I am looking forward to working as president of the National Academy of Kinesiology during this 2015-2016 year. We have already had a phone Executive Committee meeting since our Philadelphia September Academy meeting. Your fellow committee representatives are working on several fronts as outlined at the recent business meeting, including Cathy Ennis on the planning of our fall 2016 Albuquerque meeting.

My message today is simple and direct but very important. It focuses on the fundamental issue of fellow engagement in the academy. In recent years we have extended the limit on the number of fellows of the academy and sought ways to enhance the attendance at the annual meeting. I have long been concerned that even more progress in these areas is desirable for the academy to realize its potential.

Following are data that speak to what may be the central issue of fellow engagement in the academy (thanks to Kim Scott for pulling these together). Data are provided for the past 5 years in the following categories: number of active fellows, number of attendees at the annual meeting, nomination of new fellows and the home institution connection, and the number of fellows who voted in the new fellow election. I believe that at best they show that the academy does not fulfill its potential on the very important membership and engagement dimension, and at worst we are not a very vibrant group.

I present the position that we need to work harder to recruit leading scholars from our field of study who have the qualities to foster the long-held academic and
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leadership goals of the academy. As we approach the upcoming call for new fellows, this is a good time for all of us to think about ways that we can contribute to this important function of the academy. More generally, I hope that we will all enhance our efforts to play an active role in the activities of the academy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of active fellows (limit set at 165):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attendance at Annual Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Emeritus</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of nominations of new fellows where the lead nominator was from the same institution as the nominee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of nominees</th>
<th>From same institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of fellows who voted in the new fellow election:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of fellows</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>69/158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>97/154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>67/137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>81/145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>78/141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Plans for the 2016 Annual Meeting in Albuquerque

By Cathy Ennis, NAK Past-President

Program planning for the 2016 annual meeting is well under way. Because we scheduled the upcoming NAK 2016 meeting to coincide with the Albuquerque Balloon Festival October 6 to 8, I am adjusting the traditional annual meeting schedule to permit us to attend the Mass Balloon Ascension Saturday morning, October 8. We will return to our hotel about 10:00 a.m. and begin our first Saturday morning NAK session shortly thereafter. I also encourage you to attend the Afterglow and Fireworks Show Friday evening, October 7. Kim Scott will provide information for these events in the Annual Meeting packet you will receive over the summer.

If you attended the 2015 NAK meeting in Philadelphia, you know that the theme for the 2016 program is Frontiers in Kinesiology. My sincere thanks to this year’s program committee, Li Li Ji, Karl Newell, Dave Perrin, Debbie Rose, and Alison Wrynn, for their enthusiastic assistance in identifying cutting-edge frontiers and speakers. I anticipate we will have four or five major sessions, each focused on a different theme. One theme that seems to be particularly timely examines issues surrounding the frontier: preventing sudden death in sport. We are identifying leading scholars who are using innovative technologies and methodologies to treat heat illnesses, cardiovascular events, and concussions. In our efforts to look at this controversial topic from different perspectives, we also hope to invite a critical scholar to examine ethical issues surrounding sport injuries.

The program committee also is considering innovative research in a second frontier titled Enhancing Human Performance. Although this frontier is just taking shape in our committee, I anticipate speakers from a range of disciplines weighing in on topics such as the use of robotics and prosthetics to enhance locomotion for individuals with disabilities. Other topics vying for inclusion in this session are the role of epigenetics in performance, cell signaling, and scientific and ethical issues associated with high-intensity exercise, dose, and dietary supplements.

The theme of Frontiers in Kinesiology is providing a bountiful source of topics and innovations breaking ground in our field. Committee members have proposed additional frontiers in transformative educational initiatives and exercise and brain health. Additionally, sociocultural frontiers such as those examining the significance of sport and physical activity in social movements and activism and sport marketing and consumer practices are among those receiving consideration as the 2016 program takes shape. I hope you will be able to join us in Albuquerque in October for a stimulating program with a festive backdrop.
It is truly an honor to serve as president-elect of the National Academy of Kinesiology. Since my induction as fellow #447 in 2003 I have looked forward to not only attending the annual meetings but also serving the academy in a variety of different ways. I have always viewed the yearly meetings as invaluable opportunities to step out of my subdisciplinary cocoon and broaden my intellectual perspective by hearing scholars from other subdisciplines in kinesiology as well as other disciplines address the chosen theme of the conference from their academic perspective. I always leave the meeting inspired by what I have learned and eager to share the many new ideas I have acquired with my colleagues when I return to my home department. I have always valued the interdisciplinary nature of our discipline and feel blessed to have received a well-rounded graduate education during my doctoral years at Penn State University. I had the privilege to learn from and be mentored by top scholars such as Bob Christina, John Shea, Dorothy Harris, Peter Cavanagh, and John Lucas, many of whom were already members of the academy. As a scientific discipline I believe that we have the collective expertise needed for finding solutions to complex issues that threaten the health and well-being of the citizens of this country and around the globe. And through the interdisciplinary curriculum that we currently provide to a rapidly growing student body, we are preparing future professionals to directly apply their knowledge of human movement and physical activity in a variety of practice arenas.

Serving the academy in a variety of ways over the years has also enriched my experience as a fellow. Not only have I had an opportunity to work alongside and learn from fellows who are rock stars in the field, but I have also had the opportunity to assume important leadership roles and participate in decisions that have historical importance for the academy. One particularly memorable experience I had was as chair of the ad hoc Future Directions Committee in 2010. The president at the time, Dr. Roberta Rikli, charged the committee with re-examining the organizational mission, structure, and function of the academy. A major recommendation from the committee was to modify the definition of kinesiology and, in so doing, change the name of the academy from the American Academy of Kinesiology and Physical Education to the American Academy of Kinesiology (amended to the National Academy of Kinesiology after further discussion). Standing in front of the annual business meeting at that year’s meeting to present the rationale and recommendation for the name change, on behalf of the committee, was both an exciting and anxiety-inducing experience. It was a meeting with much historical significance for the academy and one in which I was proud to actively participate. I look forward to working with my esteemed fellows in this new leadership role to advance the mission of the academy and broaden its visibility and...
The National Academy of Kinesiology Is Growing Older and Better!

reach beyond the scientific community.

As president-elect I have the responsibility of chairing the Standing Committee on Nominations and Election of Officers in the coming year. Both myself and the members of this important committee (Don Morgan, Jennifer Etnier, Peter Hastie, Marilyn Mitchell, Nancy Williams, and Jeff McCubbin) look forward to receiving fellow nominations, for the positions of president-elect, secretary-treasurer, and member at large. Please send your nominations to any one of the committee members or me by February 1, 2016. In closing, I thank you for the confidence you have placed in me to lead this prestigious organization. I look forward to advancing the academy’s mission as many of my esteemed colleagues have done during their tenure as president of the National Academy of Kinesiology. I also look forward to seeing you all at next year’s annual meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico. It promises to be another wonderful program under the masterful leadership of our past president, Cathy Ennis.

**IMPORTANT DATES**

**February 1, 2016**
New Fellow nomination deadline
Nomination forms can be found on the [Website](#)

**March 1, 2016**
Hetherington Award Nomination deadline
Email nominations to Jill Whitall at jwhitall@som.umaryland.edu

**October 6-8, 2016**
2016 Annual Meeting
Albuquerque, NM during the Annual Balloon Fiesta
New Fellows

Damon Andrew is dean and the E.B. “Ted” Robert Endowed Professor in the College of Human Sciences and Education at Louisiana State University. He is also a tenured professor in the School of Kinesiology. He is a productive scholar in sport management with special interest in leadership in sport; the attraction of sport to participants, spectators, sponsors, employees, and stakeholders; and the effective integration of individuals with disabilities into the sporting environment. Dr. Andrew’s examination of organizational behavior, human resource management, and consumer behavior has led to a series of studies on the topics around the antecedents of critical organizational outcomes, such as employee satisfaction, motivation, and commitment. This work has focused on U.S. national governing body presidents and executive directors, NBA ticket sales employees, MLB spectators, PGA and LPGA tournament volunteers, minor league ice hockey spectators, athletic directors in all division levels of the NCAA, individual and team sport athletes, head and assistant coaches, NCAA Division I football and basketball spectators, sport participants with disabilities, and sport management faculty. He has coauthored a book on research methods in which he is also the coauthor of 11 chapters, has over 120 peer-reviewed articles in scientific journals and book chapters, and has secured more than $2,500,000 in extramural funding. He has given more than 80 presentations at national and international conferences. Dr. Andrew has demonstrated competent leadership for professional organizations, serves on several editorial boards, reviewed for a broad range of top-tier journals, served on many committees, and has an impressive record of involvement in conference presentations related to his scholarship.

Dr. Ketra L. Armstrong is the associate dean of graduate programs and faculty affairs and professor of sport management in the School of Kinesiology and an affiliate faculty in the departments of Afroamerican and African studies and women’s studies at the University of Michigan. Before coming to UM, Dr. Armstrong was director and professor of the graduate program in sport management at California State University at Long Beach and was an assistant and associate professor of sport management at Ohio State University. Her scholarship converges on the topics of race, gender, and social psychology of sport and leisure consumption and the management thereof. She has received several research awards and is a research fellow in the North American Society for Sport Management. Dr. Armstrong is a former NCAA Division I scholarship student-athlete, coach, and athletic administrator. She is a member of...
Carol Ewing Garber is a professor of movement sciences and education at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her research has focused on applied exercise physiology and recently more narrowly on physical activity and health. She has been a productive researcher, having published nearly 70 peer-reviewed original research articles and more than 30 reviews, chapters, and books. She was the lead author of the widely cited American College of Sports Medicine position paper titled “Quantity and Quality of Exercise for developing and Maintaining Cardiorespiratory, Musculoskeletal, and Neuromotor Fitness in Apparently Healthy Adults: Guidelines for Prescribing Exercise.”

Dr. Garber has been a Fulbright Senior Specialist and received the Healthy People 2000 Award from the American College of Sports Medicine. She is a fellow of both the American College of Sports Medicine and the American Heart Association.

Professor Garber has provided exceptional service to the profession. She is the immediate past president of the American New Fellows

the NCAA Gender Equity Task Force and was vice president of the NCAA Scholarly Colloquium, president of the National Association for Girls and Women in Sport, board member of the National Women’s Hall of Fame, and member of the prestigious Wade Trophy Selection Committee. She was the narrator and co-executive producer of the DVD Title IX: Implications for Women in Sport and Education and is the faculty advisor for the UM Student Chapter of the Association for Women in Sport Media (voted 2014 National Chapter of the Year). Dr. Armstrong received the 2014 UM Harold L. Johnson Diversity Service Award and the 2015 Charles D. Henry Award from SHAPE America.

Dr. Daniel P. Ferris is a professor of movement science in the School of Kinesiology and a professor of biomedical engineering in the College of Engineering at the University of Michigan. Dr. Ferris has an educational background including mathematics, exercise physiology, biomechanics, neuroscience, and biomedical engineering. Since joining UM in 2001, Dr. Ferris has published more than 65 research papers impacting kinesiology, biology, engineering, and clinical medicine. He is widely acknowledged as an international expert in rehabilitation robotics. Dr. Ferris is a sought-after speaker with more than 120 international, national, and local presentations of his research. Dr. Ferris has demonstrated strong success at securing peer-reviewed funding for his research, with more than $6 million in grants and contracts over the last 15 years as a faculty member. Dr. Ferris has a top-caliber record as an educator and mentor. He is a dedicated and highly effective educator for students in biomechanics—the vast majority of students rate him as excellent in their instructor evaluations. In the School of Kinesiology at UM, Dr. Ferris has served as graduate program chair and as associate dean for research. He also has served on numerous university committees at UM, including the Provost’s Faculty Advisory Committee, the Responsible Conduct for Research and Scholarship Task Force, the Global Health Visioning Committee, and the Administrative Services Transformation Advisory Committee.
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College of Sports Medicine, an organization in which she has served in many capacities both at the regional and national levels. She was a reviewer for many scholarly journals and served on numerous study sections for groups including the United Kingdom National Health Service and the National Institutes of Health.

Carol Ewing Garber is a distinguished scholar, a visible and active leader, and a first-rate professional.

Dr. Charles H. Hillman is a professor of kinesiology and community health at the University of Illinois where he is director of the Neurocognitive Kinesiology Laboratory and holds numerous appointments in the departments of psychology and internal medicine, the Beckman Institute, the neuroscience program, and the Division of Nutritional Sciences. Professor Hillman has established himself as an internationally recognized expert and leader in the investigation of exercise-related influences on the brain and cognitive function through the employment of neuroimaging techniques such as electroencephalography (EEG) and event-related brain potentials (ERPs) as well structural and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). His work is focused on the impact of exercise on brain function in children as related to cognitive development, brain maturation, and the effects of physical activity on health status as well as the facilitation of executive function and academic achievement. Professor Hillman has published more than 120 articles in peer-reviewed journals and nine book chapters; he has also coedited a book and delivered 79 invited lectures. He serves on editorial boards and as a reviewer for numerous academic journals. His work has consistently appeared in the most respected journals on neuroscience, aging, and exercise science. He has been highly successful in funding his laboratory and providing support for his graduate students with the procurement of more than $8 million as a PI or co-PI while collaborating on another $18 million in funded projects from federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health. Dr. Hillman’s record clearly reveals that he is highly recognized for his scholarly contributions and that he is a dedicated professional who is qualified to serve and further the goals of the academy.

Professor Monica Lounsbery, vice provost for faculty affairs and institutional analysis at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, has amassed an outstanding scholarship and service record. She is one of the most active scholars in our field related to policy research, especially in schools.

For over half her academic career she has been a university administrator, first as the founding chair of the department of sports education leadership at UNLV and now in her fourth year at the executive level. In addition to administrative duties and other leadership roles, she remains active as a researcher and public health advocate and is a UNLV Lincy Institute fellow and the director of the UNLV Physical Activity Policy Research Program.

Her initial research was in physical education teacher education, but it now focuses on physical activity as it relates to policy and health.
Dr. Nathan McCaughtry is a professor and assistant dean (chair) for the Division of Kinesiology, Health and Sport Studies at Wayne State University. He is a prolific pedagogy researcher with more than 70 peer-reviewed publications in a variety of top-tier journals as well as 8 book chapters.

Nate is an internationally renowned scholar known for his work in sociocultural issues in physical education and urban school wellness program reform. In particular, his work understanding the emotional dimensions of teacher change has brought critical and acclaimed attention to the need to understand more than just a teacher’s knowledge base when understanding a change program and what does and does not happen.

Notably, Nate has received over $7 million to support his work in urban schools and communities. He has received several writing awards and held several leadership roles in our field, including chair of the Curriculum Instruction Academy of SHAPE America and chair of the Research on Learning and Instruction in Physical Education Special Interest Group of AERA. Nate is also the founding codirector of Wayne State University’s Center for School Health (CSH), which has been developing and promoting healthier schools throughout Michigan since 2010. Through the center’s efforts, more than 500 schools have been able to provide health behavior change programs to improve student physical activity, nutrition, and wellness knowledge and behaviors.

Dr. Catrine Tudor-Locke is a professor and chair of the Department of Kinesiology at the University of Massachusetts. She recently relocated from the Pennington Biomedical Research Center where she was an associate professor and director of the Walking Behavior Laboratory. A native of Canada, Dr. Tudor-Locke completed her PhD at the University of Waterloo and a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of South Carolina.

Dr. Tudor-Locke is an international expert in the measurement of walking using pedometers to determine physical activity lev-
New Fellows

Dr. Sara Wilcox is a professor in the exercise science department at the University of South Carolina where she directs the CDC-funded USC Prevention Research Center.

Her research foci is in the translation, dissemination, and implementation of evidence-based health behavior change programs into community settings related to physical activity and healthy eating in diverse minority populations.
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Phillip Ward is a Professor in the Department of Human Sciences, Kinesiology and Physical Education at Ohio State University. Since 1993, Dr. Ward has amassed a stellar record of research and scholarship by establishing several key lines of research. Examples include his first-rate work linking various accountability strategies with indicators of student learning, his extensive work in continuing professional development for urban physical education professionals, and his groundbreaking work on the nature and development of physical educators’ content knowledge. He has authored more than 70 refereed research papers in premier national and international sport pedagogy and professional journals, 2 books, and 9 book chapters. He has made more than 68 national and international presentations. He has amassed over $3 million in external research funding and over $130,000 to support instructional efforts in his PETE program. He has mentored 10 doctoral students.

Dr. Ward’s service record is equally impressive, as evidenced by his sustained engagement with prestigious research journals as reviewer or coeditor and serving as school district–level consultant both in the United States and abroad. Across all levels of his field and within his own university, he has provided extensive service through his work on numerous committees and task forces.

Dr. Ward has received honors and awards from several professional societies for his contributions to sport pedagogy and PETE. In closing, Dr. Phillip Ward is a recognized national and international authority in the sport pedagogy and PETE community.

Phillip Ward

Sara Wilcox

Dr. Phillip Ward is a recognized national and international authority in the sport pedagogy and PETE community.
Since 2009 Dr. Wilcox has received in excess of $20 million in grant funding as a PI and co-PI. Regarded as a researcher who makes a difference, Dr. Wilcox received the 2003 Faith-Based Award from the South Carolina Governor’s Council on Physical Fitness for her research in African American churches.

Dr. Wilcox has published 160 peer-reviewed articles, 8 book chapters, and 3 nonrefereed publications and reports. According to Google Scholar, her publication metrics are as follows: H-index = 41; citations to her work = 6,689; citations/year = 352. She has been the consulting editor for *Health Psychology*, served on the editorial board for *Psychology and Aging* and the *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, and was the associate editor for *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*.

Dr. Wilcox is a fellow in the ACSM and a member of Delta Omega, the public health honor society. She has received numerous awards, including the ACSM Paffenbarger Research Award and the USC Educational Foundation Faculty Research Award and was named by her provost to represent the university as the 2014-15 Southeastern Conference Academic Leadership program fellow. She teaches courses in behavioral aspects of physical activity and has chaired 12 doctoral dissertation committees. Dr. Wilcox is a scholar in the broad area we define as kinesiology.

**International Fellows**

Dr. Peijie Chen is professor of exercise physiology and president of Shanghai University of Sport in China. He completed his undergraduate studies at Wenzhou University of Medicine and earned a master's degree at Shanghai University of Sport, PhD at East China Normal University, and postdoctoral training at Japan National Institute of Fitness and Sport. Dr. Chen is known for his focused research on the relationship between exercise load and immunity and neuroendocrine responses. He also is known for addressing population-based health problems resulting from unhealthy diet and physical inactivity in China. Dr. Chen has published 280 research articles in Chinese and international scientific journals, including *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity; Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport; European Journal of Applied Physiology; Life Sciences; Journal of Sport Science of China; and Chinese Journal of Sport Medicine*. His research has been supported by large competitive grants from the Chinese Central Government and Shanghai Municipal Government. He is also a recipient of the Outstanding Young Scientist Award by the Chinese Central Government, Outstanding Teacher Award in Higher Education by the Ministry of Education, Model Worker Award by the Shanghai municipal government, and Outstanding Research Award by Hong Kong Fok Ying-Tong Education Foundation. Dr. Chen has been an active leader in professional organizations. He is vice president of the Asian Council of Exercise and Sport Science (ACCESS), vice chairman of the Chinese Association of Sports Medicine (CSSS), and vice chairman of the Chinese Association of Exercise Physiology and Biochemistry (CSSS).
Fellows, colleagues, guests, and friends, it is an honor to present the new fellow's response on behalf of my fellow inductees into the National Academy of Kinesiology’s class of 2015. After we have become better acquainted with this year’s class during the past few days, two collective aspects of our group have become most obvious.

First, we each have prominent individuals in our lives—family members, mentors, teachers, colleagues, and friends—who have believed in us, supported us, and invested in our futures. Collectively, they have given us the opportunity to vigorously pursue our scholarly passions. We realize this privilege is not afforded to everyone, and we are most grateful for their support and encouragement.

Second, the class of 2015 is very diverse. Among us, we study biomechanics, exercise physiology, exercise psychology, health behavior, pedagogy, physical activity policy, and sport management. In addition to our scholarship, we have served our profession as journal editors, associate editors, editorial board members, academic conference coordinators and reviewers, elected officials in scholarly organizations, academic program coordinators, center directors, department chairs, assistant deans, associate deans, deans, and vice provosts. Undoubtedly, we are stronger together as a group, much like the various subdisciplines of kinesiology that we represent.

The latter is an important lesson I learned while studying biomechanics as a graduate student at the University of Florida. For the better part of three years around the turn of the century, I spent most of my life studying the biomechanical properties of a tennis ball—not your standard-issue tennis ball, mind you. I studied a new oversized tennis ball that was developed to be 6% larger than a standard-sized tennis ball in the hopes that the increased air resistance would slow down the pace of the game. On the heels of Goran Ivanisevic’s dominating performance at the 2001 Wimbledon Championships, where over 40% of his first serves resulted in aces and he won...
86% of his first-serve points, tennis officials convinced equipment manufacturers that the sport needed to slow down and that the best responsive option was to develop and manufacture oversized tennis balls. After millions of dollars were invested in research and development, new ball molds, and manufacturing equipment, and even new ball cans and boxes to deliver these new oversized tennis balls, the balls finally made their way to retail shelves and were met with an overwhelmingly silent consumer response. As tennis officials and equipment manufacturers tried to figure out what went wrong, *Tennis* magazine published a survey that noted 22% of the magazine’s playtesters had voiced concerns about the long-range impact the ball might have on their arms.

Armed with a narrow biomechanical focus and a research grant from the United States Tennis Association (USTA), my colleagues and I at the University of Florida designed a study to examine the effect of ball size on racket vibration, muscular activation at ball impact, and reaction time of the volley of novice and intermediate tennis players using both standard and oversized tennis balls. Using EMG, a uniaxial accelerometer, a photogate strapped to a tennis ball machine, and a Peak Motus system, our results suggested that oversized tennis balls would not cause an increased load to the hitting arm while executing a tennis volley, and we published our work and the USTA advertised it so that consumers would feel more comfortable using the oversized balls. The cash registers remained silent, however, prompting Kevin Kempin, then vice president of marketing for the ball manufacturer Penn, to conclude, “The oversized ball has been a flop—unfortunately—in terms of sales.” To this day, the commercial failure of the oversized tennis ball remains one of the largest financial losses in the history of sport equipment manufacturing.

Why did the oversized tennis ball fail? Shortly after I finished my biomechanical analysis of the oversized tennis ball, my research interests shifted into the area of sport management, and I quickly learned potential reasons for the commercial failure of the oversized tennis ball.

First, the product suffered from a poor marketing plan. There was no consumer buy-in or perceived need for oversized tennis balls. While it may have been true that the professional game of tennis needed to be slowed down, recreational tennis players liked to hit the ball hard. Often equipped with the racket endorsed by their favorite player, recreational players hoped to hit a shot or two of professional quality during their tennis outings, and slower tennis balls hampered that possibility. Further, the oversized balls were never approved for recreational tournament play, rendering the balls useless to the more competitive recreational players who purchase the highest quantities of tennis balls. Moreover, there was no support from the professional level of the game, and in a sport where consumers had been trained to purchase exactly what the pros used or endorsed, the oversized tennis ball was reduced to a trivial experimentation.

Second, the oversized tennis balls suffered from poor product placement and compatibility. The larger tennis ball was not compatible with products such as tennis ball machines or even the ball hoppers that are commonly used to pick up tennis balls. They even failed to fit within the ball pockets sewn into women’s tennis skirts at the time because those pockets could accommodate only a standard-size tennis ball.

So, what is the point of my story? Well, I spent nearly three years of my life trying to use a narrow biomechanical approach to solve a problem for an emerging product that I could have learned was doomed to failure in the first three hours of a sport marketing class. Ultimately in that particular case, the...
sport management rationale trumped the biomechanical explanation, yet there are probably hundreds of other examples in history where the converse was true.

As kinesiology scholars, we must resist the temptation to bury ourselves entirely within our own subdisciplines because the more complex problems in society will require an interdisciplinary approach to be successful. How do we break down these barriers and allow for greater collaboration? We must continue to find ways to bring our various subdiscipline thought leaders together on a regular basis for meaningful collaborative conversations. This should, of course, occur within the individual university setting as often as feasible, but we must also continue to provide the opportunities for even greater discourse at the national and international levels. To this end, the National Academy of Kinesiology is ideally positioned to foster interdisciplinary approaches to complex societal issues.

My colleagues in the NAK class of 2015 understand that fellow status is not something that we fully receive at an induction ceremony—it is something we must earn every day of our professional careers. Likewise, as kinesiology scholars, we must all continue to advance the field via an interdisciplinary approach, and we in the NAK class of 2015 are most humbled and honored to join you in this endeavor.
Dr. Shirl Hoffman is Professor Emeritus of Kinesiology at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) where he was head of the department for 10 years. He has served at all levels of education: elementary physical education teacher, college-level coach, and professor in both research university and liberal arts college settings. He has been published widely on topics related to motor learning and control, qualitative analysis of movement, and sport philosophy, especially sport and religion. Shirl also has been a frequent commentator on problems in kinesiology and higher education. He was the charter executive director of the American Kinesiology Association (AKA) and was the first editor of two AKA publications. As I describe below, Shirl clearly deserves to be recognized with the Hetherington Award for his accomplishments and contributions to the field of Kinesiology and the Academy.

Shirl has been recognized in several important ways during his career. He was named Distinguished Scholar by National Association for Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education (NAKPEHE) in 2001. He was selected to present the Dudley Sargent Lecture to NAKPEHE in 1998, the Alderson Lecture at The University of Texas in 1987, the 1989 Distinguished Lecture at San Diego State University, and has been the featured speaker at a number of Christian colleges. He is former editor of Quest and associate editor of the Chronicle for Physical Education in Higher Education. Finally, the fourth edition of his textbook, *Introduction to Kinesiology* (Human Kinetics, 2013) is recognized as the leading text for orienting students to the discipline of Kinesiology and its diverse professions.

Shirl has made many important contributions at many levels to the field of Kinesiology over an extended period of time. The overall impact of these contributions has been to greatly strengthen the field of Kinesiology. This benefits all of us in the field and it is important for us to recognize those who brought us our due recognition. The Hetherington Award is the fitting way to do that.
**Hetherington Award Acceptance Speech**

**The Unfinished Business of Kinesiology**

*By Shirl J. Hoffman, 2015 Hetherington Award Winner*

I suppose it’s only natural that such an occasion moves one to be reflective. And for that I beg your indulgence. I grew up in a small town in western Pennsylvania where I played high school sports from mid-August to late May. I was an unremarkable student more interested in athletic achievement than academic achievement. I don’t even remember giving a great deal of thought to what I wanted to do with my life, so long as it had something to do with sports. Coaching a high school basketball team, I thought, would be a dream job.

In 1958 as a sophomore physical education major at a small Christian college outside of New York City, I miraculously discovered the joy of learning. What caused this spark to ignite I couldn’t say other than to point to encouragement from a professor named Dagmar Peterson. Peterson embodied, in fact constituted, the entire physical education department. I can’t tell you specifically what she did, but I can tell you that whatever magic she plied, she made me want to learn.

At the end of my senior year I received a phone call from a Dr. Hood, who told me that “they had decided in my favor.” Poor man, I had to ask him who he was and why he was calling me. As it turned out, he was assistant superintendent of the White Plains Public Schools where I had interviewed for a position as an elementary physical education teacher several weeks earlier. I had so thoroughly dismissed the possibility that they would even consider hiring me that I had forgotten his name. A year later and seemingly out of the blue, the athletic director and basketball coach at Westchester Community College asked me to serve as his part-time assistant. Two years later, at age 25, I was appointed head coach of the team. It seemed my dream job had come true far earlier than I had ever imagined.

But ultimately, coaching didn’t quite do it for me. It was great fun and challenging, but it took only two years in the role for me to acknowledge that I missed the excitement, dare I say the thrill, of academic study. I suspect that all of you know what I am talking about—that indescribable love for intellectual challenge, discovery, and self-testing. And I missed the academic culture.

If anyone should be blamed, I suppose it should be Larry Locke, my early mentor at Teachers College, Columbia, who took whatever magic Dagmar Peterson had worked in my undergraduate years and elevated it to the next level.

So I made what for me was a momentous decision. I would abandon coaching and pursue an academic career. “Bad decision,” said the athletic director at the school. “You will live to regret it.” I loved the man but, boy, was he wrong.

My five decades immersed in the discipline of kinesiology, encircled by a fascinating collection of scholars who study and teach it, have been rich beyond my wildest dreams. I have remained a student, and my scholar friends, through their lectures, books, and papers, have been my constant teachers.

I’ve also been blessed with an extraordinarily good life beyond academe. It has been filled with good friends and acquaintances, many of them assembled here in...
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this room tonight. Chief among them is my best friend, the remarkable woman who married me nearly 20 years ago, Claude Mourot. Claude is a retired professor of French who has always endured my quirky work habits and dinner table lectures about things kinesiological with a smile, though now and then I catch her rolling her eyes.

Incidentally, I asked Claude how she thought I should approach this presentation, and she told me not to be witty, charming, or intellectual. “Just be yourself,” she said.

And just when you think life can’t get any better, along comes an award like this. I am truly honored and humbled and undeserving. Thanks to those of you who have made my academic journey such a treat.

One of the prime requirements of the Hetherington is that the recipient be emeritus—that is, formally retired from their university or college position. It is a fitting requirement in that the award honors an entire career, but when you think about it, the word emeritus is tainted with an ominous air of finality. It is the past participle of emerere, which means “to serve out, to complete one’s service.” In the 17th century it referred to veteran soldiers who had served their time or, more literally, finished their work.

Completed their service? Finished their work? I’m not so sure about that. Looking back on a half-century of work has its rewards, but it also can be a humbling experience when we realize just how unfinished our work really is. So many aspirations left unrealized, so many designs left on the professional drawing board.

“Finished our work?” I suspect that many emeritus academy members who have managed to keep a finger or two in the professional pie might say, “Not so fast.” We may no longer have to attend faculty meetings or contend with ornery students or colleagues or complain about erratic heating and air-conditioning systems. We may no longer receive regular paychecks or memos from the dean, but a good many of us have steadfastly heeded the pleadings of poet Dylan Thomas. We have refused to go gently into the night. Quite simply, many who are emeriti feel as I do: We still have a lot of unfinished business to take care of.

Certainly Earle Zeigler, who served as president of this august body in 1981 and received the Hetherington Award 26 years ago, doesn’t consider his business “finished.” After 70 years in the profession and at age 95, he continues to pump out books and pamphlets and pepper his colleagues with e-mails concerning the health of the field.

So I would remind those already emeritized or those facing emeritization (actually, that includes all of you, sooner or later) that separation from your institution doesn’t mean your work is finished. Retirement needn’t stifle your intellectual curiosity. The itch that causes you to ask and seek answers to questions when you are in midcareer will still require scratching after you have broken the formal bonds with your university.

You may find, as did I, that ideas and agendas and opportunities that institutional obligations once made difficult to explore will now be allowed to take center stage. Who knows? Perhaps your best work lies ahead.

At the risk of unfairly forcing an analogy, I would argue that our field of kinesiology also faces some unfinished business. In an era when our departments are experiencing unprecedented enrollments, when the word kinesiology seems to crop up with increasing frequency in the media, and members of the academy are quoted in mainline newspapers and journals, it is tempting to conclude that the discipline has finally arrived, that the business of monitoring, bolstering, nurturing, nudging, even reconceptualizing our field is finished. I don’t think it is.

Like some of you, I was fortunate to have launched my career in the early 1960s and practiced in an era George Sage has called the “most significant decades in the development of kinesiology as a recognized
It was a constellation of events that kick-started the transformation of our field. There was the dismal performance of American kids relative to their European counterparts on the Kraus-Weber tests. In a very short period of time a national spotlight was cast on fitness and physical activity. Shortly thereafter, we were confronted with Franklin Henry’s audacious claim that what we had embraced as a profession could actually be an academic discipline. We witnessed firsthand the impact of Sputnik on science curricula and saw how it intensified interest in the scientific underpinnings of our field. And we responded to former Harvard president James Bryan Conant’s slight in *The Education of American Teachers* that physical education shouldn’t be a graduate-level course by expanding our graduate offerings and planting PhD programs in a dizzying array of specialized fields.

It was a fascinating period. We took seriously our responsibilities as stewards of the young discipline. We redefined the field of study, reorganized curricula, and designed subdisciplines. We demolished longstanding barriers between men’s and women’s departments and engineered the founding of most of our specialized academic organizations. We oversaw a remarkable flourishing of research about physical activity. We lobbied deans and provosts.

We knew the path to something even close to what Henry had envisioned wouldn’t be easy. We took time to contemplate seriously what it meant for the field to be conceived as a discipline. We staked out our intellectual territories and agreed and disagreed in early issues of *Quest*. What is a discipline? If physical education is a discipline, how should it be conceptualized? What should be its focus? Should it be movement? Exercise? Sport? Should it be physical activity? What difference does it make? How might we mold disparate parts of the field into what we, with a straight face, could call a unified discipline?

And what should we call it? We started with the art and science of human movement and soon decided that art was somebody else’s concern and that movement was far too broad a concept around which to craft a discipline.

We debated, at length and frequently with some heat, the question of whether our field should be organized as a discipline or as a profession and grudgingly came to appreciate the distinctive academic cultures underlying each. It is an important question that we have stopped asking, but the issue is just as alive in departments today as it was in the ’70s.

It was hard work and great fun. But we made mistakes. Our notion that the new discipline should be defined by subdisciplines was ill-founded. As a result the initial dream of a fully integrated discipline never came about. We all were having so much fun supporting and extending our specialized fields that we rarely stepped back to look at the big picture. Once the new discipline began to roll, we ignored suggestions from Scott Kretchmar and Larry Locke and Daryl Siedentop and Karl Newell and Hal Lawson and others that we should do a better job of minding the store. To put it in inimitable Lawsonian terms, “Our subdisciplinary tribes forgot that we must actively steward the whole in tandem with our respective subdisciplinary parts.”

There is a lot of unfinished business. For example, confusion still reigns over the label kinesiology. While most departments with doctoral programs have adopted the term as at least a partial label, many still don’t. Those who attended this event three years ago to hear Hetherington awardee Tip
Tipton’s presentation will realize that some have never stopped believing—earnestly believing—that physical education is the label that should be applied.

A doctoral program in my home state still calls itself the department of exercise and sport science, a label I favored until Karl Newell showed me the light. Does it make any difference? Is exercise and sport science interchangeable with kinesiology? I don’t think so. With apologies to Shakespeare, a kinesiology by any other name would not smell quite as sweet.

Anyone can be forgiven for being confused about this. Search for kinesiology on the Internet and you are likely to run into several varieties of kinesiology, including dental kinesiology and spiritual kinesiology. A few years ago a chiropractic-related muscle testing practice called applied kinesiology attempted unsuccessfully to copyright the label kinesiology. They have told me that they were successful in copyrighting the label applied kinesiology.

Want to know what kinesiology is? Consult the Oxford English Dictionary, which notes that kinesiology involves “the evaluation and treatment of muscular imbalance or derangement.” Doesn’t it seem that, if after 50-plus years the major lexicographers still do not know how to accurately define our field, a lot of work remains to be done?

Another piece of unfinished business is to reach agreement on the standard core of knowledge that lies at the heart of kinesiology. At present and judging from the variety of curricula offered under its name, kinesiology has a multitude of faces, pretty much whatever collection of courses a department decides to assemble under its banner. Perhaps older, more mature disciplines can get away with such ambiguity, but I think that fields of study like kinesiology, still in their formative stages, do so at their own peril.

Let me say that I applaud the American Kinesiology Association’s efforts to draft a core of knowledge and competencies—in fact, I was involved in the process—but I honestly wonder if the association’s decision to leave the interpretation of the core components up to individual departments and to not back up its recommendations with a plan for political enforcement (aka accreditation) will have any effect in clarifying exactly what body of knowledge kinesiologists should possess.

Like others who have written before me, I worry about the splintering of our field into subdisciplines. No doubt this has been a boon to the research enterprise; on the other hand it has risked blurring our disciplinary boundaries. How so?

Consider a sport sociologist with training in kinesiology who conducts cross-disciplinary research with a sociologist. What is the added value a sociological kinesiologist brings to the project? Is there a kinesiological sociology that is somehow different from traditional sociology? In a similar vein, what boundary separates the biomechanics offered in a kinesiology department from biomechanics proper? The disciplinary boundaries of kinesiology, if they exist at all, are in desperate need of clarification.

I sometimes wonder if we haven’t advanced the discipline qua discipline all that far from where we were in the 1970s. From where I’ve been watching, kinesiology seems little more than the sum of an assortment of subdisciplines. I struggle to identify a unifying thread.

So gripped are we by subdiscipline fever that we self-identify not as kinesiologists but as sport historians, sport psychologists, motor development specialists, or some other “-ist” tagged onto traditional disciplines, which, I’m left to presume, we consider to be more prestigious.
not to wonder if our failure to self-identify with our discipline points to some serious cracks in our superstructure.

Like you, I often resort to the term subdiscipline to define our field, but it has always perplexed me. By definition, a subdiscipline is subject to some larger discipline. We tend to assume the larger discipline to which our areas of specialization are "sub" is kinesiology. Not really. Isn’t our very use of the term parent disciplines an admission that each of the subdisciplines is an offspring not of kinesiological parents but of some other parents—the traditional disciplines?

In fact, I sometimes wonder if we have the ammunition to back up our claims that kinesiology is indeed a discipline. A discipline has its unique theories, models, and methods, but I struggle to identify a kinesiological theory, a kinesiological model, or a kinesiological method. All seem derived—maybe shanghaied is a better word for it—from traditional disciplines. What might an authentic subdiscipline of kinesiology look like? When we are able to answer that question, we will have moved to a closer understanding of what an authentic discipline of kinesiology looks like.

Time doesn’t permit me to explore in depth some other pieces of unfinished business facing us. I might ask whether a discipline has a long-term future when it has come to depend on a massive influx of students who have only a marginal interest in kinesiology and whose career aspirations are for another field.

I could point to our reluctance to flex our political muscles to ensure a monopoly on preparing fitness leaders and personal trainers. Next week Washington, DC, city council will vote on new standards governing personal trainers. That the city has asked the Board of Physical Therapy and not any of our organizations to develop the rules may tell us more than we care to know about our political strength.

It’s worth remembering that academic strength and political strength draw their waters from different wells. Lest I impress you as being hopelessly jaded about the future of kinesiology, let me assure you that I’m not. In fact, I’m genuinely optimistic, but it isn’t a blind optimism. The future of any discipline is never assured. Young ones, like ours, are especially vulnerable to the whims of social preference, administrative mind-sets, market conditions, and political winds that blow both inside and beyond the university. Only the naïve professor would imagine that his or her chosen field of study is impervious to such forces and that he or she can turn a blind eye to developments that sooner or later might impact the vitality of their academic field.

Defense, some say, is a good offense. Not so on the academic battlefield where waiting to react to outside forces virtually ensures that you will be too late to protect your flanks. As I say this, our colleagues in the humanities, entrenched in the university far longer than we have been, are hustling to preserve their doctoral programs. Professors of French are confronting substantial declines unimaginable even 15 years ago. I suspect 20 years ago, it would have been hard to convince librarians that library science would fall on hard times. The air of uncertainty clouding not just our field but the entire higher education enterprise is a constant reminder that our business isn’t finished.

In closing I would remind you that stewardship—vitalizing and revitalizing the discipline—is our social, dare I say moral, obligation. Kinesiology is our collective intellectual offspring. It demands and deserves the same fierce commitment that parents pledge to their children, because like parents, we are responsible for bringing it into the world, for guiding it and protecting it. And like good parents, we need to do it wisely and with a great deal of tender loving care.
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CIP Codes and How They Are Used in Kinesiology

By Jerry R. Thomas, Dean, College of Education, University of North Texas

The National Academy of Kinesiology and the American Kinesiology Association have appointed a joint committee to evaluate CIP codes (Classification of Instructional Programs) in kinesiology and how they influence our activities and funding. As a member of the committee, I was asked to prepare a short paper about what the committee will do. This first item is to understand CIP codes and their use in colleges and universities.

CIP codes were developed by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Educational Statistics in 1980 with revisions occurring in 1985, 1990, 2000, and 2010. CIP codes provide a classification scheme to support the accurate tracking, assessment, and reporting of fields of study and program completion. Various groups track degrees, facilities, departments, majors, faculty, and many more things with CIP codes. CIP codes can have as many as 8 digits with the first two specifying the type of course. In Texas two numbers are added to the CIP codes and used as the basis for funding (e.g., SCHs weighted by CIP code) by the State Legislature. For example, 31 is Parks, Recreation, Leisure, and Fitness Studies under which kinesiology falls (rather poor grouping, I think, but regardless . . . ). Examples of other groupings are 42—Psychology, 45—Social Sciences, 13—Education, 19—Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences.

To specify under 31—Parks, Recreation, Leisure, and Fitness Studies, 31.05 is Health and Physical Education that includes (as examples):

- 31.0501.02—Health and Physical Education/Fitness General
- 31.0500.16—Sport and Fitness Administration
- 31.0505.14—Kinesiology and Exercise Science
- 31.0508.01—Sports Studies

While this is a fine classification system for tracking many things, the Texas State Legislature also uses it for formula funding. For example, fields such as engineering technologies and engineering-related fields, biology and biomedical sciences, and physical sciences are funded by the last two digits of the 8-digit CIP code at considerably higher rates than education, parks, recreation, leisure, fitness studies, or social sciences. Yet many of the same instructional activities are carried out by all of these groups (e.g., classroom lectures and labs). I would argue that the instructional and lab activities carried out in a biology major course are not substantially different from that in an exercise physiology course, yet they are funded at very different levels.

The joint committee evaluates the placement of kinesiology under the current CIP codes and discusses whether there are possible ways to have kinesiology better placed. At this time it is unclear if this would be allowed, but the committee will investigate and evaluate the placement. If kinesiology could be more aligned with other sciences, both the reporting that is done by CIP code and its use as a funding mechanism might be improved. The committee will investigate and address this task. We will develop a report for NAK and AKA on this issue and possible actions.
The editorial board had a productive meeting in September during the National Academy of Kinesiology annual conference in Philadelphia. Among the topics discussed and recommended to Skip Maier, Journals Division director (and next CEO of Human Kinetics):

- An immediate need is to index *Kinesiology Review* to enhance its credibility and attract more unsolicited submissions. Skip responded that Human Kinetics is in the process of applying to have KR indexed in Medline, Science Citation Index [ISI Impact Factor], and PsychINFO. This might take up to a year to finalize.
- A request was made for a table of contents alert to be sent to KR subscribers to market the journal and increase awareness to potential authors. Skip responded that Human Kinetics has invested in a new online platform that will allow this feature within the next few months.
- The board recommended that one article in each issue be made open access for nonsubscribers to have availability and increase visibility of the journal. Casey Buchta, managing editor of KR, has unlocked articles in the May, August, and November 2015 special issues of *KR*.
- Future themed issues were discussed, including the history of kinesiology, sedentary behavior across the life course, the role of transformation of health care in America, multicultural issues in sport and physical activity, and rehabilitation science and its professional applications.

Currently only 35 institutions subscribe to *Kinesiology Review*. The editorial board strongly encourages NAK and AKA members to contact their institution librarians and add *KR* to their subscriptions. Typically, our institutions subscribe generously to other HK journals, so adding *KR* to the list should not pose a barrier and will only add to the visibility of the journal.

The November 2015 AKA Leadership Workshop issue was just released—with the theme of The Intersection of Physical Activity and Public Health: Opportunities for Kinesiology, guest coedited by Greg Welk and Duane Knudson. A total of 11 review papers were published that spanned historical, theoretical, empirical, and university-community perspectives. The articles provide an essential bridge between two disciplines that have complementary goals of lifelong significance.

The February 2016 Academy Papers, guest edited by Barbara Ainsworth, features the theme Active Aging: From Cells to Environment. After a successful and stimulating conference, in which 11 authors spoke on biological, social, psychological, and behavioral perspectives on aging, this issue of *The Academy Papers* is highly anticipated.

I encourage all NAK and AKA members to share the exciting issues of KR with their faculty members and colleagues and to suggest the journal as a potential outlet for scholarly reviews and synthesis papers.

I am grateful to the editorial board members of *Kinesiology Review* for sharing their ideas on the journal in general and themed issues and prospective authors and for their support in all aspects of the editorial and review process. Thank you so much.
The National Physical Activity Plan (NPAP) is a broad-based set of programs, policies, and initiatives for increasing the physical activity levels of Americans. It is the product of a collaborative effort between public and private organizations. The plan aims to create a national culture that supports physically active lifestyles.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention launched an effort to create a national plan in 2007, and a national conference was held in 2009. The first version of the national plan was released in 2010, and it contained 52 strategies spread across eight societal sectors. The National Academy of Kinesiology joined as one of the members of the National Physical Activity Plan (NPAP) Alliance in 2013.

The Alliance consists of approximately two dozen professional organizations, nonprofits, government agencies, corporations, and universities.

One of the big activities for 2015 was the NPAP Congress held in Washington, DC, on February 22 to 23, 2015. Dr. Russell Pate, University of South Carolina at Columbia, organized the conference, and Dr. Wanda Jones, principal assistant deputy secretary for health, was the opening speaker. Attendees learned about the history of the plan and the many efforts made to establish awareness of the plan. Invited speakers addressed each of the societal sectors, and breakout groups discussed strategies and offered new ideas for strengthening the plan.

Other activities of the NPAP in 2015 included the release of the National Physical Activity Report Card, which graded the nation on its support for youth physical activity using several societal indicators. In the fall of 2015, the U.S. Surgeon General released a call to action on Walking and Walkability, and several members of the NPAP alliance featured prominently in that release.

Currently, the societal sectors are (1) business and industry; (2) education; (3) health care; (4) mass media; (5) parks, recreation, fitness, and sport; (6) public health; (7) transportation, land use, and community design; (8) volunteer and nonprofit; and (9) faith-based initiatives. Committees have been formed to revise and expand the strategies within each sector, and a new version of the plan will be released soon for public input.

The NPAP is an exciting endeavor that will establish a road map for policy makers and community organizations to follow in order to create a climate that fosters physically active lifestyles for all U.S. citizens, regardless of age, gender, race, religion, or disability. For more information on the NPAP, go to www.physicalactivityplan.org.
The National Collegiate Fitness Index

By David R. Bassett, Jr.

In 2011, the National Academy of Kinesiology (NAK), the American Kinesiology Association (AKA), and the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) formed a joint committee to promote physical activity on college and university campuses. At the suggestion of Dr. Patty Freedson, then president of NAK, the committee’s first action was to undertake an assessment of how conducive colleges and universities are to physical activity.

The National Collegiate Fitness Index (NCFI) was modeled after the American Fitness Index (AFI) program established by ACSM. The aim of the NCFI is to assess environmental supports for exercise, curriculum, programs that promote physical activity, and health and wellness policies. The committee developed a survey to be sent to institutions of higher education.

To assess the campus environment, the survey asks about bike sharing or bike rental programs, a campus master plan that promotes walking and cycling, free parking on the perimeter of campus, and campus walkability. The number of recreational facilities available to students, faculty, and staff is measured.

The curriculum at each institution is assessed through questions about physical education requirements, health and wellness courses for undergraduate students that include lectures and labs, the number of physical education classes offered per semester, the presence of a kinesiology or exercise science program, and the presence of an ACSM Exercise is Medicine on-campus program.

Physical activity programming on campus is assessed by counting the number of intramural sports offered per year, extramural (club) sports offered per year, university-sponsored outdoor recreation trips per year, and sessions of group fitness classes offered per year. The campus health and wellness environment is assessed through questions on personal training services, fitness testing, and physical activity and wellness counseling.

An online version of the survey was sent to more than 800 institutions with kinesiology programs in March 2014, and the survey closed in June of the same year. Of those, 108 institutions provided partial information, and 80 completed all questions. The data were compiled at the University of Iowa by Dr. Kathy Janz and were then sent to Dr. Barbara Ainsworth and her colleagues at Arizona State University. A scoring algorithm was developed, and after adjustments for student enrollments, rankings were established for three separate categories of institutions.

The top three private institutions were Southern Adventist University, Northwestern College, and Baldwin Wallace University. The top three small public universities are Lyndon State University, Henderson State University, and Western State Colorado University; the top three large public universities are Pennsylvania State University, Kansas State University, and the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. A copy of the report has been submitted to all three organizations that funded it; pending approval, it will be posted on their websites by the end of 2015.
NAK MEMBER NEWS

Dr. Bonnie Berger (#335) was granted the status of fellow by the American Psychological Association (APA) this month in the 47th Division – Exercise and Sport Psychology. She was the only fellow named in the division at the national level. Fellows are nominated by peers in the organization and must meet minimum requirements as outlined by the association. The fellow status is bestowed upon current APA members who have shown evidence of unusual and outstanding contributions or performance in the field of psychology, as stated on the APA website. Furthermore, a nominee’s work must have a national impact on the field of psychology beyond a local, state or regional level. Berger’s appointment comes after the publication of a completely revised third edition of her textbook with Robert S. Weinberg (Miami University, USA) and Robert C. Eklund (University of Stirling, Scotland) Foundations of Exercise Psychology. Adding an international focus to the text, Bob Eklund is a new member of the authorship team; the book also includes a guest chapter on “Exercise and Cognitive Function” by Yu-Kai Chang (National Taiwan Sport University).

Bradley J. Cardinal (#475) was the Keynote Speaker at the 5th Institute of Physical Education International Conference 2015, “Role of Physical Education, Sport Science, Health, Recreation and Tourism in Enhancing Human Resource Development Toward the Upcoming ASEAN Community 2015,” held in Bangkok, Thailand in August. While there he also participated in the world record setting “Bike for Mom” event held in honor of her Majesty the Queen.

At the 23rd annual conference of European Association for Sport Management, EASM, Professor Packianathan Chelladurai (#425) of Troy University was rewarded the new most prestigious EASM award – EASM Chelladurai Award.

The award is of course named after Professor Chelladurai himself and can, according to the statues by decision of the EASM board, be given to a recipient who meets the following qualifications:

- Must be an EASM member that has not previously received the Award.
- Must during a minimum of ten years been serving as a teacher, supervisor,
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in the past year, the NAK community has lost three of its highly valued fellows: Francis Nagel (#260), Christian Zauner (#327) and Jack Wilmore (#252). All made significant contributions in moving the fields of physical education and kinesiology forward. The entire NAK community extends our collective condolences to the families and colleagues of these three prominent scholars and professionals. They will not be forgotten.

NAK Memorializes the Passing of Three Fellows

NAK Call for Officer Nominations

We will elect three new Academy officers in 2016: a president-elect, secretary-treasurer, and member-at-large. The criteria for those offices are as follows:

President-elect: Active Fellow, 4 years membership in the Academy (Fellow number 514 or below, elected in 2011 or earlier)

Secretary-Treasurer: Active Fellow, 3 years membership in the Academy (Fellow number 523 or below, elected in the year 2012 or earlier)

Member-at-Large: Active Fellow, 1 year membership in the Academy (Fellow number 545 or below, elected in the year 2014 or earlier)

Other Eligibility Rules

1. Any Fellow currently holding office is eligible for nomination for the same or another office only during his/her final year in office.
2. Two Fellows from the same institution may not be placed on the ballot for the same office.
3. Nominations may be made by all Fellows, but only Active Fellows are eligible for office.

Send nominations by February 1, 2015, to:
Debra Rose, PhD
California State University, Fullerton
Department of Kinesiology
800 N State College Blvd.
Fullerton, CA  92834
Tel:  657-278-5846
Email:  drose@fullerton.edu
Doctoral Program Review Committee
By John H. Challis, chair, Doctoral Program Evaluation Committee, Penn State University

The results of the latest evaluation, 2010-2014, were released at the NAK business meeting and then shared with each of the participating programs and their respective deans. The results have now been posted on the NAK website (www.nationalacademyofkinesiology.org/results). A full report, containing some additional data, will be published in Kinesiology Review early in 2016. The Doctoral Program Evaluation Committee met Saturday, September 19, where there were interactions among outgoing, returning, and new members of the committee. While the next evaluation is still some time away, planning is already under way. A priority is to keep the means of assessment as consistent as possible so that comparisons can be made across rounds (2000-2004, 2005-2009, and 2010-2014). That stated consideration will be given to the collection of additional data that, while not necessarily part of the assessment, ranking of programs, might provide useful data for participating programs. All submitted programs are provided with a set of instructions and frequently asked questions to help with data collection and return. These instructions will be reviewed to ensure they are as straightforward as possible. Any feedback from participating institutions on any aspects of the evaluation process will be gratefully received.

Thanks should be extended to the members of the committee who stepped down this year: Beverly Ulrich (University of Michigan) and Steve Silverman (Teachers College, Columbia University). The new committee has three returning members: David Bassett (University of Tennessee), Diane Gill (University of North Carolina at Greensboro), and John Challis (Penn State University). There are two new members: Jane Kent (University of Massachusetts) and Howard Zelaznik (Purdue University). In addition we should extend our thanks for the consultants who worked hard on the statistical evaluation of the doctoral program data: Allen Jackson (University of North Texas), Jim Morrow (University of North Texas), and Nicholas Myers (University of Miami, Coral Gables).
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