

The National Academy of Kinesiology 2010 Review and Evaluation of Doctoral Programs in Kinesiology

Waneen Spirduso and T. Gilmour Reeve

In 2010, the National Academy of Kinesiology (NAK) conducted its second national doctoral program survey, based on faculty and student data from 2005 to 2009. Total T-scores for each school were derived from the sum of nine faculty indices and seven student indices. Faculty indices, based on research, presentations, grants, and honors, made up 66%, and student indices based on GRE scores, financial support, admission/acceptance characteristics, national quantitative scores and employment, made up 34% of the Total T-scores. Two rankings of these Total T-scores for the doctoral programs are presented: unadjusted and adjusted for faculty and student size. Total T-scores for each index for each school and the aggregate research funds expended by all schools are provided. These rankings are compared with those from the NAK 2005 survey and also to a ranking derived by the authors from published scores in the 2010 National Research Council doctoral program evaluation.

The National Academy of Kinesiology¹ (NAK; also referred to as the Academy) has completed its second formal review of kinesiology doctoral programs. During this past decade, the Academy has developed, piloted, administered, and reported a national review of doctoral programs in kinesiology. In 2000, the Academy conducted a pilot study in which 20 volunteer departments submitted 1998–1999 data from their degree programs. The results were used by the Academy to make modifications in the survey instrument and the planned data analyses to improve the quality of the evaluation. Reports describing this process have been published previously (Thomas, et al., 2007; Thomas, Morrow, & Stevermer, 2004), and are also available at the Academy's website: <http://www.nationalacademyofkinesiology.org/history>.

The first formal doctoral program evaluation administered by the Academy, the 2005 Program Review, included 2000–2004 data. The results of this evaluation provided a ranking of the participating degree programs based on final T-scores calculated from faculty and student performance indices (Thomas & Reeve, 2006).

Spirduso is with the Dept of Kinesiology and Health Education, University of Texas–Austin, Austin, TX. Reeve is with the Office of Academic Affairs, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.

Following a review of the results and the benefit of such an approach to the discipline, the Academy committed to providing this review every five years, and determined that by using essentially the same approach for the next formal evaluation administrators, faculty, graduate students, and potential graduate students would have consistent, timely, and reliable information relating to kinesiology doctoral programs in this country. The National Academy of Kinesiology Committee on Doctoral Programs², which had been a presidential ad hoc committee since 1995, was made a standing committee to ensure that the Academy's doctoral program evaluations continued. The Committee on Doctoral Programs guided the Academy in addressing issues related to the process and several procedures were modified and approved in the Academy business meeting in 2004. The Committee continued to work on the process for evaluating doctoral programs and determined the final metrics to be used in the current review.

Although the number can vary depending upon the criteria used, 68 universities in the United States offer a doctoral program in one or more of the different specializations of kinesiology. Most of these doctoral programs are housed in kinesiology departments or similar departments with different names. However, some programs are located in other health-related departments or colleges, making the total number of doctoral programs (68) larger than the number of departments named kinesiology. To identify departments/programs to be invited to participate in the doctoral program reviews, the Academy used the same definition of kinesiology that was reported in the Thomas and Reeve (2006) article. This definition emphasizes the multifaceted nature of the discipline in which movement or physical activity is the intellectual focus and includes the sciences and professional areas associated with the study of movement (see <http://www.nationalacademyofkinesiology.org/what-is-kinesiology>).

The kinesiology doctoral programs in the United States focus on a diversity of areas of specialization and few departments offer truly comprehensive doctoral programs that encompass the full range of specializations. A few departments offer only one specialization, whereas most others offer two or more. The nature of the majority of programs is interdisciplinary with the technology and methods of research differing widely across programs.

The purpose of this report is to describe the evaluation process, to report the final rankings for the 2010 evaluation, to make some general comparisons of these results with the 2005 Academy doctoral program evaluations, and to compare the 2010 evaluation results to three of five of the National Research Council indices. It is important to understand that the NAK evaluation target is the specific doctoral degree program, not the department as a whole or the individual specializations that are included in a degree program.

Method

The president of the Academy sent letters to the chairs of departments that were identified as offering doctoral programs in kinesiology, and to the graduate deans to whom the chairs reported, requesting that they participate in the evaluation. The chairs of participating programs returned a Confirmation Form accompanied by

a participation fee to the Academy national office. A list of the universities of the doctoral programs that did or did not participate is shown in Appendix A.

Participating chairs were then sent an Instructional Guide (Appendix B), and a data packet, which outlined the faculty and student data to be reported, described the process, and explained how to interpret the designation of faculty and student. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) sheet, a code book, and an Excel data sheet were included in the packet. The data to be reported were based on 2005–2009 calendar years. All data were sent and returned electronically, and were accompanied by a Verification Page signed by the department chair. Institutions that elected not to participate or that failed to respond were contacted by e-mail and encouraged to participate.

Institutions reported data on all current faculty members for the past five years (from January 1, 2005 to December 31, 2009). All data for any faculty member arriving during the 5-year period were included while any data for a faculty member who left during the 5-year period were excluded. Using this approach, the evaluation reflected the faculty status of the department at the end of the 5-year period. Counts, amounts, and values inserted were for their activities throughout the entire 5-year period. Some student data were for the 2009 calendar year (e.g., GRE scores) but other student data represent the total 5-year period (e.g., number of doctoral graduates). Appropriate answers were developed for frequently asked questions and were posted on the Academy web site to facilitate report preparation by the departments

Variables Included in the Review

Because this program review is of doctoral programs in kinesiology, three criteria were established to count a faculty member's data: he or she a) *currently* teaches doctoral-serving courses AND/OR directs doctoral dissertations AND/OR serves on doctoral advisory committees; b) holds a doctoral degree and is in a tenured or tenure-earning position at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor; and c) has at least 25% of his/her base salary support provided by the academic unit sponsoring the doctoral program. All three criteria must have been fulfilled for a faculty member to be included in the data sets.

Categories of Data Reported for Faculty. In addition to faculty rank, below is a list of the categories of data that were reported for the faculty. Weightings are shown in Table 1.

- Journal publications: only first author counts; or first faculty representing the department if multiple authorship with first author in another department or a student
- Books: scholarly
- Presentations: national or international meetings only
- Federal external funding expenditures: total federal dollars processed through the department's budget
- Nonfederal external funding expenditures: total nonfederal extramural dollars processed through the department's budget

Table 1 National Academy of Kinesiology (NAK) Doctoral Program Review Criteria Weightings^a

Faculty Indices		66%
Productivity	30%	
Journal publications	20%	
Books	5%	
Presentations	5%	
Funding expenditures	26%	
Federal external	15%	
Nonfederal external	8%	
Internal research	3%	
Visibility	10%	
Editorial boards	6%	
National Academy members	2%	
National Fellows	2%	
Student indices		34%
Graduate Assistant support	13%	
Student quality	10%	
GRE verbal	5%	
GRE quantitative	5%	
Employment	7%	
Postdoctoral positions	4%	
Employment in the field	3%	
Admissions	4%	
Selectivity	2%	
Yield	2%	

^a Weightings recommended by the NAK Doctoral Review Committee, discussed, and approved by members in the annual NAK Business Meeting, 2008.

Note. Selectivity = the number of student applications divided by the number of students accepted. Yield = the number of students enrolled divided by the number of students accepted.

- Internal research funding: total dollars funded from outside the department but internal to the university
- Editorial boards: includes Editor-in-Chief, Associate Editor, and Section Editor
- National Academy members: number of national academy memberships; includes National Academy of Kinesiology
- National Fellows: e.g., American College of Sports Medicine, Gerontological Society of America, Research Consortium of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Society of Neuroscience, etc.

Two of the key variables described above were changed from the 2005 review. These changes involved the way publications were counted and the way grants were reported. In the 2010 report, “Refereed Publications” represents the number of different publications produced by an academic unit (i.e., publications were not counted several times if multiple authors were in the same department). The current analysis includes only research and training grant expenditures that were processed each year through the department’s budget, unlike in 2005 when the total amount of grants obtained were reported. More detail describing the categories is provided in Appendix B.

Categories of Data Reported for Students. The quantifiable variables listed below were analyzed for students. Weightings of each variable are shown in Table 1. See Appendix B for more details.

- Graduate Assistant support: total FTE for graduate student support in 2009 calendar year (Research Assistants, Graduate Assistants, Teaching Fellows, Teaching Assistants)
- Student quality: minimum GRE verbal and/or quantitative score required—if no minimum, indicate none
- Employment:
 - Post doctoral student employment: total number over the last 5 years who accepted postdoctoral positions
 - Employment in the field: full-time appointments that required a doctoral degree
- Admissions: data provided were a) acceptance (number of doctoral students accepted in the past five years, b) enrolled—number of students accepted who enrolled in the past five years. From these, two variables were calculated from the student data:
 - Selectivity—the number of student applications accepted divided by the number of total applicants
 - Yield—the number of students enrolled divided by the number of students accepted.

Weightings of Variables

The Committee on Doctoral Programs members, all of which had extensive experience in doctoral education and program administration, developed appropriate weightings for the variables in the doctoral evaluation. These weights were based on data from the pilot study conducted by the Academy earlier and used in the initial program evaluation (Thomas & Reeve, 2006). Table 1 provides the weightings by categories and subcategories for Faculty Indices (66%) and Student Indices (34%) set by the committee and approved by at the Academy business meeting in 2004.

Data Analysis

The data analysis generally followed the procedures reported by Thomas and Reeve (2006). Two Academy Fellows who are measurement experts from a nondoctoral granting institution were contracted to conduct the data analyses. In this manner,

their decisions regarding the data analyses could not reflect on their own institution's standing in the doctoral evaluation. Policy decisions regarding categories, weights, and types of analyses were determined by the Academy. The measurement experts verified, validated, and analyzed the data, reviewed the results, and submitted a report of the outcomes to the Committee on Doctoral Programs and the Academy Executive Committee. Any data (primarily extreme outliers) that appeared erroneous were reviewed and, if needed, followed up for verification by e-mail. The range of faculty size was from 5 to 26. The grouping of institutions by size of the graduate faculty is shown below.

- 18 faculty or larger ($N = 7$)—Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, Texas A&M University, University of Georgia, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Michigan, University of Texas at Austin
- 14–17 ($N = 11$)—Auburn University, Colorado State University, Louisiana State University, Ohio State University, Oregon State University, University of Florida, University of Illinois—Chicago, University of Maryland, University of Minnesota, University of Utah, University of Wisconsin
- 10–13 ($N = 11$)—East Carolina University, Iowa State University, Arizona State University—Kinesiology, Arizona State University—PANW, Michigan State University, University of Connecticut, University of Houston, University of Massachusetts—Amherst, University of North Carolina—Greensboro, West Virginia University, University of Oklahoma
- Less than 10 ($N = 7$)—Georgia State University, Teachers College (Columbia University), Temple University, University of Arkansas—Fayetteville, University of Mississippi, University of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University

Standard scores ($M = 0$, $SD = 1$) were calculated for each of the faculty and student indices (see Thomas & Reeve, 2006) and were converted to T-scores for each of the faculty and student indices. The overall scores (Total T-score), calculated by applying the individual indices weights shown in Table 1 and totaling the faculty and student indices were then ranked for both adjusted and unadjusted data. Each program then received a rank based on its Total T-score. T-scores were also reported by institutions for each of the faculty and student indices. The tables with the more detailed analyses of faculty and students indices were constructed only for T-scores adjusted on faculty size. Finally, means and standard deviations were calculated for each faculty and student index and reported in four groups: Total T-score of 60 or higher, 50–59, 40–49, and below 40. Tables were reported in the same format as in Thomas and Reeve (2006) so that comparisons can be made.

For the current program evaluation, different methods of analyses were conducted. In two methods, faculty size was adjusted or not and in two other methods, the standard scores were truncated or not. Adjusting for faculty size allows for a comparison of faculty productivity with the influence of faculty size on variables removed. Although not always the case, large faculties have a greater opportunity to produce more research papers, presentations, and research funding than small ones on the basis of size alone. Adjusting scores also focuses the evaluation on graduate programs, not departments or program specialization, so that a doctoral program is not penalized for having only one or two kinesiology specializations. Conversely, the unadjusted method corrects for the situation in which only one or two faculty members in a small department are highly prolific, leading to a counter-intuitively high ranking. Unadjusted scores reward the absolute productivity of a program that

makes an impact, both within a state and nationally. Unadjusted scores also recognize the nonlinear and interactive benefits that accrue from having many faculty with different specializations. Faculty and doctoral students are exposed to more academic perspectives that may influence their work in their own specialization.

Truncating the standard scores at 2.576 removes the influence of extreme outliers from the analyses. Adjustment and truncation were then combined to produce four sets of analyses:

- Method #1: Adjusted for Faculty and Student Size/Truncated
- Method #2: Adjusted for Faculty and Student Size/Not Truncated
- Method #3: Unadjusted for Faculty and Student Size/Truncated
- Method #4: Unadjusted for Faculty and Student Size/Not Truncated

The final Total T-scores of the two methods differing on the factor of truncation (#1 vs. #2; #3 vs. #4) were highly correlated; both were $r = .95, p < .001$. Based on these results, the decision was to develop overall ranks based on Methods #1 and #4 analyses. Thus, two rankings were developed primarily on the basis of whether the standard scores were adjusted or unadjusted for the size of faculty and students, and hereafter are described as Adjusted for Faculty Size and Unadjusted for Faculty Size. The Committee on Doctoral Programs recommended and the NAK approved the development of two rankings with the intention of determining whether to publish one or both in future evaluations.

The correlation between the adjusted/truncated and the unadjusted/ not truncated rankings was $r = .837, p < .001$. These two final rankings and the comparison of NAK and NRC rankings are based on both adjusted and unadjusted scores, but comparisons of programs' Total T-scores on individual faculty and student indices are provided only for adjusted scores. The provision of T-score rankings for each index and for both adjusted and unadjusted was deemed to be beyond the scope of this report. However, individual graduate advisors and/or chairs of departments can calculate their rank on each index using the adjusted T-scores provided in tables that are available on the NAK website, and determine which indices of their programs have high ranks and which could be improved.

Analysis of the Evaluation Instrument

The correlations between each index and the Total T-score for both adjusted (a) and unadjusted (ua) analyses are shown in Table 2. The within-instrument correlations of each index with the total faculty indices ranged from "National Fellows," $r_{(a)} = .22$ which was not significant to "Presentations," $r_{(ua)} = .89$, which was significant at the $p = .01$ level. The correlations between each of the student indices and the Total T-score ranged from "Yield," $r_{(a)} = .06$, which was not significant, to "Post-doctoral positions," $r_{(ua)} = .75$, significant at the $p = .01$ level (Table 3).

Correlations of Total T-scores and total number of faculty were obviously low using adjusted scores, $r_{(a)} = .31$, as expected, but were moderate to high using unadjusted scores, $r_{(ua)} = .75$. The correlations between the number of faculty at ranks, showing adjusted first followed by unadjusted, were as follows: Assistant Professors, $r_{(a)} = -.09, r_{(ua)} = .22$; Associate Professors, $r_{(a)} = .22, r_{(ua)} = .58, p = .01$; Professors, $r_{(a)} = .49, r_{(ua)} = .79$, both significant, $p = < .01$. Finally, the correlation of the 29 schools that participated in both the 2010 Academy ranking and the 2005 Academy ranking, both of which used adjusted scores, was $r = .74, p = .01$.

Table 2 Faculty Indices Correlated With Total T-Score

Index	Adjusted	Unadjusted
Publications (20%)	.79**	.87**
Books (5%)	.37*	.63**
Presentations (5%)	.68**	.89**
Federal funding (15%)	.51**	.71**
External funding (Nonfed) (8%)	.54**	.55**
Internal funding (3%)	.31	.58**
Editorial boards (6%)	.75**	.85**
National Academy members (2%)	.45**	.72**
National Fellows (2%)	.22	.40*

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

Table 3 Student Indices Correlated With Total T-Score

Indices	Adjusted	Unadjusted
Average GRE—V (5%)	.42**	.30
Average GRE—Q (5%)	.47**	.42**
Assistantships (FTE) (13%)	.64**	.68
Selectivity (2%)	.45**	.35*
Yield (2%)	.06	.09
Postdoctoral positions (4%) ^a	.60**	.75**
Positions in field (3%) ^a	.32	.42**

^aAdjusted for student enrollment.

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

Results

Thirty-six of the 68 doctoral programs in kinesiology participated in the evaluation process. The list of participants is shown in Appendix A. Nine doctoral programs participated for the first time in the 2010 evaluations, and five that participated in 2005 declined to participate in the current evaluation. Most of the schools not participating have small programs that are limited in the number of specializations offered. The evaluation included 481 faculty members, ranging in number from a faculty of 5 to a faculty of 26. The average and the median number of faculty were 13.7 and 14.0, respectively. Of the universities that participated in both the 2005 and the 2010 reports, 5 programs increased in faculty, 18 did not change, and 2 decreased in faculty members.

Overall Final Ranks and Total T-scores

The Final Ranks and Total T-Scores, adjusted and unadjusted for faculty size, are shown in Table 4. The Total T-score includes both faculty and student indices.

Table 4 Overall Final Rank and Total T-Score, Adjusted and Unadjusted for Size of Faculty

Score	Adjusted for size of faculty			Unadjusted for size of faculty		
	University	Adjusted 2010 rank ^a	Score	University	Score	Unadjusted 2010 rank ^a
79	University of Connecticut	1	82	Penn State University		1
74	Penn State University	2	70	University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign		2
65	University of Maryland	3	68	University of Connecticut		3
61	University of Massachusetts—Amherst	4	67	University of Texas		4
60	University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign	5	62	University of Maryland		5
58	East Carolina University	6	58	University of Michigan		6
58	Michigan State University	6	58	Texas A&M University		6
58	University of Texas	6	55	University of Georgia		8
57	Teachers College Columbia University	9	55	University of Massachusetts—Amherst		8
57	University of Virginia	9	53	Oregon State University		10
55	Oregon State University	11	52	Ohio State University		11
53	University of Florida	12	52	Michigan State University		11
52	University of Michigan	13	51	University of Florida		13
52	Texas A&M University	13	50	Purdue University		14
51	Arizona State University–PANW	15	50	University of Minnesota		14
50	Arizona State University–Kinesiology	16	49	Arizona State University–PANW		16
49	University of Georgia	17	49	East Carolina University		16
49	University of Oklahoma	17	48	University of North Carolina–Greensboro		18
48	University of Illinois–Chicago	19	48	University of Illinois–Chicago		18
48	Ohio State University	19	47	Auburn University		20
48	University of Minnesota	19	46	Arizona State University–Kinesiology		21

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

Score	Adjusted for size of faculty		Unadjusted for size of faculty		
	University	Adjusted 2010 rank ^a	Score	University	Unadjusted 2010 rank ^a
46	Auburn University	22	46	Colorado State University	21
45	Iowa State University	23	46	University of Wisconsin–Madison	21
45	University North Carolina–Greensboro	23	45	University of Virginia	24
44	Purdue University	25	45	University of Utah	24
44	Colorado State University	25	44	Louisiana State University	26
44	University of Wisconsin–Madison	25	44	Teachers College Columbia University	26
42	University of Houston	28	44	University of Oklahoma	26
42	Temple University	29	44	Iowa State University	26
41	University of Utah	30	43	Temple University	30
41	Georgia State University	30	41	University of Houston	31
41	Louisiana State University	30	41	West Virginia University	31
40	West Virginia University	33	38	Georgia State University	33
36	Virginia Commonwealth University	34	37	Virginia Commonwealth University	34
35	University of Arkansas–Fayetteville	35	37	University of Arkansas–Fayetteville	34
34	University of Mississippi	36	35	University of Mississippi	36

^aRank—tied ranks are listed alphabetically.

Two of the student indices, Postdoctoral positions and “Employment in the field,” were adjusted for student enrollment. The rank and T-scores adjusted for faculty size are shown on the left half of the table, and the rank and T-scores unadjusted for faculty or student size are on the right half of the table. For both adjusted and unadjusted sides of the table, the T-scores are shown in the left column and the rank is in the right column.

The standard competition ranking system was used to rank the T-scores. In this system programs that make the same T-score receive the same rank (lowest, or best). Each program’s rank number is 1 plus the number of programs ranked above it. Thus, the positions of all programs ranked below tied ranks are unaffected by the tie.

Descriptive Statistics for Faculty and Student Indices by T-score Category

The Total T-scores for Faculty Indices are shown in Table 5, with each school listed alphabetically. T-scores of the individual student indices are provided in Table 6. The Total T-scores were the basis for the overall NAK rankings (Table 4), but they were comprised of T-scores for the nine indices used to evaluate faculty and the six indices used to evaluate students. The university programs that ranked in the top five overall on the Total T-score did not necessarily always rank in the top five on each faculty index. Rather, 19 doctoral programs at 18 universities ranked within the top five ranks on at least one faculty or student index.

The descriptive statistics for Total T-score categories on faculty indices such as national journal articles, books, presentations, etc. are shown in Table 7. Similarly, the student indices by T-score category are shown in Table 8.

Descriptive Statistics of All Participating Doctoral Programs

Kinesiology as a field has acquired a large number of research grants and expended a substantial amount of research funds over the five-year period from 2005 to 2009, as shown in Table 9. The total amount of external and internal research dollars spent on research over the five-year period by the 36 university doctoral programs represented in this evaluation was \$305,124,929.

Discussion

The evolution of this doctoral evaluation process, which included the Academy’s development of rigorous criteria (1996–97), administration of a pilot study (1998), and the analysis and revisions of the initial 2005 evaluation has produced a norm-referenced, objective, criterion-based survey that is based on data supplied by chairs of departments or graduate program administrators. Although the list of graduate programs that participated in the two NAK evaluations (2005, 2010) was slightly different, the overall results were fairly similar. That is, schools that tended to be at the extremities of the list in the 2005 evaluation tended also to be at the extremities of the 2010 list.

Participation of graduate programs in this review was increased from 32 in 2005 to 36 in 2010. Nine additional universities chose to participate in 2010, and five dropped out. Of the five declining in 2010, three were in the lowest five ranks

Table 5 Total T-Score Results for Faculty Indices—Adjusted for Faculty Size

University	Publications	Books	Pres.	Federal funding	Nonfederal funding	Internal funding	Editors	Academy Fellows	National Fellows
Arizona State University—PANW	44	43	49	61	49	46	46	66	48
Arizona State University—Kinesiology	46	40	44	63	47	51	37	38	76
Auburn University	50	56	47	40	47	43	42	47	48
Colorado State University	48	45	37	46	44	76	43	42	48
Teachers College Columbia University	58	58	46	46	66	46	55	50	47
East Carolina University	52	40	56	74	58	67	45	44	45
Georgia State University	37	57	47	45	61	54	41	38	53
Iowa State University	51	52	44	45	49	47	42	49	43
Louisiana State University	50	46	48	40	43	40	41	46	45
Michigan State University	66	47	61	41	47	52	49	56	49
Ohio State University	48	48	45	43	42	44	62	56	53
Oregon State University	57	53	49	65	48	47	64	50	49
Pennsylvania State University	65	55	66	74	54	61	62	68	41
Purdue University	44	45	42	41	42	55	50	44	47
Temple University	45	45	35	47	41	44	37	38	53
Texas A&M University	46	53	57	45	53	42	48	49	44
University of Arkansas—Fayetteville	40	40	45	40	48	53	36	38	47
University of Connecticut	76	66	76	46	72	47	68	44	55

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

University	Publications	Books	Pres.	Federal funding	Nonfederal funding	Internal funding	Editors	Academy Fellows	National Fellows
University of Florida	48	46	45	49	47	49	54	76	48
University of Georgia	52	61	45	45	45	41	58	56	47
University of Houston	39	42	51	57	45	46	46	38	41
University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign	42	61	55	71	53	76	74	54	53
University of Illinois–Chicago	56	41	39	62	44	40	47	47	40
University of Maryland	58	49	53	56	41	60	67	62	52
University of Massachusetts–Amherst	60	44	61	54	57	51	54	63	60
University of Michigan	39	46	56	55	76	48	55	52	40
University of Minnesota	56	41	42	42	43	46	42	60	55
University of Mississippi	37	40	44	44	45	48	42	46	43
University of North Carolina–Greensboro	46	48	47	44	45	42	57	52	56
University of Oklahoma	57	51	69	48	42	47	49	38	61
University of Texas–Austin	51	61	47	49	62	58	63	50	53
University of Utah	47	41	42	41	42	42	45	42	46
University of Virginia	56	66	76	49	59	43	57	47	61
University of Wisconsin–Madison	44	40	38	54	41	55	43	54	43
Virginia Commonwealth University	38	46	47	39	46	43	42	38	44
West Virginia University	40	76	48	40	44	40	38	56	45

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 6 Total T-Score Results for Student Indices

University	Assistantships					Yield	
	GRE-V	GRE-Q	(FTE)	PostDoc ^a	Employ ^a		Selectivity
Arizona State University-PANW	52	51	58	47	38	35	46
Arizona State University-Kinesiology	53	76	39	60	48	56	33
Auburn University	49	37	50	52	64	50	66
Colorado State University	51	57	42	38	32	51	69
Teachers College Columbia University	76	62	44	42	76	60	24
East Carolina	44	49	47	59	42	49	61
Georgia State University	41	42	43	60	44	24	56
Iowa State University	51	53	38	48	51	49	51
Louisiana State University	51	49	41	46	47	36	53
Michigan State University	47	51	64	43	54	51	56
Ohio State University	76	44	51	41	53	49	33
Oregon State University	38	46	41	49	64	48	58
Penn State University	57	64	61	66	56	60	51
Purdue University	49	49	59	47	48	44	47
Temple University	49	43	51	51	55	49	48
Texas A&M University	43	52	70	44	53	48	45
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville	44	48	38	38	53	34	54
University of Connecticut	65	55	76	67	63	61	63

(continued)

Table 6 (continued)

University	Assistantships						Yield
	GRE-V	GRE-Q	(FTE)	PostDoc ^a	Employ ^a	Selectivity	
University of Florida	50	55	51	76	61	67	38
University of Georgia	45	48	51	51	47	53	45
University of Houston	48	53	40	42	50	57	37
University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign	45	48	56	44	45	47	56
University of Illinois–Chicago	42	48	41	58	36	45	52
University of Maryland	63	64	65	67	53	62	59
University of Massachusetts–Amherst	51	52	58	61	44	53	46
University of Michigan	50	61	46	57	41	53	51
University of Minnesota	43	44	57	45	49	50	57
University of Mississippi	34	24	44	38	49	55	59
University of North Carolina–Greensboro	46	46	46	42	56	57	48
University of Oklahoma	38	42	44	48	42	60	38
University of Texas	59	59	58	45	42	52	45
University of Utah	42	36	56	41	47	51	52
University of Virginia	46	45	45	52	69	53	53
University of Wisconsin–Madison	53	60	41	49	34	53	62
Virginia Commonwealth	53	54	38	42	43	32	52
West Virginia University	47	40	46	38	47	60	38

^a Adjusted for student enrollment.

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 7 Descriptive Statistics for Faculty Indices by Total T-Score Categories—Adjusted for Faculty Size

Categories of total T-scores	Publications	Books	Presents	Federal funding	Nonfederal funding	Internal funding	Editors	Academy Fellows (all disciplines)	National Fellows (all disciplines)
<40									
<i>M</i>	4.6	.6	20.6	\$45,427	\$89,721	\$14,835	.4	.1	.5
<i>SD</i>	1.1	1.0	1.5	\$68,812	\$35,775	\$11,579	.2	.1	.1
40–49.99									
<i>M</i>	10.8	.3	19.3	\$268,865	\$78,595	\$19,797	.9	.1	.8
<i>SD</i>	3.7	.3	6.4	\$245,742	\$94,410	\$21,946	.5	.1	.7
50–59.99									
<i>M</i>	12.8	.6	27.6	\$529,088	\$331,585	\$28,794	1.6	.3	.7
<i>SD</i>	5.3	.4	7.6	\$372,719	\$246,999	\$24,468	.7	.2	.3
≥60									
<i>M</i>	23.7	.6	36.0	\$601,975	\$305,791	\$33,256	2.2	.4	.9
<i>SD</i>	8.8	.4	8.1	\$393,281	\$255,742	\$14,584	.5	.2	.4
Total									
<i>M</i>	12.2	.5	23.8	\$360,564	\$182,378	\$23,490	1.2	.2	.7
<i>SD</i>	6.6	.4	8.6	\$334,636	\$205,357	\$21,351	.7	.2	.5

Table 8 Descriptive Statistics for Student Indices by Total T-Score Category

Categories of total T-scores	GRE-V	GRE-Q	Assistantships			Yield	PostDocs ^a	Employed in field ^a
			(FTE)	Selectivity				
<40 (N = 4)	<i>M</i>	475.25	581.00	8.63	.47	.76	.02	.53
	<i>SD</i>	37.45	78.71	3.99	.24	.12	.04	.14
40–49.99 (N = 17)	<i>M</i>	496.79	624.19	13.51	.42	.75	.19	.50
	<i>SD</i>	45.48	47.84	6.65	.18	.14	.12	.27
50–59.99 (N = 11)	<i>M</i>	501.81	644.22	19.49	.37	.73	.24	.71
	<i>SD</i>	49.39	29.57	9.29	.14	.14	.21	.45
≥60 (N = 4)	<i>M</i>	543.50	673.75	32.63	.25	.81	.51	.71
	<i>SD</i>	29.42	31.11	9.43	.07	.10	.05	.25
Total (N = 36)	<i>M</i>	501.12	631.02	16.92	.39	.75	.22	.59
	<i>SD</i>	46.13	49.82	9.88	.17	.13	.19	.33

^a Adjusted for student enrollment.

Table 9 Total Funding Reported for All Faculty in the National Academy of Kinesiology 2010 Doctoral Program Review

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	M	SD
External federal funding	36	\$34,298	\$27,972,813	\$197,733,898	\$5,492,608	\$6,630,489
External nonfederal funding	36	\$17,883	\$20,217,300	\$94,567,956	\$2,626,887	\$3,833,894
Internal funding	36	\$18,745	\$2,236,148	\$12,823,075	\$356,196	\$448,105

Note. Summary of funds procured by 481 faculty members from 2005 to 2009.

and two were in the top ten of the 2005 rankings. Thus, nonreturning programs were not necessarily those that scored in the lower rankings in the first review. Of the remaining nonparticipating programs, 60% offered only one specialized area of kinesiology (usually exercise physiology), and 57% of the nonparticipating programs listed a faculty of less than 10 doctoral level faculty members on their departmental website. In contrast, 81% of the participating programs listed 10 or more doctoral faculty in their departments. In addition, out of 36 programs that participated in the NAK evaluation, 29 also participated in the NRC evaluation. Of the 32 programs that did not participate in the NAK evaluation, 25 also did not participate in the NRC evaluation. In other words, of the 43 kinesiology programs showing an interest in being evaluated, 36 (84%) of them participated in the NAK evaluation.

These rankings therefore should be viewed within the context of the total community of doctoral granting institutions that offer advanced degrees in kinesiology. Programs ranked in this review between, for example, 25 and 36, should be viewed not as the bottom of a list of 36 but rather as more likely in the middle of a list of 68 doctoral programs in kinesiology in the United States. In some cases, for example, programs ranking in the 25–36 range overall were nevertheless in the top five T-scores in one or more of the individual faculty and/or student indices. It is also noteworthy that in this period of harsh economic reductions in higher education, university doctoral programs in kinesiology-related areas have primarily held their own and some have increased in faculty.

National Rankings of Doctoral Programs in Kinesiology

Few doctoral review programs exist that include the field of kinesiology. This observation was made 10 years ago and has not changed. Indeed, the absence of a cohesive, appropriate evaluation process for kinesiology was the motivating factor that led the Academy to produce one. The *U.S. News & World Reports (USNWR)* publishes rankings for many graduate study areas, but not for kinesiology. Their assessments of graduate programs in Education, which is where the majority of kinesiology departments are located, are based primarily on expert opinions of peers and superintendents (40%), research expenditures (30%) and student selectivity and faculty resources (30%). The *USNWR* assessments of graduate programs in public health (where a few kinesiology departments are located) are based entirely on expert opinion. Kinesiology as a field of doctoral study has not been included in any *USNWR* rankings.

Academic Analytics, Inc. (AAI) is a corporation that has developed a quantitative ranking system based on a Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index (FSP Index). The FSP Index is based solely on the number of publications, citations, grants, and honorary awards won within doctoral program areas, and these are aggregated to rank program areas as well as entire universities. One short list, based on 2005 data, was published on the web in 2007 and listed AAI's top 11 programs in exercise science, but rankings for other programs and other specializations have not been published.

In the fall of 2010 the National Research Council (NRC) published an extensive report on doctoral programs in many disciplines, including kinesiology. Forty-one doctoral programs listed as being in the field of kinesiology were evaluated by the

NRC's 2010 Doctorate Research Programs Report. Their evaluation used 21 criteria grouped in five categories: *S-Rank*, *R-Rank*, *Research*, *Students*, or *Diversity*. *S-ranks* were high if a program scored highly on the variables that experts in the field deemed most important, according to their responses on a survey specific to that field. *R-ranks* were high if programs' characteristics matched those programs that faculty highly regarded and viewed to have strong reputations. Research ranks were based on faculty publications, citation rates, grants, and awards. Students ranks were derived from completion rates, financial aid, and other criteria. Diversity was meant to reflect gender, ethnic, and international students balance within the program. Rather than provide specific overall rankings of doctoral programs, the NRC provided statistical ranges within each of the five categories, with extreme measures (highest and lowest 5%) omitted for each rank. Thus, each doctoral program was associated with a range where the lowest score (e.g., #1) was the best rank that the survey system produced for the program and the highest score (e.g., #32nd of programs) represented the lowest the program was ranked. The NRC deliberately did not reduce the results to a ranking list of total scores; instead, they chose to publish an alphabetical list of schools which contained the ranges of scores (lowest and highest) that a program was awarded. In this case, the lowest scores (#1) were the best scores because it implied being the best of all the programs.

Comparison of the National Academy of Kinesiology and the National Research Council Rankings

The NAK invested considerable time and effort to be recognized by the NRC as a discipline in the life sciences category, and the NRC did so in 2006 (Thomas et al., 2007). Although the NRC evaluation process and the NAK process differ substantially on several factors, and although the NRC deliberately avoided providing an overall ranking across the five indices, many of the schools participating in both systems received different rankings in each, and it is unrealistic to expect that administrators and program directors will not attempt to compare the results from the two. Three criteria of the NRC assessment were similar in concept to the Academy's criterion-based assessment: the NRC's *S-Rank*, *Research*, and *R-Rank*. Thus, to compare the NRC and the NAK evaluations the lowest score (e.g., #1) awarded to each doctoral program for each of these three categories was taken from the NRC alphabetized list, totaled, rank-ordered, and the lowest total was ranked number one. For example, if a doctoral program in the NRC report received a #1 rank in all three NRC categories, the lowest sum of the three in the NRC "ranking" would be 3. This aggregate score for the three NRC categories was rank ordered and was then compared with the Academy's adjusted and unadjusted rankings only of schools that were also participating in both evaluations ($N = 29$; Table 10). The NRC lower range value and the two Academy rankings (adjusted and unadjusted) were rescaled to match the ranges of rankings for the 29 schools so that the scales would be the same for all three rankings. Thus, the rankings in Table 10 are rankings only for the sample of schools that participated in both the NAK and the NRC evaluations ($N = 29$). These rankings are somewhat different from the overall NAK adjusted and unadjusted rankings among all the schools that participated in the NAK evaluation ($N = 36$). Comparisons of these two rankings must also be viewed very conservatively, as the two assessments have glaring differences. These differences are shown in Table 11.

Table 10 National Research Council (NRC) Rankings and National Academy of Kinesiology Rankings Only for Doctoral Programs Participating in Both National Evaluations (N = 29)

NRC		NAK		NRC		NAK	
Rank ^a	Rank	Adjusted for size of faculty	Adjusted for size of faculty	Rank ^a	Rank	Unadjusted for size of faculty	Unadjusted for size of faculty
1	1	University of Connecticut	University of Connecticut	3	1	Penn State University	Penn State University
3	2	Penn State University	Penn State University	9	2	University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign	University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign
8	3	University of Maryland	University of Maryland	1	3	University of Connecticut	University of Connecticut
1	4	University of Massachusetts—Amherst	University of Massachusetts—Amherst	11	4	The University of Texas—Austin	The University of Texas—Austin
9	5	University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign	University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign	8	5	University of Maryland	University of Maryland
17	6	Michigan State University	Michigan State University	18	6	Texas A & M University	Texas A & M University
11	6	University of Texas—Austin	University of Texas—Austin	11	6	University of Michigan	University of Michigan
11	8	University of Virginia	University of Virginia	5	8	University of Georgia	University of Georgia
18	9	Oregon State University	Oregon State University	1	8	University of Massachusetts—Amherst	University of Massachusetts—Amherst
7	10	University of Florida	University of Florida	18	10	Oregon State University	Oregon State University
18	11	Texas A&M University	Texas A&M University	21	11	Ohio State University	Ohio State University
11	11	University of Michigan	University of Michigan	17	11	Michigan State University	Michigan State University
11	13	Arizona State University—Kinesiology	Arizona State University—Kinesiology	7	13	University of Florida	University of Florida
5	14	University of Georgia	University of Georgia	22	14	Purdue University	Purdue University
21	15	Ohio State University	Ohio State University	5	14	University of Minnesota	University of Minnesota
3	15	University of Illinois—Chicago	University of Illinois—Chicago	3	16	University of Illinois—Chicago	University of Illinois—Chicago
5	15	University of Minnesota	University of Minnesota	23	16	University of North Carolina—Greensboro	University of North Carolina—Greensboro
26	18	Auburn University	Auburn University	26	18	Auburn University	Auburn University
15	19	Iowa State University	Iowa State University	11	19	Arizona State University—Kinesiology	Arizona State University—Kinesiology

(continued)

Table 10 (continued)

NRC		NAK		Adjusted for size of faculty		NRC		NAK	
Rank ^a	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank ^a	Rank	Rank ^a	Rank	Rank	Rank
23	19	University of North Carolina–Greensboro		10	19	University of Wisconsin			
22	21	Purdue University		27	21	University of Utah			
10	21	University of Wisconsin		11	21	University of Virginia			
24	23	Temple University		15	23	Iowa State University			
20	23	University of Houston		24	23	Louisiana State University			
24	25	Louisiana State University		24	25	Temple University			
19	25	Georgia State University		20	26	University of Houston			
27	25	University of Utah		19	27	Georgia State University			
28	28	University of Arkansas–Fayetteville		28	28	University of Arkansas–Fayetteville			
28	29	University of Mississippi		28	29	University of Mississippi			

Note. Only schools reviewed in both NRC and NAK were ranked on this list ($N = 29$), thus some programs' rankings in the NAK are slightly different from their ranking in Table 4, which contains the NAK adjusted and unadjusted rankings for all 36 doctoral programs evaluated in 2010. NRC "Rankings" were constructed for this table by summing the minimum range score for S-, R-, and Research Ranks, then sorting from the lowest to the highest S-, R-, and Research Ranks sum in this particular group of graduate programs. These are not the rankings published by the NRC. The range in the NRC report of minimum ratings on any S-Rank, R-Rank or Research score was 1–41. The range in NAK ratings was = 1–36. NRC data were adjusted by NRC for size of faculty.

Table 11 Differences Between the National Research Council and the National Academy of Kinesiology Doctoral Program Rankings

National Research Council	National Academy of Kinesiology
<i>N</i> = 41	<i>N</i> = 36
Partly reputation based	Norm-referenced
Database from 2006	Database from 2005 to 2009
Comparisons made on a sample (1/2 of total schools)	Comparisons of all schools in data pool
S- and R-score, research ranges provided	Rankings, adjusted and unadjusted for size
Schools not on Academy list (9)	Schools not on NRC list (5)

Even with these differences, the Pearson product-moment correlation between the two lists, using only the 29 kinesiology-related programs that were on both lists, was $r = .80$, $p < .01$ for the ranks based on faculty size adjustments, and $r = .70$, $p \leq .01$ for the unadjusted scores. It is likely that the correlation was higher comparing the two adjusted columns, as both the NRC and NAK adjusted rankings were based on adjusted scores. The rank order comparisons are shown in Table 10. These NAK results were reported to the academic departments electronically in 2010, relatively quickly after the data were collected.

Summary

This completes the National Academy of Kinesiology's second review of faculty, doctoral students, and research productivity in doctoral programs in the field of kinesiology. This review is an objective, criterion-based review of kinesiology doctoral programs in the United States. Moreover, it is the only review that has been conducted by the same organization more than once. One strength of the evaluation is that with only slight improvements, the survey instruments used in 2005 and 2010 were essentially the same. Even with changes to the scoring method used to quantify peer-reviewed publications and research and training grants, the temporal stability over the five-year period was relatively high. The Academy's commitment to produce these doctoral program evaluations on a predictable and reasonable cycle will allow participating departments to objectively determine the quality of their programs, to document improvements in their programs to determine which areas they wish to enhance and discuss ways to accomplish that, and to use these results in discussions with their deans to promote their programs within their universities.

The results of the NAK rankings were compared with rankings of the highest rankings published by the NRC and found to be highly correlated. Because these rankings were based on objective criteria established by members of the NAK over a 10-year period of study based on a pilot review, the data should be very useful to kinesiology administrators and faculty of doctoral programs to motivate faculty, to identify the strengths and weaknesses of programs, to identify areas that need additional resources, and to use as a benchmark from which progress within the

next five years can be measured. It can also serve as the basis for positive publicity for deans, chairs, provosts and presidents. Finally, potential doctoral students will have additional information upon which to make their decisions.

Acknowledgments

This paper was supported by the National Academy of Kinesiology. Spirduso was Chair of the NAK's Committee on Doctoral Programs, and Reeve was a member of that committee. Two other Academy Fellows who are measurement experts, James R. Morrow, Jr. and Allen W. Jackson from the University of North Texas (a non-doctoral granting program in kinesiology), were contracted to evaluate the data and report to the NAK. The data presented are from their report. The NAK Executive Committee and the NAK Doctoral Committee have read this report and approved its publication. The authors also wish to acknowledge the efficient and timely assistance of Kim Scott and Amy Rose throughout the entire doctoral review process.

Notes

1. The National Academy of Kinesiology was formerly known as the American Academy of Kinesiology and Physical Education.
2. The 2010 NAK Committee on Doctoral Programs consisted of Dr. Daniel Corcos (University of Illinois at Chicago), Dr. Kirk Cureton (University of Georgia), Dr. Scott Kretchmar (Pennsylvania State University), Dr. T. Gilmour Reeve (Louisiana State University), and Dr. Waneen Spirduso (The University of Texas at Austin and Committee Chair).

References

- National Research Council Report. <http://chronicle.com/article/NRC-Rankings-Overview-/124739/>.
- Thomas, J. R., Clark, J. E., Feltz, D. L., Kretchmar, R. Scott, Morrow, J. R., et al. (2007). The academy promotes, unifies, and evaluates doctoral education in kinesiology. *Quest*, 59, 174–194.
- Thomas, J.R., Morrow, J.R., Jr., & Stevermer, C. (2004). Evaluating doctoral education in physical activity: Role of the American Academy of Kinesiology and Physical Education. *Quest*, 56, 361–376.
- 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.

Appendix A

Participating and Non-Participating Programs in NAK Doctoral Program Review 2005–2009

Participating programs	Nonparticipating programs
Arizona State University–PANW	Ball State University
Arizona State University–Kinesiology	Brigham Young University
Auburn University	Florida State University— #1 Movement Science
Colorado State University	Florida State University— #2 Sport Management
East Carolina University	Indiana University
Georgia State University	North Dakota State University
Iowa State University	Oklahoma State University
Louisiana State University	Springfield College—Exercise Science
Michigan State University	Springfield College—Physical Education
Oregon State University	State University of New York–Buffalo
Penn State University	Syracuse University
Purdue University	Texas Woman’s University
Teachers College, Columbia University	The University of Idaho
Temple University	United States Sports Academy
Texas A&M University	University of Alabama
The Ohio State University	University of Delaware
University of Arkansas	University of Florida—Sport Management
University of Connecticut	University of Idaho
University of Florida—#1 Physiology	University of Kansas
University of Georgia	University of Kentucky
University of Houston	University of Massachusetts— Sport Management
University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign	University of Miami
University of Illinois–Chicago	University of New Mexico
University of Maryland	University of Northern Colorado
University of Massachusetts— #1 Exercise Science	University of Oregon
University of Michigan	University of Pittsburgh
University of Minnesota	University of South Carolina— #1 Exercise Science
University of Mississippi	University of South Carolina— #2 Physical Education
University of North Carolina–Greensboro	University of Southern Mississippi
University of Oklahoma	University of Tennessee
University of Texas	University of Toledo
University of Utah	Virginia Tech University
University of Virginia	
University of Wisconsin–Madison	
Virginia Commonwealth	
West Virginia University	

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—2009) with two data entry sheets: Faculty Data, Student Group Data. The faculty data are entered for EACH faculty but the student data are entered for the entire academic unit being evaluated.

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

Return the completed EXEL file electronically to: _____ AND mail a hardcopy with signature to: NAK Business Office, _____.

Sign-off

The department chairperson MUST sign-off on a hardcopy of the data submitted, verifying its accuracy. Use the Verification Page associated with this document. The mailing address is shown above.

Review Period

Data to be included are for the 5 calendar years 2005–2009. 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 2005–2009 as described on page 4 of this Instructional Guide.

FAQ

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

Faculty Data

DATA Page

Faculty Data

A. 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. Hold a doctoral degree and be in a tenured or tenure-earning position at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor
3. At least 25% of their base salary support provided by academic unit sponsoring the doctoral program.

B. Instructions for Completing Each Column in Faculty Data Sheet (EXCEL variable names are listed in parentheses; sheet name Faculty Data).

Faculty (faculty)

Individually list each faculty member who meets the above criteria for inclusion using any alphanumeric code that is meaningful to you. These should be faculty members who currently exist in your unit this academic year. It does not matter if they were not in your unit last year or 5 years ago; they still count.

Rank (rank)

To indicate rank of a faculty member: use 1 = assistant professor, 2 = associate professor, and 3 = professor.

Publications

Even if a particular faculty member has not been in your unit for a total of 5 years, still include all 5 years (2005–2009) of his or her publications.

Corresponding author publications (cajpubs)

This column should sum to the total number of scholarly publications produced by the department. Enter the number of full length scholarly articles in refereed journals, chapters in books, and monographs for which each faculty member is the corresponding author. If the corresponding author is not a faculty member in the department, assign the publication to the first faculty author from your department. [This column will be used in the analysis to generate the rankings.]

Coauthor publications (coauthorjpubs)

Enter the number of full length scholarly articles in refereed journals, chapters in books, and monographs for which each faculty member is a coauthor; for example, the 2nd, 3rd, or other author. The sum of this column reflects the total number of faculty who coauthored an article and reflects department collaborations. [This column will not be used in the 2005–2009 evaluation, but will be analyzed as a potential future additional model if the Academy approves it for the 2010–2014 evaluation]. *Do not include abstracts, proceedings, or project reports.*

Books (bookpubs)

Enter the number of books for the past 5 calendar years (author, coauthor, or editor). If more than one faculty member is a coauthor, 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 corresponding or coauthor over the past 5 calendar years. If more than one faculty member is a coauthor, 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 presider.

External 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* that were processed through the department's budget for each faculty member over the past 5 years. If multiple investigators, divide dollar amount proportionally by assignment. The proportional amount should total to the actual award expenditures. If multiple years, include only the dollar amount expended for the 5 years under evaluation.

External research funding nonfederal (foundations, corporations, etc. (extfundnonfed)

List the total extramural dollars (direct + indirect costs) for all contracts, grants, training program grants, etc. *expenditures* that were processed through the department's budget for each faculty member over the past 5 years. If multiple investigators, divide dollar amount proportionally by assignment. The proportional amount should total to the actual award expenditures. If multiple years, include only the dollar amount expended for the 5 years under evaluation.

Internal research funding (infund)

List the total intramural dollars for internal research grants only for each faculty member for the past 5 years. If multiple investigators, divide dollar amount proportionally by assignment. The proportional amount should total to the actual award amount. If multiple years, include only the dollar amount for the 5 years under evaluation.

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 (includes NAK) for any year during the past 5 years. Count the number of academies in the past 5 years, and NOT the number of years. For example, if professor X was elected to Fellow status in the National Academy of Science in 2005 and the NAK in 2009, the number entered is 2.

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, AAHPERD Research Consortium, etc.) for which each faculty member was selected.

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

Minimum GRE Verbal Score Required (minGREVerbal)

Enter the minimum GRE Verbal score required for admission to the doctoral program; if none—enter NONE.

Minimum GRE Quantitative Score Required (minGREQuant)

Enter the minimum GRE Quantitative score required for admission to the doctoral program; if none—enter NONE.

GRE Scores (aveGREVerbal; aveGREQuant)

Enter the AVERAGE entry GRE scores (verbal, quantitative) for all doctoral students CURRENTLY in the program. 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 2009 calendar year (spring, summer and/or fall, 2009). Include all doctoral students enrolled for one or more academic credits.

Student support (stusupport)

Enter the total number of FTE for which your unit has graduate student support FOR THIS ACADEMIC YEAR. 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.

Enrolled (enrolled)

Enter the number of those who were accepted who actually enrolled in this program.

Postdoctoral student employment (postdoc)

Enter the total number of doctoral graduates in the past 5 years who accepted postdoctoral 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 postdoctoral employment indicated above.