

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Health, Human Performance, Recreation & Coaching Majors and Minors, 2017-2018**

Date: 5/16/2018

Time: 10:00-11:00am

Place: WH 2008

Attended: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean Katy Heyning; Department Chair Kelly Witte; Faculty and staff in the Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Coaching program/s: Andrea Ednie, Bridgette Hermanson, Wesley Kephart, Jason Shurley; Audit & Review Team Chair Jiazhen Zhou; Audit & Review team members Eric Appleton, Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
Program coordinator Andrea Ednie provided an overview of the program. Over the past 5 years, there has been new department leadership and three new faculty were hired. Main accomplishments during the review period included:
 - Enrollment has stayed around 300 majors, 350 minors.
 - Two minors were created (sport management, strength & conditioning) and a new Human Performance major is in development. Several international travel study courses have been created.
 - The student internship program has been expanded. It is now required for every student; opportunities have been expanded to national and international sites; and internships are now categorized based on student interest (exercise physiology, sport management, recreation, health promotion). The internships have been well received among the students.
 - Community-based opportunities are being offered in many courses.
 - Students are actively involved in research projects and encouraged to attend conferences, and are actively engaged in two discipline-related clubs.
 - The program has built active collaborations with other campus units (e.g., the Math department offers more statistics courses for this program; with CoBE in sports management and sports tourism programs).

Future plans include: (1) Launch the Human Performance major by Fall 2019. Achieve accreditation for the new major by 3 years after its launch; (2) review and make any needed curricular revisions to the minors; (3) develop a Health Promotion major; (4) increase involvement with the graduate emphasis program on coach and human performance.

AVC Greg Cook suggested the program consider a Doctorate in Physical Therapy program. Nationally, there is more demand than programs can meet (about 1900 applicants but only about 600 admitted). The Provost suggested that the program work with UW-Rock County to facilitate continuing education. The degree completion program from UW-Rock campus could create a pipeline for a program here, which could help UW-Whitewater attract working students to come back to school. The Provost also suggested that the program consider collaborating with CoBE on a program in Hospitality management.

Dean Heyning expressed her appreciation to the program for the excellent work they have done in overcoming difficulties within the program, restoring order and a positive environment.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

- a) Program array growth and possible challenges: *The program has a clear plan for launching a new major in Human Performance to replace the current Health, Human Performance and Recreation emphasis (under Physical Education major). There are some related issues that the program should consider:*
- *With the change from emphasis into major, there might be unexpected growth in enrollment. Also the minors (such as the sport management minor) will likely keep growing. Does the program has a plan to cope with this growth, especially in terms of resources needed? Or maybe the program intends to keep the enrollment around 300 even there are strong growth needs?*
There was discussion of managing enrollment. There are no plans at this time to set caps for enrollment. AVC Greg Cook noted that the new major intended to draw additional students to the university (instead of drawing students away from existing programs on campus). It is projected that 80 more students will join the program, and the added income would help cover additional costs (e.g., for labs, for new faculty). The program was encouraged to communicate any emerging resource needs to the college and Provost's Office.
 - *Do the current faculty have the necessary expertise for the new major? Any special consideration on expertise in possible future hires?* Andrea noted that the existing faculty have all the expertise needed to support the new Human Performance major.
 - *Might need to revise mission statement to reflect recent changes in the programs.* The program is already planning to review and make needed revisions to their mission statement.
- b) Resources: *Is there any clear plan in place for addressing resource issues such as exercise physiology lab upgrade, faculty space, meeting space, larger desks for students? Have issues such as high enrollment caps and high advising load been addressed? Also is there any preparation for addressing resource issues that might be caused by potential program growth?*
New requests have been made and are pending. The department was encouraged to keep in contact with the Dean's Office about resource needs and consider other locations (e.g., the Sentry building) for lab spaces.
- c) Inclusive excellence. *The program maintain strong relationships with community partners and foster an inclusive environment. Does the department have any strategy to increase faculty diversity?*
There was discussion of strategies to increase faculty diversity, including looking for more diverse candidates for part-time positions, contacting PTs with diverse backgrounds and adding them to the advisory board, and drawing from minority staff/faculty at UW-Rock and Blackhawk.

The review team noted the good work on assessment of student learning across the review period, and all those present thanked the program's faculty and staff for their positive leadership, collaboration, and hard work.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 3 recommended action (see page 14, point 4) related to program curriculum, resources, and assessment.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation without qualification.*
- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next full self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due **October 1, 2022 to the Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies and November 1, 2022 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**

7) Adjourn.

Submitted by Jiazhen Zhou

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2017-2018
Health, Human Performance, Recreation & Coaching Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 3/22/2018 Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program Health, Human Performance, Recreation & Coaching Major X Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: Jiazhen Zhou (chair), Rashiqa Kamal, Eric Appleton, Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook
Review meeting attended by: Jiazhen Zhou, Rashiqa Kamal, Eric Appleton, Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook

I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Solid, but a little general. I wouldn't mind a few details or examples regarding how, for example, "both faculty and students foster environments and programs for all abilities and background."
2. General education and other program support.
 - a. Narrowly focused on GenEd alone -- are there links/overlap between other programs? Are there any courses that they find non-majors gravitate to? Any non-major courses that are recommended to or are frequently taken by their students?
 - b. The general education course PEGNRL 192 is mainly supported by the department, not the program.

- c. What is the relationship between this program and others in the department and college? Does it contribute courses or faculty to those areas?
- 3. Inclusive excellence.
 - a. Would like to hear about actions being taken by the program. They note the outreach to Fairhaven and local schools as community building, but recruitment of students/staff is stated in a passive manner: 'the program tends to attract. . . " Similarly, 'we may not currently have the most diverse faculty (but) our work environment is very collegial, equitable and inviting."
 - b. Are any measures being taken to improve the diversity at the workplace?
- 4. Thorough response to previous A&R recommended actions. The program has done a lot of work on assessment.

I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

1. The program’s mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.

No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
Some/Partial Evidence	4
Sufficient Evidence	1

2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and making decisions about changes to the program goals.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a “vision” for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	1

6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)

0

Comments

- 1. The Mission statement is really rudimentary, it is the least that I would expect graduates to be able to do. Shouldn't the scope be increased and the mission should really focus on some special skills that the program's graduates will have that they can't obtain anywhere else?
- 1. The mission statement is a little basic and general -- it might be of use to include some sort of 'by doing' that helps point out the special features, strengths, or uniqueness of the program.
- 1. The mission statement is too broad, especially considering the work that was done to revise the curriculum and infuse global learning and research into the program.
- 2. Goals are clearly stated and a good description of progress toward meeting them is provided. A lot has been accomplished over the past few years!
- 2. Kudos to the department for making all the positive changes! Looks like technology/ lab upgrade is a priority.
- 2. The program worked hard to launch two new minors in sport management and strength & conditioning. Both minors have been successful so far. They also started building a Human Performance major. The efforts in promoting undergraduate research are also notable. Great achievements!
- 2. It would be easier to compare if you also show the data about participation in undergraduate research during the last review period.

- 3. Still the goal setting process needs to be formalized. The ad hoc collaboration on projects might have worked till now but as the program grows, the process needs to be more formal. For example, goals that have been completed since the last review should be replaced by new ones. How does the department decide which goals should take precedence?
- 3. Some more specifics would be nice -- what is the actual pipeline for projects and reports? From this paragraph it sounds like stuff happens when it happens. It's evident that a lot of work has been happening; what are the actual steps of the process?
- 3. I believe there is a goal setting process in place- which was described some in the responses from the previous A&R, but this process was not described here.
- 4 The items are listed, but it would good to hear about a timeline for implementation on each, and perhaps a bit about what it will take to accomplish each goal.
- 5 Has anyone in or associated with program -- faculty or student -- earned any awards or recognition?
- 5. They haven't won awards or awards don't exist?

II. Assessment: A. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1

No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- 3. Lots of data on student learning are listed as having been considered in making the curricular revisions. Can you offer a few specific examples of what was considered and the impact it had on your planning and decision-making?
- 5. Online courses should have few different questions in student evaluations pertaining to effective delivery of content through the online platform that is much different than face-to-face.

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	5
---------------------	---

Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Excellent assessment on student learning outcome.
1. Good work on revising the SLOs. Good mapping of SLOs to courses. LOTS of progress has been made in stating SLOs and developing a systematic and sustainable assessment plan!
1. A few of the SLOs could be 'unpacked' a bit (e.g., #4 includes both inquiry and analysis, and quantitative and info literacy into one SLO--could be broken into two).
2. Nice to see an array of measure approaches.
4. Work with the Office of Academic Assessment to find a way to pull this program's data from the SOAS
5. Very good examples of how data were discussed and used. Table format makes this information very clear and easy to see what was done.
6. Consider sharing data with students too.
6. Any plans to share the data with the advisory board members or the students?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data

1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

2. There is no official separate graduation data for HHPR emphasis. The department might have kept their own records for each emphasis? If not, maybe those separate records could be kept starting now?
- 2-3. Information is for Phys Ed as a whole -- is it not possible to collect data for individual majors? The table in 3 indicates 4.3 as the average completion years. "It's very common to graduate in four years." What's causing that .3?
4. Did not see specific strategies to attract and retain diverse students.
4. It sounds like they're doing much as most other departments are able do in recruitment. Are there ways to work with Admissions on recruiting for the program?
6. It appears the over-enrollment issue is being worked on with the new hire and curriculum changes.
7. Looks like the program is growing at a healthy pace. There is need for additional resources to meet the requirements.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. This should be a university-wide initiative but the program needs better plans to track graduates.
1. & 3. It sounds like the program is accessing the available post-graduation data. Can alumni surveys include more specific questions? What else can the Alumni office do to help track graduates?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)

1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

Nice. Here's some of the stuff that it would be good to see in the mission statement. . .

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

1-2. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- 1-2. Just curious -- is the ethnic make-up (and the gender make-up) of the program similar to what is found in the field as a whole?
2. They acknowledged the lack of diversity in current faculty and aimed to improve this in hires during next 5 years.
4. One thing that is worthy of mentioning is that the faculty have high advising load (sometimes over 110 advisees per faculty). This situation might can be improved with new hires start to advise?

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

1-2. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
Comments	

IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. The faculty have been active in research and publications.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program

1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

May need additional positions if enrollments continue to grow.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings

1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3

No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. There are decent needs for resources including labs upgrade, lack of faculty space, meeting space, larger desks for students, and subscription of more journals in their areas.

1. The list of needs is specific and supported.

1. The program needs some serious upgrade to the facilities in order to be cutting edge!

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program**1. Program strengths are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. List appears specific and supported.

3. The program has presented very clear development plan and resource needs.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions**1. Strengths of the Program**

- An energetic group of faculty.
- Have a good array of internship and extra-departmental connections. Relationship with Intercollegiate Athletics, strong internship and field study programs, the variety of service. Learning and Community Based Learning projects that students can get involved.
- Strong assessment plan working toward redesigning curriculum. Structured assessment activities appear to continuing apace.
- Well-qualified faculty who are active in teaching, research, and service. A clear vision for the program moving forward with the introduction of a new major, and name change of the program.
- Much appears to have been done these past few years to strength the program. The addition of the new faculty is hoped to ease some of the advising and teaching overloads.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Come up with a better plan to track graduates.
- Clarify program goals- some have already been met work on new mission and vision statement for the program to help reflect the changes.

- The report identifies several: lowering of enrollment cap, offering selected courses with more frequency, shifting the advising load, streamlining the curriculum, seeking additional lab resources. Assessment tasks are also included in the breakdown of action and improvement. These all seem rather sizeable tasks, and I think they cover the concerns or issues noted throughout the report.

3. Other comments/questions

- The department needs resources in terms of new hires and updating its facilities and technology.
- The task list is pretty sizeable. It would be good to have a timetable to lay out how and when things will be done so that the program does not try to accomplish too much all at once.
- Try to hire diverse faculty. When recruitment/hiring opportunities arise, considering strategies to tap into a pool of more diverse candidates.
- What are the new expertise needed for future staff? Possible collaboration on new hires with other departments such as Biology?
- How will the new major affect your assessment plan?

4. Recommended Actions

1. Curriculum.
 - a. Finalize the curricular revisions that are in process, addressing the issues identified in the self-study (e.g., HHP curriculum is too broad).
 - b. Implement the Human Performance major.
 - c. Revise mission statement to reflect recent changes in the programs.
2. Resources. Work with the college to obtain resources to address issues such as labs upgrade, lack of faculty space, meeting space, larger desks for students, subscription of more journals in their areas, low class offering frequency, high enrollment caps, and high advising load.
3. Assessment. Continue the good progress you have made in assessing student learning in the program.

5. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification	X*
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program.	
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	

*Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next full self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due **October 1, 2022 to the Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies and November 1, 2022 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**