demographic Data are OPTIONAL and NOT used for the NAK evaluation procedures.

If you have questions regarding the information requested, please contact _____ in the NAK Business Office (phone: _____, email: _____).

Return all completed files electronically to: _____.

Sign-Off Procedures

There are two sign-off procedures this round:

1. The Program chairperson MUST sign-off verifying the accuracy of the data submitted. A Faculty/Student Data Verification Page is provided.
2. BOTH the Program chairperson and the unit Budget Officer or other budget authority must sign-off on the Program Funding Verification Page.

Review Period

Data to be included are for the 5 calendar years 2010-2014. For faculty members, you are to include faculty members who are CURRENTLY conducting doctoral activities in your unit. Counts, amounts, and values inserted are for their activities throughout the ENTIRE 5-year period.

For student data include the current year or the entire 5-year period of 2010-2014 as described in this Instructional Guide.

FAQ

A list of Frequency Asked Questions can be viewed at _____. If you have a question, contact _____ and you will receive a reply to your question. If appropriate, it will also be added to the Internet FAQ.

Getting Started

Download the attached “NAK Doctoral Program Evaluation Data Sheet 2010-2014” and RENAME it. **Name the Excel file with the following structure:** “University Name – NAK – 2010-2014” (e.g., West Florida – NAK – 2010-2014)

Program/Faculty Inclusion

A. Criteria for Inclusion of Program

1. Program must graduate an average of at least 1 doctoral student per year,
2. Must be offered by a college or university that has current regional higher education accreditation, and
3. At least 1/3 of the faculty members in the program must be kinesiologists (broadly defined and up to individuals to determine if their expertise falls under this umbrella term).

B. Criteria for Inclusion of Faculty—Faculty must meet all three of the following:

1. Currently teach doctoral-serving courses AND/OR direct doctoral dissertations AND/OR serve on doctoral advisory committees;
2. Holds a doctoral degree and be in a tenured or tenure-earning position or continuing appointment as clinical professor at the rank of assistant, associate, or full professor;
3. At least 25% of their base salary support is provided by academic unit sponsoring the doctoral program.

Not all faculty members from your school or department need to be included. The NAK is reviewing programs, not departments - if the doctoral program emphasis overlaps the field of kinesiology, it is fine. To determine which of the individual faculty members “make sense” to include, the following criteria are intended to assist decision making:

1. Must have 25% or greater salaried appointment in the academic department within which the program being reviewed is administered **PLUS**
2. At least 2 of the following
 - a. Served on a Kinesiology doctoral dissertation committee,
 - b. Served as primary mentor for a Kinesiology doctoral student,
 - c. Teach graduate coursework in the program sponsoring the Kinesiology doctoral degree,
 - d. Has graduate faculty status in Kinesiology or umbrella department sponsoring the degree.

Faculty Data

Note this is the FIRST page of the Excel sheet (Faculty Data)

Instructions for Completing Each Column in Excel Faculty Data Sheet (variable names are listed in parentheses).

Number of Kinesiology Program Faculty (nfac)

Enter the number of faculty members that you use to determine the data entered on the “Faculty Data” Excel sheet.

Below the bottom “Yellow” description, enter the names (Last, First) of the kinesiology faculty that were used to obtain the values for Faculty Data. The number of entries must equal the number of kinesiology program faculty (**nfac**).

Publications

Even if a particular faculty member has not been in your unit for a total of 5 years, still include all 5 years (2010-2014) of his or her publications.

Faculty Publications (facpubs). Enter the number of full-length scholarly articles in refereed journals, chapters in books, and monographs published during this period (2010-2014 calendar years) for which at least one of your faculty members is a co-author. NOTE, each publication is counted only one time, even if more than one of your faculty members are co-authors. This column should sum to the total number of UNIQUE research publications produced by the program. DO NOT INCLUDE ABSTRACTS, PROCEEDINGS, OR PROJECT REPORTS.

The Program Chairperson MUST submit a bibliography listing the UNIQUE **facpubs** for the unit in the 2010-2014 period. It is to be submitted in MS Word format. This bibliography should total to the number of **facpubs** listed for all faculty members.

Books (bookpubs). Enter the number of books for the past 5 calendar years (author, co-author, or editor). If more than one faculty member is a co-author, count the book as 1 for EACH of them. If more than 1 edition is published in the 5-year period, count EACH edition.

Presentations (Present)

Enter the number of presentations whether presenter or co-author over the past 5 calendar years. If more than one faculty member is a co-author, count the presentation as 1 for EACH of them. INCLUDE ONLY SCHOLARLY PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS. Do NOT include sessions for which the faculty member simply acted as a presenter.

Editors and Editorial Boards (editboard)

Enter the number of editorships and editorial boards for scholarly journals that each faculty member has held over the past 5 years. Do NOT include journals for which one simply serves as a reviewer. For example, if professor X served on *Medicine and Science in Sports & Exercise* for Years 1, 2, and 3; *Journal of Motor Behavior* for Years 3 and 4; and started on a new editorial board for *The Journal of Sport Psychology* in Year 4, the total would be 3.

National Academy Members (natlacademy)

Number of national academy memberships held by faculty members in the program in 2014. These memberships must remain active in 2014. Count the number of academies, not the number of years each person was a member of the academy. NOTE: the National Academy of Kinesiology (NAK) membership must be “active” in 2014 to be counted. Faculty members who allowed their status to lapse prior to 2014 without being reinstated by December 31, 2014 do not count.

Fellows in National Associations (natlfellow)

Enter the number of other national associations (other than Academies) across the 5-year period (e.g., ACSM Fellow, Society of Gerontology Fellow, SHAPE America Research Fellow, etc.) for which each faculty member was selected.

Faculty Names (Last, First)

You **MUST** enter the names for all of the faculty in the program being evaluated who meet the criteria on page 2. You **MIGHT** want to enter individual values for each faculty member for the associated variables listed in Row 1 and then total the entries. **ONLY the Total is required for submission (Row 2 of the Excel Sheet titled “Faculty Data”).**

Program Funding Data

Note this is the SECOND page of the Excel sheet (Program Funding Data)

Funding

Institutional Research Grants EXPENDITURES. *Federal extramural funds (not funding from university) (extfundfed).* List the total extramural dollars (direct + indirect costs) for all contracts, grants, training program grants, etc. *expenditures* for the faculty listed on Excel sheet #1 that were processed through the department’s budget for each of the past 5 years.

External research funding non-federal (foundations, corporations, etc. (extfundnonfed). List the total extramural dollars (direct + indirect costs) for all contracts, grants, training program grants, etc. *expenditures* for the faculty listed on Excel sheet #1 that were processed through the department’s budget for each of the past 5 years.

Internal Grants Funding RECEIVED. *Internal funding (infund)* for research and teaching. List the total university or college intramural dollars for internal research or instructional grants *received* for each of the past 5 years. Awards CANNOT come from within

the departmental unit. Funding **MUST** come from the college or university level.

The Program Chairperson and a Budget Officer **MUST** sign and submit the “NAK Doctoral Program Funding Verification Page.”

Student Group Data

Note this is the THIRD page of the Excel sheet (Student Group Data)

Data Page: Student Group Data

A. Criteria for Inclusion of Current Students: Data included here are summary/grouped data

B. Instructions for Completing Each Column on the Student Group Data Sheet:

For the following three GRE variables, report GRE Scores based on the **revised GRE scoring** which ranges from 130-170 (see https://www.ets.org/gre/revised_general/scores/). Students with scores based on the previous GRE reporting method (200-800) must be converted to the 130-170 system. A GRE Conversion chart is available from ETS at https://www.ets.org/s/gre/pdf/concordance_information.pdf.

Minimum GRE Verbal Score Required (minGREVerbal).

Enter the **CURRENT** minimum GRE Verbal score required for admission to the doctoral program.

Report using the revised 130-170 GRE scale.

If none – enter NONE

Minimum GRE Quantitative Score Required (minGREQuant).

Enter the **CURRENT** minimum GRE Quantitative score required for admission to the doctoral program.

Report using the revised 130-170 GRE scale.

If none – enter NONE

GRE Scores (aveGREVerbal) (aveGREQuant). Enter the **AVERAGE** entry GRE scores (verbal, quantitative) for all doctoral students **CURRENTLY** in the program. **Report scores based on the revised 130-170 GRE scale.** If the student has completed the GRE more than once, use only the scores **ACTUALLY USED** to make the admission decision. Use all full- and part-time students enrolled in the doctoral program in this field during the 2014 calendar year (spring, summer and/or fall, 2014). Include all doctoral students enrolled for one or more academic credits.

Doctoral Student Publications (docpubs). For doctoral students who were/are enrolled any time during the period 2010-2014, count the number of publications that they had where they were the **FIRST** author. Count any publications that occur while they were enrolled and

up to 2 years **FOLLOWING** their graduation if they are (1) the **FIRST** author and (2) the publication is based on worked they conducted while a student in your unit. **DO NOT INCLUDE ABSTRACTS, PROCEEDINGS, OR PROJECT REPORTS.**

Student Support (stusupport). Enter the total number of FTE for which your unit had graduate student (**masters and doctoral**) support **FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2014** (Spring, Summer, & Fall). These could be Research Assistants, Graduate Assistants, Teaching Fellows, Teaching Assistants, etc.

Applications (applicat). Enter the number of completed doctoral applications received for the doctoral program for the past 5 years. This is the number of applications that have reached your unit’s decision point (this might be the Graduate School, the Department Chair, or the Graduate Coordinator, etc.).

Acceptance (accept). Enter the number of doctoral students who have been accepted into this doctoral program in the last 5 years.

Post-doctoral Student Employment (postdoc). Enter the total number of doctoral graduates in the past 5 years who accepted post-doctoral positions. This does **NOT** include regular faculty positions taken.

Employment in the Field (employfield). Enter the total number of doctoral graduates in the past 5 years who accepted full-time professional positions 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.

Doctoral Student Demographics

Note this is the FOURTH page of the Excel sheet (Doctoral Student Demographics)

Submission of these data is OPTIONAL and data are NOT used in the NAK evaluation process. Demographics will be published for those submitting data.

Enter the **DOCTORAL** student enrollments for the following classifications for **EACH** year from 2010-2014:

American Indian or Alaska Native

Asian

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Black or African American

White

More than one Race

Unknown or Not Reported

The “Total doctoral student enrollment” is automatically calculated based on the numbers you enter for the 6 categories for each year.