

# NAKPEHE

National Association for Kinesiology & Physical Education in Higher Education

September  
2010

Volume 21  
Number 3

*The Chronicle of Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education*

## ■ From the President

*Mike Metzler, Georgia State University*

### **A Call for Collaboration Among KPE Professional Associations**

One can use any of several terms to describe the current predominant state of kinesiology and physical education departments in higher education: splintered, fractured, threatened, and in the extreme, “no longer in existence.” The course we have taken to arrive at this juncture has been well documented since the early 1970s, and needs no reiteration here. However, there is one contributing factor that is rarely mentioned publically—a subtle but real estrangement among the three leading KPE professional associations: the National Association for Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education (NAKPEHE), the American Academy of Kinesiology of Physical Education (AAKPE), and the American Kinesiology Association (AKA). Like the unfortunate situations in many college and university departments, this estrangement has its own history; as a long-standing officer in NAKPEHE, an AAKPE Fellow, and a close observer of the establishment and expansion of AKA, I am all too familiar with each association’s contributions to what might be labeled KPE’s “academic turf cold war.”

To come clean myself, I will admit to taking an initially defensive position as a member of the NAKPEHE Board of Directors as AKA established itself a few years ago. I mistakenly thought that AKA was a threat to the viability of NAKPEHE, and started to blame some of NAKPEHE’s problems on AKA’s ascent. Somewhere along the line, I began to see things quite differently and have now come to realize that NAKPEHE is solely responsible for its viability and its resolve to address its problems. Our future—whether to thrive or barely survive—is ours alone to determine. I understand that even more clearly from serving as our current president.

We must all recognize that there will never be, nor should there be, a single professional organization that can lead KPE in higher education. All three of these associations have different and important missions. For the future welfare of KPE departments, our subdisciplines, our programs, and individual professors, these missions should be viewed as complimentary, not competitive. Toward that end I have



*The Chronicle of Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education is a publication for the NAKPEHE membership, and is a forum for interdisciplinary ideas, concepts, and issues related to the role of kinesiology and physical education in higher education with respect for social, cultural, and personal perspectives.*

*(continued)*

## From the President, *continued*

initiated a meeting at the October AAKPE in Williamsburg, Virginia with Maureen Weiss, the incoming Academy president, and Gil Reeve, the current AKA president to discuss how our associations can better work together, not separately. I should note that Gil was an enthusiastic participant at this June's NAKPEHE Leader Development Workshop at Georgia State. Our own Future Directions Committee has made several recommendations that would lead to formal and ongoing collaborations among the three associations. Those recommendations will be taken up by our Board of Directors this fall. All of these efforts add up to a modest but encouraging start at building a new history of trust, support, and collaboration among NAKPEHE, AAKPE and AKA.

As this new academic year begins, it is not too soon to start making plans for the January 2011 NAKPEHE Conference in Orlando, Florida. The conference theme, "The QUEST for Significance: A Dialogue of Professional Impact," is well suited to promote ideas that can be used to establish more and better collaboration among the three KPE professional associations. I will extend a direct invitation to AAKPE and AKA members to join us in Orlando and begin this important conversation. Look for the conference announcement and call for papers in this issue and on the web site ([www.nakpehe.org](http://www.nakpehe.org)). Vice-President Richard Oates has been working diligently to plan a conference that will feature many of our traditional lectures and paper sessions, with some added new ways to interact with colleagues from their own and other disciplines. I look forward to seeing you there. In the meantime, I wish you a productive and rewarding fall term at your institution. ■

*Please make your plans now to attend  
and/or present your work or ideas at the  
2011 NAKPEHE Conference,  
January 5-8 at the Hilton  
in the Walt Disney World Resort in Orlando, Florida.*

*For information,  
contact **Dr. Richard Oates**  
Associate Dean  
School of Education  
North Georgia College  
& State University  
e-mail:  
[roates@northgeorgia.edu](mailto:roates@northgeorgia.edu)*



Photo courtesy of The Hilton in the WALT DISNEY WORLD® Resort

## Upcoming Conventions

### **NAKPEHE**

January 5-8, 2011  
The Hilton in the  
Walt Disney World  
Resort  
Orlando, FL



## ■ Editor's Invited Column

### **NAKPEHE Leadership Development Workshop**

*Steve Estes, Dean*

*College of Professional Studies, Missouri Western State University*

On July 8 and 9, 2010, NAKPEHE hosted a leader development workshop designed to provide leader training for current and future NAKPEHE leaders and administrators. Seventeen faculty and administrators attended, and the attendees were divided equally among junior and senior leaders in kinesiology. "Leader" was defined to mean a faculty or administrator who influences colleagues in kinesiology or physical education: program coordinator, assistant chair or chair, graduate coordinator, associate dean, dean, or any faculty or administrator interested in assuming a leader role in the field of kinesiology broadly defined.

By the accounts of the participants the leader workshop was a success, especially regarding the opportunity for "emerging" leaders in kinesiology to interact with their more experienced counterparts. The workshop was designed in such a way that the participants had the opportunity to discuss specific aspects of leadership and administration that affect kinesiology units. While several of the participants have no assigned administrator role, 11 of the attendees have held, or currently occupy, the position of department chair. Several of these chairs have been in that role for less than two years. Seven of the attendees held the role of dean or associate vice president, and again several of these administrators were relatively new at their positions. The opportunity to discuss issues pertinent to chairs, deans and other academic leaders—as well as with administrator "wannabes" —was reported to be a valuable one for those who attended.

The workshop was organized in a manner similar to those formerly run by the College and University Administrator Council (CUAC), an AAHPERD organization that was composed of the senior HPER administrator at a college or university. CUAC disbanded in the early 2000s, but many who attended the NAKPEHE workshop recalled the format and found it valuable in their own development as an administrator or leader. Similar to the CUAC workshops, the NAKPEHE Leader Development Workshop provided lots of opportunities for interaction around specific themes that kinesiology leaders deal with in our times. Unlike the CUAC workshops, though, the purpose of the NAKPEHE workshop was the development of "emerging" leaders: approximately half of the attendees at this workshop as well as future workshops will focus on providing emerging leaders and administrators opportunities to discuss and learn about leadership and administration in kinesiology specifically, and in higher education generally. In short, the focus on leader development distinguished this NAKPEHE workshop from other past and current leadership efforts in higher education.

The workshop had five sessions over the two days, the first of which discussed the process of leader development. Steve Estes, dean of the College of Professional Studies at Missouri Western State University and a former department chair of Exercise and Sport Science at East Carolina University,



*...the  
purpose  
of the  
NAKPEHE  
workshop  
was the  
development  
of "emerging"  
leaders...*

*(continued)*

## NAKPEHE Leadership Development Workshop *continued*

---

discussed characteristics of successful leader development programs. Estes noted that one of the most successful and longest running leader development programs is run by the United States Army Reserve Officer Training Program (ROTC). ROTC curriculum focuses on leader development, and the Army has systematized its curriculum of training college students to be Army 2nd lieutenants. The quality of ROTC leader training is measured by the many Fortune 500 companies that go to Ft. Knox every two years to observe the Army's ROTC Leader Training Course, a 30-day initial leader training experience for first and second year college cadets who are introduced to the Army and its leader expectations.

Estes observed that ROTC curriculum contains six elements in common with other quality programs: commitment to service that is larger than one's own personal goals, values that define and characterize leadership through behaviors, the disciplinary study of leadership, numerous opportunities to practice both followership and leadership, a quality mentoring experience that includes being mentored as well as mentoring one's junior colleagues, and an assessment of one's leader skills that includes assessments by self, peer, instructor, and formal assessments. The discussion that followed noted that these characteristics of leader develop are evident in leader development programs in teacher education, Boy Scouts, business, religious organizations, and higher education. Several participants noted that one or more of these characteristics occurred during their own growth as administrators or leaders, and that they created similar opportunities for junior colleagues over the years.

Betty Block, online graduate coordinator at Adams State College and a former department chair of kinesiology at Georgia College and State University, then led a discussion on the nature of higher education in the 21st century. Block discussed how the characteristics of "supercomplexity," a theoretical model developed to understand how higher education is being changed by cultural forces, are having an impact on kinesiology units. Titled "Supercomplexity and Leadership," Block reminded the participants that the rapid pace of change in higher education has been going on for some time. John Massengale argued in 1987 that kinesiology (physical education) must continually justify its existence in a changing world to remain relevant:

"As an integral part of education, contemporary physical education continually attempts to renew its significance for a modern society that finds itself in a continual process of change and uncertainty. Modern times appear to be more and more complex, and a clear and accurate perception of the present often becomes allusive . . . Although change is always present in any complex society, the accelerated rate of this change is clearly becoming a misunderstood and disruptive force." (Massengale, 1987, p.121)

Readers of *Quest* and NAKPEHE's *Chronicle* will recognize some of the characteristics of supercomplexity as it has been described as postmodernism, post-industrialism, post liberalism, liquid modernity, hyper-modernism, neo-pragmatism, the centrifugal age, or new capitalism. Many NAKPEHE scholars have discussed how these models affect kinesiology. Characteristics

*(continued)*

## **NAKPEHE Leadership Development Workshop *continued***

of supercomplexity include globalization, digital technology, interpenetration of higher education with the wider society, agendas of “access,” marketization, competition, and accountability. Kinesiology leaders are dealing with these issues in order to achieve the mission teaching, research, and service.

The third session was led by Jesse Germain, Deputy Directory of Physical Education at the United States Military Academy at West Point, and was titled “Middle Management and Leadership.” Germain noted that . . . “(l)eaders in higher education report to others, and are responsible for influencing various constituencies. Lines of authority are often blurred, and the ability to accomplish objectives is more difficult than in business.” As a military officer Germain is especially aware of the dual roles one plays as a superior with direct reports, as well as being a subordinate and reporting to a superior officer. While the roles in the military are particularly well defined, Germain noted that all of us in higher education are in similar situations. In fact, it may be more difficult in higher education as many influential leaders do not have identifiable rank. Knowing how to operate within middle management roles can make one a more effective leader.

Germain then asked a question of the attendees: how can one be a successful leader in higher education given that we have few resources, the institution of higher education is becoming more complex, and the authority of the leader is less than absolute? The discussion that followed was lively and supported by anecdotes of role conflicts with both subordinates and superiors, and how these situations were handled (or not!).

Leah Fiorentino, dean of the School of Education at the University of North Carolina Pembroke then led a discussion of women in leader roles in kinesiology. Fiorentino noted that the historic dearth of women administrators limited opportunities for women to go into leader roles. As kinesiology evolved as a profession, however, there are now more women leaders, and consequently more women mentors. Much of the discussion focused on mentoring opportunities and how to facilitate them, and many of the participants discussed mentors they’ve had in their careers – both men and women.

Women participants at the workshop noted that they were often asked to assume leader or administrator roles, whereas the male participants often sought these roles. It was noted that men are often socialized into seeking leader roles, whereas women are socialized into support roles. In addition, men and women prepare differently to assume leader roles: women often seek training in the forms of reading the literature or attending trainings or workshops; men, in contrast, often look for training on the job. These generalizations were borne out by the narratives of the people attending the workshop. There was agreement that as there are more women administrators and leaders who can serve as mentors it is likely that our emerging female leaders will have more opportunities than in the past to assume leader roles.

Much of the discussion that followed focused on how one selects mentor. Almost all of the participants were able to identify one or more colleagues who had a significant impact on their leader style and opportunities. Indeed, it was noted that the workshop itself was an opportunity for meeting colleagues for both roles. Final thoughts were that those of us in leader roles, whether men

*(continued)*

*“...how can  
one be a  
successful  
leader  
in higher  
education  
given that  
we have few  
resources...?”*



## **NAKPEHE Leadership Development Workshop *continued***

---

or women, continue to seek guidance and mentoring so that our leadership skills continue to improve.

The final workshop session focused on the “A List”: assessment of learning (AoL), accreditation, and accountability. Gil Reeve, department chair of kinesiology at Louisiana State University and former associate vice president for assessment at Texas Tech University, and Bill Russell, assistant professor at Missouri Western State University and incoming president of the Missouri Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation led a discussion on how to influence colleagues to participate in assessment efforts. It was noted that the need to perform assessment is increasing every year at the program, department, and university level. State legislators, regents, university administrators, and the public demand to know if universities are achieving the mission they have set for themselves, and assessment and accreditation are the means by which we demonstrate that we are achieving our missions.

Reeve and Russell began the discussion with an overview of the six regional accrediting agencies for higher education such as the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) in the Midwest, or the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges (SACS) in the South. They noted that all of these agencies have some requirements to assess student learning: goals are articulated for what students should know and be able to do, that there is a method in place for assessing that learning, that data are collected and analyzed, and that programmatic adjustments have been made. Department chairs are charged with seeing that AoL is performed, and the key is to influence faculty to be involved in doing this work well. The chair is the administrator of the department, and consequently is the primary person responsible for seeing that AoL is completed. Two problems the chair experiences in doing AoL are: (1) the chair ignores the process, or (2) the chair does all of the AoL. Both situations present their own problems.

Discussion ensued, and it was noted that many faculty do not really understand the assessment process itself, or the need for it. Program coordinators who have not come out of pedagogy often miss the point entirely and in many cases actively resist performing AoL. In many cases faculty are content to use the traditional measures of learning such as course grades. It was noted among the participants that less than half are in units that have a faculty assigned to do AoL. It was pointed out that if institutions value AoL then they will assign resources in the form of reassigned time to see that it is done.

Along these lines one participant told a story of how the accreditation process and the personnel evaluation process were connected: financial incentives in the form of merit raises were associated with the performance in the area of service, specifically AoL. Within a year the performance of people doing assessment improved dramatically. However, another respondent agreed that while this solution is likely to work in the short run, there is a problem with having that system in place in the long run because it is likely resources will not always be available. Also, AoL is an ongoing requirement and may be better considered a part of a faculty’s responsibilities along with teaching, research, and service. By tying the assessment of faculty to AoL as an ongoing component of the evaluation process universities are more likely to see that it is done.

*(continued)*

## **NAKPEHE Leadership Development Workshop *continued***

A question was asked regarding the role of the leader in assessment. The response was that it is up to the leader to bring assessment up in an appropriate way, and to keep assessment before the faculty by charging them with the task and in turn assessing the faculty in their performance of it. In the end it was noted that there are four reasons for doing AoL: one is to find out what your program is about – understanding. Secondly, program improvement. Third: take what you know and disseminate it – research of teaching. Fourth: for review and accreditation. These are not hierarchical rationale, but rather are cyclical. So the professionalism of the culture is what makes AoL work, and leadership is inherently about professionalism.

The workshop concluded with a discussion of the value of the workshop itself. Estes asked the following question: Was the NAKPEHE Leader Development Workshop just experienced worth repeating? After some discussion it was agreed by the participants that they would do the workshop again, and there was consensus on the following points: First, keep the workshop inexpensive. To this end it was recommended that the workshop be held on a host campus close to a major airport for easy transportation (Georgia State University in Atlanta, Georgia, and its Department of Kinesiology and Health hosted this first workshop). Participants stayed in university residence halls; the agenda was short and focused; and registration was free for NAKPEHE members. Total cost for a new member was in the \$450 range, including transportation, and for several participants it was only a few hundred dollars total.

Next, it was agreed that an even distribution of “emerging” leaders and experienced leaders was ideal for leader training. Along these lines it was agreed that the focus of the workshop should continue to be the “emerging leader.” One of the primary benefits of the workshop was the mentoring opportunity for new members, and that the opportunity to discuss sensitive topics among the participants was invaluable.

The date of the workshop was also good and it was agreed to hold the next workshop at the end of the week of the Independence Day holiday. It was also suggested that the workshop rotate among universities, and perhaps alternate with the NAKPEHE conference so that faculty would not have to travel far for a NAKPEHE conference on a yearly basis (in other words, if the annual conference is in the East then the leader workshop could be in the West – Shane Frehlich offered California State University, Northridge as a possible future meeting site for West-based leader workshops). Finally, it was suggested that the size was good – groups of approximately 20 facilitated conversation. Should the workshop grow larger than 30 participants then the participants could be divided into groups of 20. Materials used in the workshop were distributed to the attendees on CDs, including suggestions for further readings and contact information.

*Participants indicated they are interested in attending a similar workshop in the future. Faculty and administrators interested in attending a workshop in 2011 are encouraged to contact Steve Estes, workshop coordinator, for more information. A decision regarding a summer 2011 workshop will be made at the annual NAKPEHE conference in Orlando, Florida, in January of 2011. ■*



## ■ Current Issues

### **Teacher Preparation and Conceptions of Teacher Learning in Physical Education**



*Samuel R. Hodge, The Ohio State University*  
*Jennifer Faison-Hodge, Capital University*

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act was signed into law by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2001 as an amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. More succinctly, ESEA was amended by Public Law 107-110 NCLB (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Recently, President Barack Obama called for re-envisioning the United States (U.S.) government's role in education through the reauthorization of the NCLB (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). The President's re-envisioning requires high quality teacher preparation in colleges and departments of education throughout the U.S.

In this column, we engage in discourse on teacher preparation and conceptions of teacher learning with particular relevancy to physical education teacher education (PETE). Recently and jointly, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and American Institutes for Research (AIR) released a report titled, *An Emerging Picture of the Teacher Preparation Pipeline* (Ludwig, Kirshstein, Sidana, Ardila-Rey, & Bae, 2010), on the nation's teacher workforce and teacher preparation programs. Next, we present selected findings from the report germane to teachers and teacher preparation.

*(continued)*



## Teacher Preparation *continued*

### Teacher Workforce and Preparation Programs

In 2007-2008, there were nearly 4 million men and women employed as teachers at schools in the U.S. (Table 1). Most teachers (85.5%) were employed at traditional public schools and there were twice the percentage of teachers at elementary schools than those working at high schools.

**Table 1** Demographic Data on the Nation's Teacher Workforce

Total number of teachers	3,898,420
Public	
Traditional public	85.5%
Charter school	1.9%
Private	12.6%
Bureau of Indian Education schools	0.1%
School Level	
Elementary	60.6%
Secondary	30.2%
Combined	9.2%
Average Age	
Less than 30 years old	17.7%
30 to 49	49.6%
50 to 54	13.1%
55 and older	19.5%
Years of Full-Time Teaching Experience	
Less than 4 years	20.3%
Four to nine years	27.6%
Ten to 14 years	16.0%
15 years or more	36.1%

*Source:* Ludwig et al. (2010). *An Emerging Picture of the Teacher Preparation Pipeline*. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, DC.

Further the report reconfirms that “the pool of teacher candidates is not as diverse as the students in U.S. schools, despite many years of innovative recruitment and financial strategies” (Ludwig et al., 2010, p. 4). In 2007-2008, over 80% of the public school teachers were White citizens native to the U.S.

*(continued)*

## Teacher Preparation *continued*

In contrast, Black and Hispanic teachers each made up about 7% of the teaching force, respectively. In the report, the data about Black teachers reflect mostly African American citizens native to the U.S. Likewise the term Hispanic reflects US citizens whose ancestry is Hispanic, Chicano/a, Cuban, Latino/a, Latin American, or Mexican. Specific to location, inner cities were the only community types where Black and Hispanic teachers represented more than 10% of the total teaching population (Table 2).

**Table 2** The Racial Composition of the Current Teacher Workforce, 2007-2008

	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Other
All public schools	83.1%	7.0%	1.2%	7.1%	1.6%
Traditional public	83.3%	6.9%	1.2%	7.0%	1.6%
Charter school	72.9%	12.3%	2.6%	9.3%	2.8%
Community Type					
City	71.0%	12.0%	2.2%	13.1%	1.8%
Suburban	84.6%	6.3%	1.4%	6.2%	1.5%
Town	89.0%	4.1%	0.5%	4.7%	1.6%
Rural	90.3%	4.6%	0.4%	3.3%	1.4%

Source: Ludwig et al. (2010). *An Emerging Picture of the Teacher Preparation Pipeline*. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, DC.

It is estimated that there will be a need to hire 435,000 new teachers by the year 2015 and 445,000 additional new teachers by 2018 (Ludwig et al., 2010). There are differences in the beliefs of deans and department chairs of professional preparation programs and the beliefs of school principals and teachers. A 2006 MetLife survey of deans, department chairs, school principals (elementary/secondary), and teachers revealed that:

- Deans and department chairs were much more likely to believe that their teacher candidates were prepared to teach than either principals or practicing teachers believed.
- Engaging families in supporting their children's education tended to be the area for which all groups rated teachers' preparedness the lowest.
- With the exception of deans/department chairs, at least a fifth of all groups rated the following areas as ones in which teachers were not very prepared or not at all prepared: (a) Engaging families in supporting their children's education, (b) Maintaining order and discipline, and (c) Working with children with varying abilities. (Ludwig et al., 2010, p. 10)

(continued)



## Teacher Preparation *continued*

---

In the AACTE and AIR reports, trend and distribution data are presented on enrollment in education and non-education degree programs; institutional diversity; student diversity in schools, colleges, and departments of education; and degree completion, as well as the attributes of faculty in professional education programs. The report shows that most full-time faculty in professional education programs in fall of 2007 were White (78%), next were Black (10%) and Hispanic (4%) faculty, which generally reflects the racial or ethnic composition of students in their programs (Ludwig et al., 2010). Likewise, full-time adjunct faculties of professional education programs were also similar in race and ethnicity to the students in their programs with 78% White, and 7% Black and 3% Hispanic adjunct faculty members. Ludwig and colleagues surmised that there is no indication the diversity of the workforce will change dramatically in the near future. Certainly teacher preparation programs have the critical responsibility of preparing well those who, regardless of their various diversities, do enter the teaching profession.

### Conceptions of Teacher Learning and Practice

In their seminal paper, Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999a) discussed three major conceptions of teacher learning by “unpacking their differing images” (p. 250). The three conceptions of teacher learning were identified as: knowledge-*for*-practice, knowledge-*in*-practice, and knowledge-*of*-practice. Cochran-Smith and Lytle’s discourse was about understanding teacher learning based on the descriptions and suppositions that underlie methods and on the educational aims that guide different teacher learning initiatives. Here images or descriptions of knowledge (and of knowing) refer to how questions as those stated below are understood and addressed in the three conceptual orientations:

- What knowledge are teachers assumed to need to teach effectively?
- What are the domains, sources, or forms of such knowledge?
- Who generates that knowledge and for what purpose?
- Who evaluates, interprets, and values that knowledge?

Cochran-Smith and Lytle explained that though “competing in fundamental ways, these three conceptions coexist in the world of educational policy, research, and practice and are invoked by differently positioned people in order to explain and justify quite different ideas and approaches to improving teaching and learning” (p. 251). They explained further that the main differences among the three conceptions of teacher learning rests in the assumptions that underlie these methods; that is, the images of knowledge, practice, and teachers’ roles.

Cochran-Smith and Lytle called the first conception knowledge-*for*-practice (k-*for*-p). In this model, college and university researchers and scholars discern and disseminate what is typically known as formal knowledge and theoretical models (and best practices) in various disciplines for teachers to consume and utilize as they strive to improve their practice. In this conception, the emphasis is on teachers acquiring content knowledge

*(continued)*

## Teacher Preparation *continued*

---

and pedagogical skills from the expertise of others and their own experiences. The others usually are faculty scholars and researchers who have developed formal knowledge and theory in different disciplines. The premise is that teaching has a distinctive and specialized knowledge base that teachers strive to acquire and they deposit this unique bank of knowledge into their understandings and practices. It is reasoned that the most effective teachers are those who are most knowledgeable about best practices and who regularly and accurately use these practices in their classes (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999a).

The second conception of teacher learning was termed knowledge-*in*-practice (k-*in*-p). Underscored is the importance of what is known as practical knowledge. That is, knowledge that effective teachers possess as it is grounded in practice and in teachers' reflections on their practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999a). It is believed that teachers learn best when they can explore the knowledge grounded in the work of expert teachers and/or to deepen their own knowledge and expertise as makers of prudent judgments and constructors of meaningful learning experiences.

The third conception of teacher learning is what Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999a) called knowledge-*of*-practice (k-*of*-p). In k-*of*-p, it is believed that the knowledge teachers must have to teach justly and effectively is constructed "when teachers treat their own classrooms and schools as sites for intentional investigation at the same time that they treat the knowledge and theory produced by others as generative material for interrogation and interpretation" (p. 250). Here teachers learn as they help construct "local knowledge of practice by working within the contexts of inquiry communities to theorize and construct their work and to connect it to larger social, cultural, and political issues" (p. 250). For more complete discourse on the conceptions of teacher learning and teacher education, we direct you to Cochran-Smith and Lytle's works (1990, 1992a, 1992b, 1993, 1998, 1999a, 1999b).

## Physical Education Teacher Education

In her chapter titled, *Learning to Teach Physical Education*, O'Sullivan (2003) discussed the theoretical orientations undergirding research on learning to teach. Drawing from Cochran-Smith and Lytle's (1999a) discourse about conceptions of teacher learning, O'Sullivan discussed teacher preparation in the context of PETE programs. For example, O'Sullivan asserts that Siedentop and some of his former doctoral students' (Romar, 1995; Siedentop, 2002) research on what teachers know about physical education content and how they use it is reflective of the k-for-p conception. The popular curriculum model, *Teaching Games for Understanding* (Griffin, Mitchell, & Oslin, 1997) is also reflective of this conception. Clearly, reflective of the k-for-p conception to teacher learning, adapted physical education (APE) and related specialized content knowledge is presented in the *Adapted Physical Education National Standards* (Kelly, 2006). Further owing to the k-for-p conception, APE teacher preparation programs often follow competency-based guidelines. In 1993,

(continued)



## **Teacher Preparation *continued***

---

the Adapted Physical Activity Council (APAC) of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance issued competency-related guidelines for APE teacher preparation. Its main purpose is advocacy for persons with disabilities through promotion of programs, policies, standards, and research (AAHPERD, 2008).

The k-for-p conception is also reflected in Kowalski and her colleagues' advocacy for an infusion of disability-content into PETE program curriculums as a strategy for promoting favorable attitudes and developing competency in teaching students with disabilities (Barrette, Fiorentino, & Kowalski, 1993; Kowalski, 1995; Kowalski & Rizzo, 1996). Kowalski and Rizzo (1996) found the more knowledge and experience college students had through infused disability content and APE course work, the higher their perceived competence was in teaching students with disabilities. Likewise, Rust and Sinelnikov (2010) emphasized the importance of adequate professional preparation and the interplay of knowledge of disabilities and pedagogical content knowledge, as well as a teacher candidate's perceptions of his teaching efficacy. They stressed the need for realistic practicum experience settings and the importance of acquiring pedagogical content knowledge for teaching students with disabilities.

Scholars continue to raise issues of curriculum priorities of PETE programs. Some issues revolve around professional preparation of teachers to work effectively with students with disabilities. How teachers are prepared, and what happens to their efficacy in teaching students with disabilities during their professional careers are important questions. These questions must be considered in making decisions on policy, curricular change, and teacher preparation and development. Mindful of the k-in-p conception of teacher learning, for example, PETE programs should ensure teacher candidates lead micro-teaching episodes with small groups of students with disabilities (e.g., during practicum experiences) such that they develop a sense of personal mastery through reflection and practice before teaching in larger classes as in their student teaching internships. Moreover, our advocacy for case study methodology and reflective practice in APE draws from the k-in-p conception (Hodge, Murata, Block, & Lieberman, 2003a). The intent of using cases and reflections is to provide the intellectual challenge and social contexts in which teacher candidates and practicing teachers can unpack the knowledge embedded in the informed teaching decisions of others and/or can deepen their own knowledge and their own abilities to make thoughtful decisions in their situations (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999a). Such preparation and development strategies would add to teacher candidates' and teachers' stores of knowledge while they engage in building self-efficacy (Block, Taliaferro, Harris, & Krause, 2010; Hodge, Davis, Woodard, & Sherrill, 2002).

Physical education scholars insist that well-designed professional development programs can serve to deepen and extend teachers' content knowledge and extend and refine their pedagogies (Ko, Wallhead, & Ward, 2006). For practicing physical education teachers (generalists and APE specialists), professional development opportunities should be made available by school districts and designed to equip teachers with advanced knowledge and skills

*(continued)*

## **Teacher Preparation *continued***

---

necessary to teach students with various disabilities. Drawing from the k-of-p conception, school districts should encourage physical education teachers to strive toward becoming culturally competent as well. For example, a series of funded workshops (inquiry communities) might be offered for teachers with a focus on implementing culturally relevant pedagogies in urban schools. Teachers participating in such workshops will acquire a deeper understanding and valuing of teaching a diversity of students, and their cultural competencies are likely to be improved. The focal assumption in the k-of-p conception is that the knowledge teachers need to teach effectively and justly emanates from systematic inquiries about teaching, learners and learning, content and curriculum, and schools and schooling (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999a). Inquiry communities comprised of APE specialists and general physical education teachers, as examples, would allow them to explore critical questions, theorize and construct their work and relate it to broader social, cultural, and political issues. Teachers who participate in inquiry communities improve their social awareness about issues in and beyond schools.

### **Coursework and Practicum Training**

The k-for-p conception of teacher learning is well-embedded in the history of physical education teacher preparation. Since the development of early practicum models to today's inclusion-based approaches, the use of an introductory APE course coupled with practicum experience training has been incorporated in PETE programs (Walsh, Jansma, & Porretta, 1992). Instructors of the APE course are usually committed to implementing course work and practicum experiences intended to prepare PETE teacher candidates for effectively teaching students with disabilities. Commonly, PETE teacher candidates are exposed to only one APE course during their professional preparation (Walsh et al., 1992). Arguably, exposure to one such course does not provide the knowledge, experience, or competence teacher candidates need to become effective teachers in inclusive classes (Kowalski & Rizzo, 1996). The challenge is to maximize student learning within such curriculum constraints (Hodge, Tannehill, & Kluge, 2003b).

There is a wealth of research on APE course work and practicum training that confirms such academic preparation can influence PETE students' attitudes and perceived competence in teaching students with disabilities. Research shows that PETE students who have had satisfying practicum experiences with persons with disabilities are likely to develop favorable attitudes associated with improved perceived competence (Kowalski & Rizzo, 1996). In contrast, if the quality or quantity of professional preparation is limited and does not provide adequate attitude-change strategies, PETE students' attitudes and perceived competence in teaching students with disabilities will not change favorably or may be adversely impacted (Downs & Williams, 1994). To improve teacher preparation, some have called for restructuring of PETE programs with an infused curricular approach that provides information and experiences for PETE students to practice effective pedagogy with a diversity of students with and without disabilities throughout their professional preparation (Kowalski, 1995). There is also advocacy for the

*(continued)*



## Teacher Preparation *continued*

---

use of case study methodology and reflection in PETE programs (Collier & O'Sullivan, 1997; Hodge et al., 2003a; Hodge et al., 2003b; O'Sullivan, 2003; Stroot, 2000; Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 1994).

### Case Study Methodology

In their book titled, *Case Studies in Adapted Physical Education: Empowering Critical Thinking*, Hodge and colleagues (2003a), emphasized case study methodology for teacher use in exploring the challenges and rewards of learning to teach persons with and without disabilities across various physical activity environments. This methodology is intended to promote an interactive, problem-solving teaching and learning approach, to attend to real-world issues that occur in physical activity contexts such as physical education, disability sports, recreation, and health clubs. Hodge and colleagues (2003a) explained that case study scenarios present critical thinking opportunities for teacher candidates aspiring to become certified and highly qualified physical education professionals. Case studies are intended to augment those things teacher candidates learn during their academic preparation and teaching experiences. Case study method can also help teachers construct knowledge-in-practice, as they think critically about life in schools and other contextual situations, as they question and explore, and as they are empowered as social agents in the process. Moreover, using a case studies approach is an effective "strategy for helping physical educators work with administrators, parents, and students of all ability levels" (Wilson, 2000, p. 37). Further Wilson stated that a case study approach compels teacher candidates "to actively generate solutions to real-life challenges, instead of passively receiving theoretical content through lectures" (p. 37). This calls for reflective practitioners.

### Self-Reflection

It is well-accepted that competent practitioners learn by doing and develop their capacity to generate new *knowledge-in-action* through reflective practice (Schon, 1987). Schon asserted that professional preparation programs in education should be centered on developing teacher candidates' capacity for *reflection-in-action*. Teacher candidates should be guided in learning by doing, reflecting back on their actions, and developing an ability to reflect on what they are doing while they are doing it (Schon, 1987). Research supports the use of self-reflection in teacher professional preparation in physical education (Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 1994). Positioned in the k-in-p conception, it is believed that reflection reinforces the importance of a teacher thinking critically about and appropriately responding to those areas of greatest challenge, as well as appreciating those successes experienced in teaching. Tsangaridou and O'Sullivan (1997) found that experienced physical education teachers engaged in both (a) microreflections, which were interpreted as reflections that inform teachers' daily practice that were focused on pedagogy, content, ethical, moral, and social issues; and (b) macroreflections, which were interpreted as reflections that inform teachers' practices over time that were focused on changes in classroom practice and professional development.

*(continued)*

## **Teacher Preparation *continued***

---

In APE research, Connolly (1994) explored how practicum experiences and journal writing in an APE course affected the “lives” of enrolled PETE students. In addition to Connolly’s (1994) work, other scholars have explored the question of what meaning do PETE students ascribe to practicum experiences in preparing them to teach students with disabilities. For example, Hodge et al. (2003b) explored the meaning of practicum experiences for PETE students enrolled in an introductory APE course with an inclusion-based practicum requirement. They asserted that journaling served as a useful medium for reflection. The sum of empirical results confirms that critical reflection is a useful medium for PETE teacher candidates and practicing physical education teachers to identify issues, reflect upon and share thoughts, feelings, impressions, beliefs, and attitudes and to think about schools and schooling, and about how to address various issues or concerns (Connolly, 1994; Hodge et al., 2003b; Tsangaridou & O’Sullivan 1994, 1997). The goal of teacher preparation is to produce teachers who are prepared and willing to teach well.

### **Effective Teaching**

Effective teaching means designing lessons to maximize the amount of time each student spends in direct practice at a level that ensures a continuing development of the skill compatible with a minimal number of errors (Webster, 1993). This means teachers must understand and appropriately manipulate task structures in physical education. Classroom ecology research has exposed task structures that serve to situate and guide the processes that occur in instruction. In physical education, three main task systems are identified: instructional, managerial, and student social systems. First, instructional task structures facilitate student learning and are comprised of the various learning tasks and activities in which students engage. Research indicates that differences in task difficulty, task presentation, and accountability will lead to varying levels of student participation within instructional tasks (Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983). When a teacher’s task presentations are clear and concise, students are likely to engage in the task in ways expected by the teacher. But when a teacher’s task presentations are vague, students are more likely to engage in off-task behaviors. Second, managerial task structures bring order and organization to the learning environment and facilitate student engagement in lesson activities. Managerial task structures are constructed when teachers establish appropriate rules, routines, and behavioral expectations. Third, student social systems represent occasions where students engage in social interactions with one another. Teachers must determine how and when student socializing will be encourage or discouraged during class time in exchange for their willingness to participate in instructional tasks and learning activities (Zmudy, Curtner-Smith, & Steffen, 2009).

In addition to manipulation of task structures, there are other key indicators of effective teaching essential to teaching in physical education. These include (a) finding ways to keep students appropriately engaged in planned activities a high percentage of the time and doing so without resorting to coercive, negative, or punitive behavioral techniques; (b) developing and maintaining positive class climate whereby students have many opportunities

*(continued)*

## Teacher Preparation *continued*

---

to practice at levels appropriate to their abilities; (c) individualizing instruction for success-oriented and on-task behaviors of students, which may include adapting and adjusting strategies to match contextual variables; (d) using peer tutors to assist and give additional attention, which may allow greater opportunities for students to practice successfully; (e) using appropriate reinforcement strategies to motivate students; (f) providing congruent, specific and prescriptive feedback; and (g) organizing practices in a manner that promotes student learning and retention (Webster, 1993). The time students spend in lesson activity should be directed at skill acquisition with clear accountability measures on learning outcomes through active participation. In lesson planning, teachers must design learning experiences that ensure their students actively participate in fun movement activities. It is important that teachers focus on students having fun while they move. But, they must also hold students accountable for effective forms of movement in skill acquisition, development, or proficiency.

The *re*-construction and infusion of disability knowledge is also necessary in PETE programs so as to better prepare competent teachers to work effectively in inclusive settings. We believe that disability discourse should be addressed from both an embodied (Fitzgerald, 2005) as well socially constructed perspective (Grenier, 2007). Whenever teacher preparation programs offer coursework coupled with practicum and field-based experiences, the teacher candidates should be challenged to think critically and reflect on their experiences. They are likely to develop appropriate and essential knowledge and skills for teaching students with disabilities (Connolly, 1994; Hodge et al., 2003b). This process will help teacher candidates maximize their understandings of disability and teaching, and enhance their efficacy and advocacy as teachers.

Lastly, teacher preparation programs and school districts should ensure that teachers are prepared to create culturally responsive learning spaces. Culturally competent, teachers are able to connect with most, if not all, students and contribute meaningfully to their school experiences (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). They must hold ethnorelativistic views in accepting, adapting to, and including student diversity (DeSensi, 1995). Social justice pedagogies such as culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2000) are advocated. For more complete discourse on culturally responsive and inclusive practice in physical education, we direct you to Timken and Watson's (2010) chapter titled, "Teaching All Kids: Valuing Students Through Culturally Responsive and Inclusive Practice."

## Summary

We envision a new and diverse teacher workforce and insist that it is the professional obligation of PETE programs to ensure that this is realized. In this column, we discussed three major conceptions of teacher learning and practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999a) by which PETE programs can draw from when conceptualizing curriculum priorities and approaches for preparing an effective and dynamic, and socially just and culturally competent physical education teacher workforce.

*(continued)*



## Teacher Preparation *continued*

### References

- American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. (2008). Retrieved from <http://www.aahperd.org/>.
- Barrette, G. T., Fiorentino, L. H., & Kowalski, E. M. (1993). Physical education teacher education (PETE): Innovation through infusion and integration. *Physical Educator*, 50(2), 69-76.
- Block, M. E., Taliaferro, A., Harris, N., & Krause, J. (2010). Using self-efficacy theory to facilitate inclusion in general physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 81(3), 43-46.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. *Educational Researcher*, 19, 2-11.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1992a). Communities for teacher research: Fringe or forefront. *American Journal of Education*, 100 (3), 298-324.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1992b). Interrogating cultural diversity: Inquiry and action. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43, 104-115.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1998). Teacher research: The question that persists. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1, 19-36.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999a). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999b). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher*, 28, 15-25.
- Connolly, M. (1994). Practicum experiences and journal writing in adapted physical education: Implications for teacher education. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 11, 306-328.
- DeSensi, J. T. (1995). Understanding multiculturalism and valuing diversity: A theoretical perspective. *Quest*, 47, 34-43.
- Downs, P., & Williams, T. (1994). Student attitudes toward integration of people with disabilities in activity settings: A European comparison. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 11, 32-43.
- Fitzgerald, H. (2005). Still feeling like a spare piece of luggage? Embodied experiences of (dis)ability in physical education and school sport. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 10(1), 41-59.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching—Theory, research & practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grenier, M. (2007). Inclusion in physical education: From the medical model to social construction. *Quest*, 59, 298-310.
- Griffin, L. L., Mitchell, S. A., Oslin, J. L. (1997). *Teaching sport concepts and skills: A tactical games approach*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hodge, S. R., Davis, R., Woodard, R., & Sherrill, C. (2002). Comparison of practicum types in changing preservice teachers' attitudes and perceived competence. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 19, 155-171.
- Hodge, S. R., Murata, N. M., Block, M. E., & Lieberman, L. J. (2003a). *Case studies in adapted physical education: Empowering critical thinking*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.
- Hodge, S. R., Tannehill, D., & Kluge, M. A. (2003b). Exploring the meaning of practicum experiences for PETE students. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 20, 381-399.
- Kelly, L. (Ed.). (2006). *Adapted physical education national standards* (2nd ed.). National Consortium for Physical Education and Recreation for Individuals with Disabilities. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Ko, B., Wallhead, T., & Ward, P. (2006). Chapter 4: Professional development workshops—What do teachers learn and use. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 25, 397-412.

(continued)

## Teacher Preparation *continued*

- Kowalski, E. M. (1995). The infusion approach to teacher development. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 66(4), 49-54.
- Kowalski, E. M., & Rizzo, T. L. (1996). Factors influencing preservice students' attitudes toward individuals with disabilities. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 13, 180-196.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34, 159-165.
- Ludwig, M., Kirshstein, R., Sidana, A., Ardila-Rey, A., & Bae, Y. (2010). *An emerging picture of the teacher preparation pipeline*. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, DC.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2003). Learning to teach physical education. In S. J. Silverman & C. D. Ennis (Eds.), *Student learning in physical education: Applying research to enhance instruction* (2nd ed.) (pp. 275-294). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Romar, J. E. (1995). Case studies of Finnish physical education teachers: Espoused and enacted theories of action. (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55, 3134A.
- Rust, R., & Sinelnikov, O. (2010). Practicum in a self-contained environment: Pre-service teacher perceptions of teaching students with disabilities. *Physical Educator*, 67(1), 33-45.
- Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Siedentop, D. (2002). Ecological perspectives in teaching research. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21, 427-440.
- Stroot, S. A. (Ed.). (2000). *Case studies in physical education: Real world preparation for teaching*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.
- Timken, G. L., & Watson, D. (2010). Teaching all kids: Valuing students through culturally responsive and inclusive practice. In J. Lund, & D. Tannehill (Eds.), *Standard-based physical education curriculum development* (2nd ed., pp. 122-153). Sunbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Tousignant, M., & Siedentop, D. (1983). A qualitative analysis of task structures in required secondary physical education classes. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3, 47-57.
- Tsangaridou, N, & O'Sullivan, M. (1994). Using pedagogical reflective strategies to enhance reflection among preservice physical education teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14, 13-33.
- Tsangaridou, N, & O'Sullivan, M. (1997). The role of reflection in shaping physical education teachers' educational values and practices. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17, 2-25.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2004). *Elementary and secondary education act: Sec. 9101 definitions*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/>.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development. (2010). *ESEA blueprint for reform*. Washington, D.C.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 20-32.
- Walsh, M. B., Jansma, P., & Porretta, D. (1992). The status of the introductory adapted physical education course in Ohio. *Future Focus: Ohio Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 13(3), 24-27.
- Webster, G. E. (1993). Effective teaching in adapted physical education. *Palaestra*, 9(3), 25-27, 29-31.
- Wilson, S. (2000). Disability case studies: Learning to include all students. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 71(4), 37-41.
- Zmudy, M. H., Curtner-Smith, M. D., & Steffen, J. (2009). Ecology and task structures in adventure education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 31(3), 319-340. ■

## **NAKPEHE Foundation Memorial Fund**

This fund was started with a large gift to NAKPEHE through the will of Dean A. Pease. Donations to the NAKPEHE Foundation Memorial Fund can be forwarded to:

NAKPEHE  
c/o Ginny Overdorf  
Dept. of Exercise &  
Movement Sciences  
William Paterson  
University  
300 Pompton Road  
Wayne, NJ 07470

Make checks payable to:  
NAKPEHE Foundation  
Memorial Fund.

# ■ Best Practice in Teaching and Learning

## **Peer Review: The Change From Formative to Summative Evaluation**

*Michael W. Kernodle, Erik Rabinowitz,  
and Robert N. McKethan  
Appalachian State University*



## **Introduction**

Over forty percent of colleges and universities now use peer observation and evaluation in the classroom. The evaluation can be used either in a formative or summative fashion. Formative feedback is information that is intended to support an educator's academic growth towards becoming an excellent or expert teacher. Formative feedback aims to be non-evaluative and is not intended to be a snapshot or final judgment of an educator's fitness or competence. Rather, the goal is to provide information that educators can use when they reflect on their teaching, plan changes in the future, and help others to understand who they are when they teach and how they approach the task of university teaching. The formative peer observation process is most important for junior faculty to help prepare them early for their career teaching demands which can be overwhelming and can negatively affect research and service. Early intervention provides junior faculty with the tools to successfully handle these problems. The information acquired during peer evaluation can also be used in a summative fashion to be incorporated into the formal reward system of tenure, promotion and salary increases.

A potential strength of the peer evaluation process is that teachers may gain new ideas and perspectives about teaching from colleagues resulting in improved teaching ability. However, peer evaluation scores may reflect a bias relating to the observer's own beliefs about teaching. In addition, without a systematic approach including observer training, multiple visits and the use of reliable observation instruments: peer evaluation may not be a valid method of evaluation, especially summative evaluation. The following article chronicles the still-evolving change from a formative to summative method of peer evaluation at Appalachian State University.

*(continued)*



## Peer Review *continued*

Initially, the Department of Health, Leisure and Exercise Science at Appalachian State University used a relatively simple method of formative evaluation. Prior to the in class evaluation the observer (one observer was assigned to evaluate all teachers) would provide a pre-class visitation form (see Figure 1) to the teacher to furnish the observer an idea of what would be covered during the class to be observed. During the in class observation a non-validated assessment form was filled out by the observer (see Figure 2).

**Figure 1** Pre-Class Visitation Form

Pre-Class Visitation Form	
Faculty Name	
Course Title	
Date	
1.	What is the goal for the course and what do you hope the students will gain from this class session?
2.	What can I expect you to be doing in this class session and what teaching methods will you use?
3.	What have the students been asked to prepare for the class?
4.	Will this class be generally typical of your teaching? If not, what will be different?
5.	Is there anything you would like me to focus on during class?

*(continued)*

## Peer Review *continued*

**Figure 2** Class Visitation Form

Class Visitation Form

Instructor \_\_\_\_\_

Course \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Items are rated on a 5-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

1. The instructor is very knowledgeable about the subject matter
2. The instructor is well prepared for the class meeting
3. The objectives of the class session are clearly stated
4. The instructor is able to explain the subject clearly
5. The instructor makes use of examples and illustrations
6. The instructor reviews major points covered in the class
7. The instructor deals with topics in sufficient depth
8. The instructor uses class time well
9. The instructor answers questions precisely
10. The instructor makes students feel free to ask questions
11. The instructor stresses a conceptual grasp of the material
12. The instructor discusses current developments in the field
13. The instructor demonstrates enthusiasm for the subject
14. The instructor acknowledges when students are not comprehending

At the end of class, without the teacher present, the students were asked for verbal feedback about the teacher's performance (see Figure 3). The final step in the process was a meeting between the observer and the teacher to discuss the results and potential positive changes to increase teaching performance.

*(continued)*

## Peer Review *continued*

Figure 3 Student Feedback

CARTOONS

~~NAME~~ ~~DATE~~ TUES MARCH 16

I LEARNED A LOT

~~HE~~ CONCERNED ABOUT HIS STUDENTS  
EASY TO GET ALONG WITH  
"EXCELLENT TEACHER", GREAT  
THOUGHT

~~HE~~ SOMETIMES A LITTLE VAGUE (MUMBLES SOMETIMES)  
(HARD TO TAKE NOTES & FOLLOW TRAIN OF THOUGHT)

COVERED THE MATERIAL ON SYLLABUS WELL

GOOD EXAMPLES

~~HE~~ RELAXED CLASS

~~HE~~ THOUGHT ON STUDENTS LEVEL

KNOWS OUR NAMES

GOOD SENSE OF HUMOR

~~HE~~ KNOWLEDGEABLE

~~HE~~ PRACTICAL

~~HE~~ GETS STUDENTS INVOLVED

~~HE~~ ASKS QUESTIONS WELL - GETS STUDENTS IN DISCUSSION

~~HE~~ CURRENT

~~HE~~ ENCOURAGING

~~HE~~ "GOOD COFFEE" - (MAYBE DONUTS?)

~~HE~~ CARED ABOUT OUR IDEAS.

~~HE~~ INTERESTING

~~HE~~ ENJOYABLE

~~HE~~ TALKS & DISCUSSES W/ YOU NOT AT YOU

~~HE~~ GOOD FRIEND

HE ENJOYS TEACHING

~~HE~~ ALWAYS PREPARED

~~HE~~ ALWAYS AVAILABLE FOR HELP

BEN GOOD OUTLINES (SOMEDAYS - SOMETIMES DID NOT COVER ALL MATERIAL)

~~HE~~ - ~~CONFIDENT~~

- INTELLIGENT

- KIND

~~HE~~ MOVE AROUND CLASS WHEN LECTURING.

~~HE~~ CHANGE TONE OF VOICE MORE

- OPEN & HONEST

- UNDERSTANDING

~~HE~~ REAL PRACTICAL STUFF

OVERALL NICE  
WORK AS ALWAYS  
WATCH THIS

(continued)



## Peer Review *continued*

---

### Change Number One

However, the faculty, under the guidance of the Teaching Enhancement/Peer Evaluation Committee, decided to develop a more systematic evaluation system utilizing a validated instrument (see Figure 4) which was modified after one year (see Figure 5), and an observational process that would better withstand the rigors of the tenure/promotion process. However, this was still a formative evaluation.

The following changes were made:

Instead of one faculty member assuming responsibility for the evaluations, triads are now the norm. We have one lead observer (a faculty member considered to be a master teacher) assigned to each faculty member to be observed in coordination with a second faculty observer (usually a faculty member in the observers content area). The triad then follows this protocol.

- The lead observer (as designated by the Teaching Enhancement Committee) initiates a conversation with the individual to be observed and the second observer to determine the date and time of the class to be observed. Because many classes involve student teaching or field experiences later in the semester, observations are scheduled as soon as the faculty member feels comfortable that they have had enough time in the classroom for a valid assessment.
- At least 3 working days before the observation is to take place, the individual to be observed provides each observer with a copy of the syllabus and learning objectives for the class session that will be observed. Prior to the observation, both observers will review the course syllabus and the learning objectives for the day.
- The observers also meet with the faculty member to discuss the protocol for the evaluation as well as the goals of the class session.
- Both observers should arrive 5-8 minutes before class begins to observe instructor's preparation for class.
- At the beginning of the class, the instructor will make the following statement to the class: "Dr \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ are here to observe as part of our annual peer review process."
- During the class, both observers will complete a Peer Assessment of Teaching Performance Instrument. Care should be taken to include relevant comments in the space provided.
- The instructor stops class with 8-10 minutes to spare and turn the class over to the observers.
- The lead observer (without the teacher in the room) will ask each of the following questions and record responses verbatim. The second observer will also record responses verbatim.
  - a. What feedback would you like to give about this faculty member?
  - b. Was the class I just observed a typical class for \_\_\_\_\_?

*(continued)*

## Peer Review *continued*

**Figure 4** Validated Peer Assessment

Yes	No	NA	Teacher Practice Statements: Original Validated Form	Observation Notes
			<b>Management of Instructional Time</b>	
			Teacher has materials, supplies and equipment ready at the start of the lesson or instructional activity.	
			Teacher gets the class started quickly.	
			Teacher uses available time for learning and keeps students on task.	
			<b>Management of Student Behaviors</b>	
			Teacher stops inappropriate behavior promptly and consistently, yet maintains the dignity of the student.	
			Teacher analyzes the classroom environment and makes adjustments to support learning.	
			<b>Instructional Presentation</b>	
			Teacher links instructional activities to prior learning.	
			Teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning activities that make these aspects of subject matter understandable and meaningful for students.	
			Teacher speaks fluently and precisely.	

(continued)

## Peer Review *continued*

**Figure 5** Modified Peer Assessment

<b>Peer Assessment of Teaching Performance Instrument</b> <i>Department of Health Leisure and Exercise Science</i>				
Instructor: _____		Course: _____		
Observer: _____		Date: _____		
	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Rating</b>		
<b><i>Management of Instructional Time</i></b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
♦ Teacher has materials, supplies and equipment ready at the start of the lesson or instructional activity.				
♦ Teacher gets the class started quickly.				
♦ Teacher uses available time for learning and keeps students on task.				
<b><i>Management of Student Behaviors</i></b>				
♦ Teacher stops inappropriate behavior promptly and consistently, yet maintains the dignity of the student.				
♦ Teacher analyzes the classroom environment and makes adjustments to support learning.				
<b><i>Instructional Presentation</i></b>				
♦ Teacher links instructional activities to prior learning.				
♦ Teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning activities that make these aspects of subject matter understandable and meaningful for students.				

(continued)



## Peer Review *continued*

---

In closing, the observer thanks the students for their comments and states, “I will be here for a couple of minutes if anyone wants to talk with me.” This allows students who may not be comfortable speaking out in front of the class to share their thoughts. Their comments should also be recorded verbatim.

- The lead observer takes both records of verbatim comments and word processes them. The only time a comment may be recorded in any other than the exact form it was stated is the deletion of obscenity/profanity.
- The 2 observers will meet to compare their observations and the verbatim comments with the syllabus and learning objectives. They will prepare a summary report with suggestions for improvement. They will commend areas where the instructor is doing well.
- Within 7 days of the observation, the 2 observers and individual observed will meet to discuss the observation and the summary report. At the conclusion of this meeting, all materials become the property of the person observed. This person has the option of including the materials in his/her portfolio.
- The observers sign a Statement of Confidentiality

I understand that the Peer Observation Process is confidential. Whatever I observe in the classroom is not to be discussed with anyone other than the individual observed and the other observation team member. I cannot disclose this information during DPC meetings or in any other setting.

Signature\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_

## Change Number Two

More recently, it became evident that Appalachian State University would pass a mandate that the peer evaluation process across campus would be summative. In addition, our department developed a comprehensive Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Merit document and one of the main ways to accrue points was in the area of teaching. Therefore, our department decided to be proactive and develop a summative evaluation system that would enhance peer evaluation and provide summative information for the tenure/promotion process. The basic protocol was maintained, but the following changes were made:

- We modified the formative assessment scale from an observed N/A to a 1-5 Likert scale with the retention of an N/A category (see Figure 6).

*(continued)*

## Peer Review *continued*

**Figure 6** Online Peer Assessment, Page 1

**Lead Observer Peer Assessment of Teaching Performance Instrument**

Department of Health, Leisure, and Exercise Science

Please rate all questions on the Peer Assessment of Teaching Performance Instrument using the following scale:  
5 = Superior,  
4 = Above Average,  
3 = Average,  
2 = Needs work,  
1 = Needs a lot of work  
NA not observed

**Observers and Instructors**

Instructor

Lead observer

Second observer

**Management of Instructional Time Questions (MITQ)**

	5	4	3	2	1	NA
A. Teacher has materials, supplies and equipment ready at the start of the lesson or instructional activity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Teacher gets the class started quickly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Teacher uses available time for learning and keeps students on task.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments on Management of Instructional Time

**Management of Student Behaviors Questions (MSBQ)**

	5	4	3	2	1	NA
A. Teacher stops inappropriate behavior promptly and consistently, yet maintains the dignity of the student	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Teacher analyzes the classroom environment and makes adjustments to support learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comment on Management of Student Behaviors (denote letter of question for referencing)

**Instructional Feedback Questions (IFQ)**

	5	4	3	2	1	NA
A. Teacher provides feedback on the correctness or incorrectness of in-class work to encourage student growth.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Teacher affirms a correct oral response appropriately and moves on.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Teacher provides sustaining feedback after an incorrect response by probing, repeating the question, giving a clue, or allowing more time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal and non-verbal communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments on Instructional Feedback (denote letter of question for referencing)

## Peer Review *continued*

**Figure 6** Online Peer Assessment, Page 2

Instructional Monitoring Questions (IMQ)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
A. Teacher poses questions clearly and one at a time.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Teacher uses student responses to adjust teaching as necessary.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments on Instructional Monitoring (denote letter of question for referencing)							
<div></div>							
Communication in an Educational Environment Question (CEEQ)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
Teacher treats all students in a fair and equitable manner.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments on Communication in an Educational Environment							
<div></div>							
Instructional Presentation Question (IPQ)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
A. Teacher links instructional activities to prior learning.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline (s) he or she teaches and creates learning activities that make these aspects of subject matter understandable and meaningful for students.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Teacher speaks fluently and precisely.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Teacher provides relevant examples and demonstrations to illustrate concepts and skills.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Teacher engages students intellectually through discussion.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Teacher conducts the lesson or instructional activity at a brisk pace, slowing presentations when necessary for student understanding but avoiding unnecessary slowdowns.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Teacher makes transitions between lessons and instructional activities within lessons effectively and smoothly.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Teacher makes sure that assignments are clear.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Teacher uses instructional strategies that are adapted to diverse learners.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Teacher uses instructional strategies that encourage the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
K. Teacher uses technology to support instruction.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
L. Teacher encourages students to be engaged in and responsible for their own learning.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments on instructional presentation (denote letter of question for referencing)							
<div></div>							

(continued)



## Peer Review *continued*

**Figure 6** Online Peer Assessment, Page 3

**In the space below, please describe other teacher or student behaviors observed in class.**

**What feedback would you like to give about this faculty member?**

**Was the class I just observed a typical class for \_\_\_\_\_?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

Comments

**Additional student comments**

## Peer Review *continued*

**Figure 7** Revised Peer Observation Assessment

Revised Peer Observation Assessment of Teaching Performance Instrument
Exit this survey

Teaching Assessment of Peer Performance Scale (TAPPS) for HLES

Please score all questions on the TAPPS using the following scale:

5 = Superior,  
4 = Above Average,  
3 = Average,  
2 = Needs work,  
1 = Needs a lot of work

Observers and Instructors

Instructor

Lead Observer

Second Observer

Has materials, supplies, equipment ready and gets class started quickly.

☒ YES

☐ NO

Teaching Performance Analysis

Teacher/Instructor:

	Superior	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Needs Mentoring
Provides sustaining feedback after correct and incorrect response by probing, repeating the question, cueing, and/or allowing more time.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Uses verbal and non-verbal communication techniques to foster active inquiry.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Treats all students in a fair and equitable manner, and calls on class uniformly.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Links instructional activities to prior learning or knowledge.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Speaks fluently and precisely.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Provides relevant examples and demonstrations to illustrate concepts and skills.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Uses available time for learning and keeps students on task.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Poses questions clearly and one at a time.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Engages students in intellectually stimulating environment.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Conducts the lesson at a brisk pace, slowing when necessary, but avoiding unnecessary slowdowns.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Uses instructional strategies that are adapted to diverse learners.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Uses instructional strategies that encourage the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Encourages students to be engaged in and responsible for their own learning.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

In the space below, please describe other teacher or student behaviors observed in class.

Was the class I just observed a typical class for \_\_\_\_\_?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Elaborate on No response

Students: What feedback would you like to give to this faculty member?

## Peer Review *continued*

---

- Content reliability assessment occurred prior and post to this conversion by 5 faculty representing the 6 programs in Health, Leisure & Exercise Science (HLES).
- With the advent of technology the peer evaluation assessment was placed online using a survey tool called Survey Monkey. Lead observers inputted all observation scores for themselves and the second observer.
- The scale was then piloted for three semesters and questions with a cut score response rate of 20%
- This made it so all questions and peer observation would be measurable/ consistent across all six areas of contents.
- The tool started with 25 questions, 6 questions scored higher than 20% of N/A reporting. All other questions did not reach higher than 6% N/A reporting. Item reliability on remaining items was conducted resulting in a .89 overall reliability. The 6 questions were eliminated (see Figure 7 on previous page).
- Additionally, since two faculty members are conducting the evaluation simultaneously an inter-rater reliability examination was conducted with a reliability of .84 (Each team done individually then combined and divided). Inter-rater reliability team scores ran from a high .96 to a low .56.
- Item scale reliability examinations were conducted to improve overall reliability. However, even though reliability may improve very little by removing a few questions the content value seem to outweigh reliability benefits.

### What Is Next?

The faculty will vote for acceptance of this new peer evaluation process. If it is accepted the individual faculty scores will be compared to a departmental mean and will be used in a summative fashion as a part of the Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Merit process. In addition, each faculty member will be allowed to choose two or three areas of weakness as evidenced by the peer evaluation process and write a description of how they plan to strengthen these weaknesses. If the scale is accepted we will also develop a more formalized training program for observers.

Presently, the observations are set up in advance, but unannounced observations may be of value. Also, the possibility of setting up video cameras for the purpose of evaluation may be useful. In addition, the use of teaching portfolios that allow for self-assessment, syllabus design, teaching philosophy etc. could provide useful information in the peer evaluation process. Finally, there are plans for a mentoring system to match “experienced” teachers with junior faculty or those asking for assistance in the classroom. ■



## ■ NAKPEHE Announces Named Lecturers for 2011 Conference

NAKPEHE President Mike Metzler is pleased to announce the three named lecturers for the 2011 Conference in Orlando, Florida. On Thursday evening of the conference, Andrew Hawkins will deliver the twentieth Delphine Hanna Lecture, titled, "Kinesiology for Humans." Dr. Hawkins is a Professor in the College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences at West Virginia University.

Alison M. Wrynn will deliver the forty-fifth Amy Morris Homans Lecture at Friday's luncheon. Dr. Wrynn is a Professor and Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies in the Department of Kinesiology at California State University, Long Beach. Her lecture is titled, "Beyond the Standard Measures: Physical Education's Impact on the Dialogue About Obesity in the 20th Century."

The thirtieth Dudley Allen Sargent Lecture will be delivered at Saturday's luncheon by E. Newton Jackson, Professor and Chair of the Department of Leadership, Counseling, and Instructional Technology at the University of North Florida. Dr. Jackson's lecture is titled, "Our Profession: A History of Inclusion." ■



*Andrew Hawkins*



*Alison M. Wrynn*



*E. Newton Jackson*

## **CALL FOR PROPOSALS!!**

### **2011 Joanna Davenport Doctoral Poster Presentation and 2011 Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Award**

The 2011 NAKPEHE Conference will be in Orlando, FL from January 8–11, 2011. If you are currently a doctoral student, then we want you to share your research with us in the Joanna Davenport Doctoral Poster Presentation. If you are an emerging professional and have been in your first higher education position for five years or less, then please submit a proposal for the Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Award.

The doctoral poster presentation and young scholar awards provide emerging scholars an opportunity to share their research at a national conference and network with outstanding educators, administrators and scholars from a variety of disciplines in Kinesiology and Physical Education.

The next few sections of this column provide more information about the doctoral poster presentation and the young scholar award. Read them carefully and share this information with your colleagues!

#### **Joanna Davenport Poster Presentation Prize for Doctoral Students**

The National Association for Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education (NAKPEHE) would like to invite doctoral students to submit poster presentations for the 2011 conference in Orlando, FL. The conference will provide the doctoral students with a wide array of sessions to attend that will have greater meaning as they prepare to enter the higher education employment arena. This year there will be a special opportunity for doctoral students to participate in the conference. All doctoral students will be offered the opportunity to participate in a committee-reviewed doctoral student poster presentation session. The poster presentations will be available for viewing at the conference. A Review Committee will select one doctoral student poster to receive the Joanna Davenport Poster Presentation Prize, and the presenter will be awarded a monetary prize and a free membership in NAKPEHE for the coming year. The Joanna Davenport Poster Presentation Prize will be awarded at a special reception following the Delphine Hanna Lecture.

In addition to this session, we hope there will be time for doctoral students to meet together in a less formal setting to discuss their common concerns. Our hope is to establish a connection between similar doctoral programs and establish a mechanism for communication between students with similar or supportive research directions. The structure and philosophical direction of NAKPEHE offers a positive interdisciplinary theme that encourages sharing within and across specialty areas; and welcomes new ideas and insights from differing perspectives. There will be numerous social opportunities for the doctoral students to interact with NAKPEHE members.

If you have any specific questions related to doctoral student involvement, please feel free to contact Camille O'Bryant ([cobryant@calpoly.edu](mailto:cobryant@calpoly.edu) or 805-756-1787).

#### **2011 Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Award—11th Annual Special Open Paper Competition for Young Professionals**

The National Association for Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education (NAKPEHE) would like to invite new professionals, employed for the first time (and for less than 5 years) at an institution of higher education, to participate in a special program at the 2011 conference in Orlando, FL. The 2011 NAKPEHE conference marks the 11th year in which the Executive Board of NAKPEHE has approved an Open Paper Competition to encourage the development of innovative ideas and discussions from our newest members of the profession.

The winner of the Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Open Paper Competition will have the opportunity to present the paper at a special session at the 2011 conference. In addition to this unique presentation opportunity, the Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar will be awarded a monetary prize and given a free membership in NAKPEHE for the upcoming year.

#### **Proposals are due by OCTOBER 1, 2010!**

If you would like specific conference information, please contact Dr. Richard Oates ([roates@northgeorgia.edu](mailto:roates@northgeorgia.edu)), or visit the NAKPEHE web site ([www.nakpehe.org](http://www.nakpehe.org)) and click on the "Conference" tab. Scroll down to these awards to find additional information and proposal submission forms.

*See you in Orlando!!*

*Camille O'Bryant, Ph.D. - Cal Poly State University, San Luis Obispo, CA*



## CALL FOR PROPOSALS

**2011 Conference, January 5–8, 2011**  
**Hilton in the WALT DISNEY WORLD Resort, Orlando, Florida**

### **Theme: “The Quest for Significance: A Dialogue on Professional Impact”**

NAKPEHE’s premier publication is the journal *Quest* whose mission statement reads:

“*Quest’s* purpose is to stimulate professional development in physical education by publishing articles concerned with issues critical to physical education in higher education. The journal does not publish original research reports but welcomes articles that complement or review scholarly work related to the profession. Both theoretical and practical articles are considered. *Quest* serves a broad readership that includes academicians, teachers, and administrators by providing a public forum for scholarly and creative thought about the profession.”

The 2011 conference theme will not only explore “what” we are doing within the profession, but also the “significance” of what we are doing. Professionals in our field have a long and storied history of contributions to, and impact on, the profession. As Aristotle once said, “The aim of art is not to represent the outward appearance of things, but their inward significance.”

Program proposals will include a statement of significance along with the program abstract.

To submit a program proposal:

**[www.nakpehe.org](http://www.nakpehe.org)**

Proposals are due October 1, 2010.

For information, contact:

Dr. Richard Oates, EdD

Associate Dean, School of Education

North Georgia College & State University

E-mail: [roates@northgeorgia.edu](mailto:roates@northgeorgia.edu)

Phone: 706-864-1624



*Photo courtesy of The Hilton in the WALT DISNEY WORLD® Resort*



# Honor Awards Nomination Form for 2011

Award Title (check one):

☐ Distinguished Service    ☐ Distinguished Scholar    ☐ Distinguished Administrator

Nominee's name \_\_\_\_\_

Address & phone \_\_\_\_\_

Nominated by: (name, address, & e-mail address) \_\_\_\_\_

Attach statement of support for Nominee (based on criteria below), sign it, and forward with this form to: Marilyn Buck, School of Physical Education, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306. Or e-mail: [mbuck@bsu.edu](mailto:mbuck@bsu.edu). **Deadline is 8/1/10.**

---

## Criteria for Awards

All references to NAKPEHE should be interpreted to include the parent associations, NAPECW & NCPEAM.

### Distinguished Service Award

Shall be awarded to a person who:

1. Has been a member of NAKPEHE continuously for at least 10 years.
2. Has given outstanding service to NAKPEHE as evidenced by achievement in at least 5 of the following:
  - a) Officer of the Association
  - b) Member of the Executive Board
  - c) Chair of a committee
  - d) Committee member for at least 2 yrs
  - e) Attendee at annual conference
  - f) Speaker at annual conference
  - g) Speaker at annual conference as Homans, Sargent, or Hanna lecturer
  - h) Workshop leader
  - i) Contributor to NAKPEHE publications

### Distinguished Scholar Award

Shall be awarded to a person who has made a significant contribution to physical education in higher education through scholarly pursuits within a multidisciplinary perspective and has been a contributing member of NAKPEHE continuously for at least 5 years. Nominees will be judged on their contributions by showing distinction in at least one area with contributions to two or more:

1. Author of book(s)
2. Author of articles in professional or lay periodicals
3. Editor of book(s) or monographs
4. Researcher who develops, executes, and reports significant research
5. Lecturer at professional meetings
6. Other scholarly areas not listed above

### Distinguished Administrator Award

Shall be awarded to a person who, through application of administrative/managerial skills, has made significant contributions to the profession and/or related fields, both within and beyond the higher education community, and has been a contributing member of NAKPEHE continuously for at least 5 years. Qualified nominees shall have achieved at least one of the following with distinction:

1. Success as an administrator within a program of physical education in higher education in at least one of the following categories:
  - a) Dean or Assistant/Associate Dean of a school or college in which physical education is a unit
  - b) Chairperson of a physical education department in a college or university
2. Advancement of the goals and ideals of the profession through the application of managerial skills within other groups or organizations.
  - a) Executive Director/President/Program Leader for a physical education discipline related organization or conference
  - b) Director of a regional/national/international physical education project or activity
  - c) Dissemination (publications, presentation, teaching) of scholarly/academic innovations concerning physical education administration that have had a national impact on physical education
  - d) Leadership in physical education organizations as a member of a governing body
  - e) Record of influence outside the profession of higher education which has served physical education as a discipline beyond the institution.

*Note:* One letter from an employee and one from a higher level administrator must accompany the application.

# Authors Sought

We're always looking for quality articles for the Leadership, Issues, Best Practice, Research, New Professionals, or International columns. Please consider submitting an article to one of these columns or encourage your colleagues to do so. Contact the appropriate Associate Editor or the Editor directly with your submission or any questions.

## Chronicle Deadlines

Deadlines for *The Chronicle of Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education*:

Copy to Editor	Published
Dec. 15	February
March 15	May
July 15	September

All material submitted to *CKPEHE* must be double spaced, and regular articles should not exceed 8 pages in length.

## Chronicle Editor

Dr. Shane G. Frehlich  
Department of Kinesiology  
Redwood Hall, 250  
California State University, Northridge  
Northridge, CA 91330-8287  
Fax: (818) 677-3207  
Phone: (818) 677-6437  
E-mail: [shane.g.frehlich@csun.edu](mailto:shane.g.frehlich@csun.edu)

## Associate Editors

Section	Associate Editor	E-mail
Leadership in KPE Higher Education	Greg Letter	<a href="mailto:letter@adelphi.edu">letter@adelphi.edu</a>
Current Issues	Sam Hodge	<a href="mailto:Hodge.14@osu.edu">Hodge.14@osu.edu</a>
Best Practice in Teaching and Learning	Mel Finkenberg	<a href="mailto:mfinkenberg@sfasu.edu">mfinkenberg@sfasu.edu</a>
New KPE Professionals	Camille O'Bryant	<a href="mailto:cobryant@calpoly.edu">cobryant@calpoly.edu</a>
In Memoriam	Deborah Buswell	<a href="mailto:buswelld@sfasu.edu">buswelld@sfasu.edu</a>
Scholarly Publications	Deborah Buswell	<a href="mailto:buswelld@sfasu.edu">buswelld@sfasu.edu</a>
International	Mary Hums	<a href="mailto:mhums@louisville.edu">mhums@louisville.edu</a>
Research Digest	Bob Pangrazi	<a href="mailto:pangrazi1@msn.com">pangrazi1@msn.com</a>

## Job Notice Web Postings

Submit your job openings for posting at a NAKPEHE Web page and for e-mailing to over 600 professionals in the field. The Web site OPERA is updated weekly and receives nearly 600 hits per week. The annual registration fee for hiring departments is \$150. For details, please visit <http://www.nakpehe.org/OPERA/Index.html>.



# To Join NAKPEHE or Renew Your Membership

Apply Online at  
[www.nakpehe.org](http://www.nakpehe.org)

NAKPEHE membership entitles you to four issues of *Quest*, one of which features the *Academy Papers*, and three issues of the *Chronicle of Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education* per year, and to member rates for the annual conference. Please complete this form and return it to the address listed. **Or apply online at [www.nakpehe.org](http://www.nakpehe.org).**

What are your special interests? Check no more than three.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adapted                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Dance                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administration            | <input type="checkbox"/> History                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Anatomical Kinesiology    | <input type="checkbox"/> Measurement & Evaluation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Anthropology of Play      | <input type="checkbox"/> Motor Development        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Athletic Training         | <input type="checkbox"/> Motor Learning/Control   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Instruction         | <input type="checkbox"/> Pedagogy                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biomechanics              | <input type="checkbox"/> Philosophy               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coaching                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Physiology of Exercise   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comparative/International | <input type="checkbox"/> Psychology               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum                | <input type="checkbox"/> Sociology                |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Sport Management         |

## Rank

- ☐ Instructor  
☐ Assistant professor  
☐ Associate professor  
☐ Full professor  
☐ Other\_\_\_\_\_

## Institution

- ☐ 4 yr. college/university  
☐ Jr./community college  
☐ Other\_\_\_\_\_

Name\_\_\_\_\_

Address\_\_\_\_\_

City, State, Zip, Country\_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ U.S. Faculty \$80  
☐ International Faculty \$80 (includes mailing)  
☐ Emeritus (all publications) \$45  
☐ Emeritus (*Chronicle* only) \$15  
☐ Graduate Students \$30  
☐ Concurrent AAKPE membership \$30  
☐ Sustaining Member \$85  
☐ Tax deductible contribution to NAKPEHE \$\_\_\_\_\_

Mail checks, payable to NAKPEHE, and this form to:

NAKPEHE c/o Ginny Overdorf  
Department of Exercise and Movement Sciences  
William Paterson University  
300 Pompton Road  
Wayne, NJ 07470

(Canadian and other foreign members must use a money order or check imprinted "U.S. Funds.")



## NAKPEHE Leadership Roster, 2010-2011

**CKPEHE Editor:** Shane Frehlich, California State University, Northridge

### Associate Editors

Leadership in KPE Higher Education: Greg Letter, Adelphi U.

Current Issues: Sam Hodge, Ohio State U.

Best Practice in Teaching and Learning: Mel Finkenberg, Stephen F. Austin State U.

New KPE Professionals: Camille O'Bryant, California Polytechnic State U.

In Memoriam: Deborah Buswell, Stephen F. Austin State U.

Scholarly Publications: Deborah Buswell, Stephen F. Austin State U.

International: Mary Hums, Univ of Louisville

Research Digest: Bob Pangrazi

**President:** Michael Metzler, Georgia State University [mmetzler@gsu.edu](mailto:mmetzler@gsu.edu)

**President-Elect:** Beverly Mitchell, Kennesaw State University [bmitchel@kennesaw.edu](mailto:bmitchel@kennesaw.edu)

**Past President:** Leah Holland Fiorentino, Univ. of North Carolina – Pembroke [leah.fiorentino@uncp.edu](mailto:leah.fiorentino@uncp.edu)

**Vice President:** Richard Oates, North Georgia College & State University [roates@ngcsu.edu](mailto:roates@ngcsu.edu)

**Vice President-Elect:** Valerie Wayda, West Virginia University [valerie.wayda@mail.wvu.edu](mailto:valerie.wayda@mail.wvu.edu)

**Executive Director:** Ginny Overdorf, William Paterson University [NAKPEHEED@gmail.com](mailto:NAKPEHEED@gmail.com)

**Secretary:** David Claxton, Western Carolina University [claxton@email.wcu.edu](mailto:claxton@email.wcu.edu)

**Parliamentarian:** Mel E. Finkenberg, Stephen F Austin University [mfinkenberg@sfasu.edu](mailto:mfinkenberg@sfasu.edu)

**Necrologist:** Anne Stewart Corpus Christi, TX [emlean@gmail.com](mailto:emlean@gmail.com)

**Archivist:** Richard Swanson, Greensboro, NC [ldswanson@triad.rr.com](mailto:ldswanson@triad.rr.com)

### Committee Chairs:

**Bylaws:** Betty Block, Adams State College [bettyannie@stjoelive.com](mailto:bettyannie@stjoelive.com)

**Foundations:** Ron Feingold, Adelphi University [feingold@adelphi.edu](mailto:feingold@adelphi.edu)

**Future Directions:** Andrew Hawkins, West Virginia University [andrew.hawkins@mail.wvu.edu](mailto:andrew.hawkins@mail.wvu.edu)

**Membership Services:** Camille O'Bryant, California Polytechnic State University [cobryant@calpoly.edu](mailto:cobryant@calpoly.edu)

**Publications:** John Massengale, Las Vegas, NV [john.massengale@cox.net](mailto:john.massengale@cox.net)

### Membership Services Sub-Committee Chairs:

**Awards:** Cathy Buell, San Jose, Ca. 95192-0077 [cmbuell@email.sjsu.edu](mailto:cmbuell@email.sjsu.edu)

**Membership:** Gibson F. Darden, Coastal Carolina University [gfdarden@coastal.edu](mailto:gfdarden@coastal.edu)

**Nominations & Elections:** Dennis Docheff, University of Central Missouri [doshceff@ucmo.edu](mailto:doshceff@ucmo.edu)

**Public Affairs:** Vanessa Fiaud, William Paterson University [vfiaud@gmail.com](mailto:vfiaud@gmail.com)

**Social Justice & Cultural Diversity:** Anna Marie Frank, DePaul University [afrank@depaul.edu](mailto:afrank@depaul.edu)

**Technology:** Robert McKethan, Appalachian State University [mckethanrn@appstate.edu](mailto:mckethanrn@appstate.edu)

## Nominations for NAKPEHE Leadership Positions

### NAKPEHE Needs You!

Nominations for 2011 NAKPEHE leadership positions are requested from the membership. The Nominations and Elections Committee is currently seeking candidates for the following offices: President-Elect (male), Vice-President-Elect (male), and Secretary (male or female). If you are interested in serving or would like to suggest someone to the committee, please notify Dennis Docheff at [docheff@ucmo.edu](mailto:docheff@ucmo.edu). ■


# Funding for NAKPEHE Special Projects

One of the responsibilities of the Foundations Committee is to oversee the spending of all endowed funds. There is interest money available in NAKPEHE's endowed funds to be used for special projects to further the goals of NAKPEHE. These are also projects that would not fall under the operating budget of NAKPEHE.

Requests for special projects should be submitted by July 1st or November 1st of each year to the Chair of the Foundations Committee (FC). The FC, if possible, will make their decisions via e-mail. So there should be a short turnaround in the decision-making process.

Project requests should include:

1. Person(s) submitting request, address, phone, e-mail
  2. Title and description of project
  3. Itemized cost of project
  4. Timeline for completion of project
  5. Proposed benefits to NAKPEHE
- \_\_\_\_ Request Advance \_\_\_\_ Request Reimbursement \_\_\_\_ Other

For 2011 requests, submit your proposal to: Judy Bischoff ([jbischof@niu.edu](mailto:jbischof@niu.edu)) or 1891 N. Via Carrizal, Green Valley, AZ 85614 before May 15th and after October 15th. Between those two dates, send to 854 Sandpiper Shores Rd., Coolin, ID 83821. 

*Publisher:*  
Rainer Martens

*Journals Division Director:*  
Greg Reed

*Chronicle Managing Editor:*  
Jeff King

*Graphic Designer:*  
Kim McFarland



**Human Kinetics**  
P.O. Box 5076  
Champaign, IL USA 61825-5076  
[www.HumanKinetics.com](http://www.HumanKinetics.com)