

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Coaching (PETE) Majors and Minors, 2017-2018**

Date: May 2, 2018

Time: 2:00-3:00PM

Place: WH 1013

Attendance: 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 Jay Cameron, Kathleen Happel; Audit & Review Team Chair Nick Guo; Audit & Review Team members Eric Appleton, Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook

1. Call to order at 2:03 pm
2. Introductions
3. Overview of review team item evaluation, program comments
The review team recognizes the hard work of the department faculty and staff in the recent curricular revision. In addition, the program committed time and resources to participate in the summer assessment institute and left with a good data collection plan in place.

Program Coordinator Jay Cameron and Department Chair Kelly Witte expressed thanks for the review and feedback provided by the committee, noting that they found the feedback useful. They noted several program strengths, including that the program makes it possible for students to earn three licenses from DPI. Although not required, feedback from principals indicates that having all three is an advantage for students in the hiring process. The program continues to try to reduce credits to degree.

The program noted their focus on professionalism in the field (i.e., they are training physical educators, not gym teachers) and that more students are going on to graduate programs and becoming athletic directors and principals. It was noted that UW-Whitewater is the only program in the state to offer all three licenses; it is also unique in its focus on serving students with disabilities. The Provost encouraged the program to send stories that highlight these unique aspects to University Marketing and Communications and be sure to highlight student successes on the program's website to publicize its unique strengths. Nick Guo encourages the department to also use student progress and placement performance as a recruiting pitch. Finally, Assistant Dean Casey noted the program's success in transforming its culture to one of teamwork, building, and positive attitude and leadership.

4. Discussion of Review Team's evaluations

- a) *Update the status of the program's assessment of student learning outcomes. What progress has been made since the program's participation in the June 2017 Assessment Institute? More specifically, please discuss ways in which the program might effectively and efficiently align their accreditation Standards with campus ELOs (i.e., without requiring added assessment tools or assignments), as well as the current status of data collection and use of data.*

Jay provided a handout with the professional standards the program must meet. Jay and Kelly explained how SLOS were set as standards, but the program would like to adjust language to reflect the standards' general components, which could then be used as SLOs. There was discussion of how to best organize and categorize the standards and restate them as a smaller set of SLOs with measurable outcomes, building on what already exists and not adding additional assessments and workload. It was noted that the issue is not a lack of data, but how to organize it and align all the parts. The review team encourages the program to work with Assistant Dean Casey to rephrase and align the standards. The implementation of the assessment plan will be an ongoing process. The review team encourages the program to develop detailed plans and goals for the next five years, to support continued progress.

- b) *Please discuss the enrollment trends. The self-study refers to graduation delays. Is this an indication that the program is over-enrolled? Could the rigorous course sequencing requirement (18 credits per semester) be a deterrent to students' interests in the program? More documentation is needed on the trends and predictions of enrollment data.*

Regarding enrollment trends, the committee noticed that students have to take 18 credits each semester in order to meet all three different licenses. The program is continuing to work on curricular revisions to reduce credits and time to degree.

- c) *Please discuss any resource needs. Are overloads an issue? Is there need to hire additional assistant coordinator?*

In terms of resource concerns, both the committee and faculty feel there has been good support from the Dean and Chair. One issue is the need for overload sections. Junior faculty are not asked to teach these, but they put a strain on the department. As enrollments have increased, another developing issue is how to manage student teaching requirements with current staffing. The Provost encouraged the program and college to work with each other and the central administration to find ways to move resources to programs that are growing, such as this one.

5. Recommended Actions: The evaluation reports lists two recommended actions (see page 14, item #4) related to assessment and program planning.

6. Recommended Result: *Continuation with minor concerns*

- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
- A progress report that addresses the recommended actions is due to the college dean by March 2, 2020 and to the A&R Committee by March 16, 2020.
- Next full self-study is due to the college dean by October 1, 2022 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2022.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies

Undergraduate Programs, 2017-2018

Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Coaching Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Date of Evaluation 3/13/2018 Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Coaching Major X Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: Nick Guo, Xueqing Chen, Eric Appleton, Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook

Review meeting attended by: Nick Guo, 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	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	5
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	2
---------------------	---

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

Comments

1. Formatting comment; the table connecting program activities to UWW values and missions most evidently speaks to the individual mission statements. I'm not sure why the five values are repeated on each line when the discussion in the third column doesn't address a particular value.
1. There are no summary points offered for Mission Statement #8.
2. It would be good to hear how GENED courses in general contribute to the major/minor. Are there other programs that share any cross listed courses?
2. Limited evidence of supporting GENED proficiencies other than 1 GENED course is taught by the Department.
3. I'd like to hear more about the Jamaica student teaching experience; why Jamaica? What unique things does this program offer UWW students? How new is the Urban Education partnership? It's noted that only two students have participated -- is that simply because the program is so new? Good to hear that the participants were immediately hired. While noting that the program is committed to faculty diversity, it's also noted that forces beyond the program prevent effectiveness -- since it seems less possible to effect change here, it might be good to switch the focus of the report to efforts in student recruitment?

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	1
No/Limited Evidence	2
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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	4
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	1

Comments

1. Would having a program mission (as opposed to the umbrella of the HPERC statement) statement provide anything toward clarity or long-term planning?
3. I am confused by the response. First there's the statement that the program goal for 2012-16 was for graduates to be hired as teachers. That seems a bit like saying that the goal of the program is to have students graduate from the program. On the other hand, there seems to have been a lot going in, including response to previous A&R notes which constitute a hefty number of concrete goals. The table seems to list the data collection method and how and when the data is collected, but doesn't seem to have any information as to what long or short term goal this data might be applied toward implementing. Lots of tools, though. Lots of data coming in. I'd like more clarity on the pipeline of decision making.
4. Ah, I think the third paragraph of this section answers my questions about the table. . .
5. Has anything been won by individual faculty of students? It would be good to hear about individual achievements, as well.
5. No special recognitions or awards have been earned by the program during the review period
6. Why is CAEP accreditation optional? Is there a benefit to having this? (Not being familiar with these acronyms, it'd be good to have them spelled out here and there. . .

Goals provided with a general description of associated tasks. The goal and objective "statement" were broad but appeared to align with the program's mission. It would be worthwhile for the program to write a mission and goals in which to focus their work related to program improvement. The list of data sources and tracking available is helpful. This program is lucky to have so many data sources. However, the response provided does not clearly articulate the how the program will use these data sources to set goals (i.e., process). Will goals be created/reviewed at every monthly meeting? When will "data based goal setting" start? This level of detail is warranted considering the process for setting and monitoring goals was not implemented until 2016 even though much of the data listed has been available prior to 2016. While the program does not have a vision, the College does. Until a mission and vision statement is created, the program should use the College statements to help guide planning.

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

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

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

Comments

1. Wow. Tight schedule. Looks like the minute they walk in the door, the student needs to know exactly what they want; how possible is it for a student to come into the program if they make the decision in say, their 2nd year? It's noted that summer/winter courses as well as 18 credits a semester are required in order to graduate in four years -- do most majors make it through in four years?

5. "Not answered." Is this because there are no online courses, or just a missed question?

It is not clear what the SLOs are for this program. The assessment plan does not include SLOs. It is not clear how the assessment data provided and briefly summarized were used to track student progress on learning outcomes.

3. Good examples of using data to inform curricular changes. However, it is not clear that a process is in place to make data based decisions in a consistent and meaningful way.

5. Question on online learning was not answered.

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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	2
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2

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

Comments

1. I was unable to access Appendix D; the list of outcomes provided as response to the question appears comprehensive.
1. The standards are listed as learning outcomes. It is my understanding that there is a difference between standards and outcomes. Standards being developmental over a period of time, and outcomes are specific and measurable objectives students complete toward meeting the standards. Guidance from the review team is warranted on how to evaluate this area.
1. Like the program, I struggle with how to meet both national standards requirements, and campus and program SLOs. Standards are not the same thing as program SLOs, but they are certainly related. The Standards listed on page 15 aren't SLOs. While the "elements" listed are SLOs, they are much too specific to serve as program-level SLOs (they're really more like course learning objectives), and there are far too many of them. I encourage the program to work with the college and the Office of Academic Assessment to find a 'middle ground' that provides an appropriate

- level of SLOs for the program that still aligns with the Standards & elements on one hand and the campus ELOs on the other—and that doesn't require any added assessment tools or assignments.
2. The table linking all the various standards/ELOs was very interesting.
 3. A specific task schedule is outlined up through June 2017, and a more general set of goals is provided for 2018-2019. I encourage the program to take stock of where they are now in accomplishing these tasks and build an overarching general and sustainable assessment plan that can guide their efforts across the next several years. This is more of an assessment 'strategic plan' for the program, which can then be fleshed out each year (like you've done for the 2017-18 year).
 3. What does it mean to 'create consistency across. . .'" Does this refer to course content or assessment methods, or something else?
 3. A detailed plan is in place but I'm not sure how the data is distributed for action at the end. Data is collected, digitized, stored on a google drive, and then. . . ?
 3. I'm also unsure if "complete by June 16th, 2017" means that the activity was indeed completed on that date, or that remains the goal date. What mechanism is in place for the program/reviewers to know that something has been successfully implemented?
 3. The program included a detailed plan for 2016-17, but it is not clear what the plan is moving forward.
 4. Good to hear the advising issues have been sorted out; interested to hear future student responses to the change.
 4. Scores and surveys seems to be the data offered -- are there embedded assignment or project-based assessment tools being used?
 4. (*Just a note:* When submitting excel files to the A&R portal, please remove student names as well as SSNs. Remember that all files uploaded in the portal can be accessed by any faculty or staff member with a NetID.)
 4. Data sources reported were edTPA, Praxis, and SOAS- these were not all the sources listed in other areas of the report. Are these the sources the program used to make program decisions? There was not a clear alignment between these and Standards (SLOs).5. Two examples are given, but I would like hear a bit more about the decision making process. Whatever process is being used appears to have worked in these two instances, but I'd like to hear a bit more about the nuts and bolts. Who chose this assessment activity, who presented the data to whom, who was in on the final decision making?
 4. Glad to see that you are using the SOAS data. It might be useful to look at a few of the other items with relatively low scores that might be particularly relevant for the program (e.g., ...improved my ability to understand and comfortably interact with people from cultures different from my own, 3.93;coursework in my major was challenging, 3.83).

5. What's the *process* for discussing data and using it to make data-based decisions? Who is in charge of this, how often do discussions take place, how/how often do you check back to see the impact of data-based decisions? Are the people listed in the detailed action plan done for the Assessment Institute (pg 29-33) the program's assessment committee? There's no discussion of the process for making sure assessment of student learning is done in a sustainable way.
6. It's noted that systematic sharing efforts/use of data in meetings have not yet been adopted (which reflects my concern regarding the item above (*II.B.5. Faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.*)). If there's no systematic sharing process, how can you be sure things aren't falling through the cracks?

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	1
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Unsure what "The table above seems to show a higher number of students completing degrees despite a lower number of students enrolled in the program.' refers to or should mean.
3. As was noted earlier, due to the licensure requirements, getting it all in in four years is not always possible (4.3 years. . .)
3. If students are taking 18 credits each semester (except one semester at 16 credits; for a total of 142), then how can the average credits to degree be 131? Do students on average bring in 11 credits through transfer, AP, etc?

4. It appears that the program says pretty close to home for recruitment (UWW student athletes); are there other available avenues for recruitment (such as the Urban Institute)? Since this is a tightly scheduled program throughout the four years, what is Admissions doing to help incoming students find this program in a timely fashion?
5. Would be helpful for you to present the overall percentage of URM students in your program so we can better evaluate it in relation to the university average.
6. It appears that the program is doing its best to make sure students graduate in a timely manner (such as opening second sessions of courses). The question then becomes, with the note of 'many classes currently run with an overload of students' whether the program has sufficient instructors to meet the demand.
7. Hmm. Enrollment is down, but improving -- yet many classes are running with overloads. If the program reaches its ideal size of 150-175, does that mean the overloads will become worse? I'm unclear on this.

The program has not outlined any efforts undertaken either at the program or college level to address enrollment, diversity of our teacher candidates in licensure programs.

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

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

1. What is the Alumni office doing to help track graduates?
2. Just curious -- I know that each state has its own licensing requirements, but can a program only train to place its students in its home state?
3. Knowing that tracking graduates is seldom at the top of instructor priorities, are there any way the programs can be more systematic in tracking graduates? And again, what is the Alumni office or other University level offices doing to aid collection of this information?

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

Comments

I'm convinced that the program has unique features and is an essential and competitive component of the university.

Please tell me more about the uniqueness of the location and the athletic programs. Why exactly do these set us apart/above other schools? Because of all the licensure requirements, etc., can there even be much variation from program to program?

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	0
Some/Partial Evidence	5
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	0
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. I did not see any information on diversity (though gender can be surmised through names. . .).
2. Are there any specializations expected for faculty? Some of this is touched upon in explaining the turnover between 2012 and 2017. It seems that moving toward group advising is a step backwards from the more individualized advising that was recently instituted -- this would seem to be connected to the enrollment overload as well, even though the program is not asking for more instructions (with a new one starting in August of 2018)

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	0
---------------------	---

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

Comments

Items are listed for only two instructors. What can be done to foster enhancement activities for the remaining instructors -- time, opportunity, funding, etc.?

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

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

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

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

Comments

One grant is listed, and it's mentioned that OSRP support is "outstanding." Are there any other grant efforts in the pipeline?

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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

Even though they say things are adequate, I still worry about the over-enrollment mentioned earlier. I look forward to seeing how advising will be sorted out.

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

Comments

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)

0

Comments

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- The program recently redesigned its curriculum to reflect the changes in K-12 schools. The program committed time to evaluate the curriculum and assessment planning process. Further, the program seems responsive to changes from professional organizations (SHAPE standards) and the Department of Public Instruction.
- It looks like they've done a lot since the last review and there's a lot of data collection in place. They have responded to the data previously collected and made changes that appear to benefit the program, particularly in updating the program as a whole.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- The program would benefit from using the mission to create program goals and specific and measurable student learning outcomes.
- There is an abundance of data collected, but no clear plan to review it and discuss how to use it to improve the program.
- There was not much of a description of the programs effort to recruit students, or respond to changes that are impacting student enrollment.
- More clarity on how assessment data is shared and implemented so that things don't fall through the cracks.
- More information on what specific assessment activities lie ahead in the multi-year plan.
- Reaching out to Admissions for recruitment help. Reaching out to the Alumni office for graduate tracking help
- Continue working on advising issues.

3. Other comments/questions

- The program has made progress on its assessment, but the long list of Standards/SLOs is still problematic. Can the program work with the college and Office of Academic Assessment to find a way to streamline the list, while still meeting the professional body standards?
- The introductory remarks were helpful in providing context for this review- thank you.
- The report is well written, well documented, and easy to follow.

4. Recommended Actions

1. Assessment: Use the information and plan created at the Summer 2017 Assessment Institute to create a sustainable, long-term assessment plan.
 - a. Review and revise SLOs so they are learning outcomes, not standards.
 - b. Fully implement the assessment plan.
 - c. Articulate a clear process for discussing, making use of, and sharing data.
2. Program planning:
 - a. Articulate a clear process for setting and monitoring program goals, including how data are discussed and considered in setting goals.
 - b. Discuss ways the program can proactively respond to recruitment, enrollment and advising concerns.

5. Recommended Result*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	X*
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.	

*A progress report that addresses the recommended actions is due to the college dean by March 2, 2020 and to the A&R Committee by March 16, 2020.

Next full self-study is due to the college dean by October 1, 2022 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2022.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report
Undergraduate Programs, 2019-2020
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Due to circumstances surrounding COVID-19, this program did not have a Follow-Up meeting for their 2019-2020 review. The document below is considered the program's follow-up report for the 2019-20 audit and review cycle. Please refer to a document on our website titled "Audit and Review and COVID" for further information.

Program Name: **Physical Education, Teacher Education, Health Education, Adapted Physical Education**

Date of Review Team Meeting: April 10, 2020

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: Cancelled; Time: Cancelled; Location: Cancelled

Evaluations submitted by: Katy Casey, Yamin Ahmad, Sarah Hessenauer

Review meeting attended by: Yamin Ahmad, Katy Casey, Sarah Hessenauer, S.A. Welch

Recommendation #1

Assessment: Use the information and plan created at the Summer 2017 Assessment Institute to create a sustainable, long-term assessment plan. a. Review and revise SLOs so they are learning outcomes, not standards. b. Fully implement the assessment plan. c. Articulate a clear process for discussing, making use of, and sharing data.

Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	4
Making Progress	0
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #1

There definitely is improvement. I like how the learning outcomes had specific actions associated with them.

The program has made good progress towards addressing the first recommended action. They have articulated SLO, have an assessment plan and are currently in the process of implementing it. They also have a clear process for discussing and sharing data.

The department reported attending the assessment institute in summer of 2017. The department has examined preliminary data and has started to make changes based on this data.

A) SLO's were revised/updated.

B) Plan has been developed and implemented.

C) Clear plan for discussing and making use of data was presented.

Recommendation #2

Program Planning

- A) Articulate a clear process for setting and monitoring program goals, including how data are discussed and considered in setting goals.
- B) Discuss ways the program can proactively respond to recruitment, enrollment and advising concerns.

Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	3
Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #2

- Very thorough. I liked how they addressed concerns from outside agencies (about advising).
- The program has plans to reduce the credits to degree with significant program changes. Faculty and staff in the program work collaboratively with college administration to engage in recruiting activities.
- I appreciate the efforts the program is making related to advising.
 - There continue to be issues related to advising in this program.
 - One of the challenge has to do with how the program wants students to be advised (three-license program) versus what is currently documented as approved curriculum.
 - I think students will continue to struggle to understand requirements until the new program is submitted and approved.
- The program has a clear process for setting and monitoring programmatic goals. It also has ideas for how to improve the process of data collection and using it towards setting goals.
- There is evidence that the program is taking a more proactive approach towards recruitment, enrollment and advising concerns.
- A clear program planning process was identified.
 - A) A process for setting and monitoring goals was identified. Currently one person directs this process, but there is a plan for a more collaborative approach. Examples of monitoring was provided.
 - B) Plans for recruitment, enrollment, and advising were presented.

Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	0
No	4

Additional comments:

This reflects much thought, effort, time, and energy devoted to improving the program. I would like to compliment the program for their efforts!

The program is working hard to improve assessment and curriculum. For the next self-study the program should:

- include a description of how the workload has been distributed among faculty and staff supporting the program.
- Consider making the processes more streamlined and efficient in order to make the workload manageable.
 - For example, is it possible for the program to focus on one or two SLOs per year as opposed to measuring and reporting on all every year?
- Include the data they have collected from the implementation of their revised assessment plan. They should summarize the results for the SLO's that were assessed and show how they have been using the data to make curricular revisions (if any).

***Next FULL Self-Study is due to the College Deans on October 1, 2022 and by November 1, 2022 to the Assessment Office.**