Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Human Performance Majors and Minors, 2022-2023

Date: 1/31/2023
Time: 11:00-12:00
Place: Winther 1013

Invited: Interim Provost Robin Fox; Interim Dean Lana Collet-Klingenberg(Education & Prof. Studies); Department Chair/Program Coordinator D'Arcy Becker and Lindsey Greviskes; faculty and staff in the Human Performance program; Audit & Review Team Chair Bruce Cohen; Audit & Review team members Matthew Winden, Edward Gimbel; and Kelli Danielski (Andrea Ednie attended face-to-face in place of Kelli Danielski); Assessment Representative Katy Casey

1) Call to order

2) Introductions

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:

   a) Program remarks

   b) Review team comments: Overall, the review team was impressed with the progress made since the last review. Specifically, the effort involved in creating a new major which included significant curricular changes. The team is not recommending a progress report, and looks forward to the next full self-study review in Fall 2027.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

   a) The program is considering pursuing accreditation. The team discussed the work load associated with applying for and sustaining accreditation. Please describe the inherent value to the program in terms of recruitment and quality with this endorsement. Is program staffing sufficient to address the additional work?
   i) *Benefit is national recognition for recruitment and retention purposes. Increase scientific rigor and reputation of program. The program believes resources exist to support accreditation. New certificate options and curriculum has been aligned with standards; program believes coursework already exists and is aligned.*

   b) The assessment plan is ambitious and will require engagement from all faculty and staff to implement. How has the program discussed sustainability of the assessment plan?
   i) *Direct assessment is embedded in courses and pulled to review program goals. Instructors who teach signature assessment courses enter data in google doc. Program discusses the data each fall and spring term, and about once per year they discuss changes based on data.*
   ii) *Dean commented on the structure of the assessment plan and considers it a model plan for pulling and reviewing data.*

   c) The program has done exceptionally well advocating for and obtaining resources to support students in the program. There are some remaining needs that seem like a reasonable request (e.g., desks) that could be addressed by the College and be beneficial to multiple programs.
   i) *Equipment shortages are an issue for the program. The Provost will cover expense of treadmills to address some needs for key courses. Some items are becoming outdated and need to be replaced-department funds are not always sufficient.*
   ii) *Provost suggested creating a long-term plan to address equipment needs. Chair wondered if there were*

other funding sources available (e.g., grants) to help with costs. Both the Provost and Dean shared potential funds available through distance education that may be available upon request, and based on availability.

5) **Recommended Actions**: The evaluation report lists three recommended actions (see page 6), related to assessment, enrollment, and resources.

6) **Recommended Result**: *Continuation without qualification*
   - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
   - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
      X **Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2027 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2027.**

7) Adjourn.

Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
<u>Short</u> Self-Study, Undergraduate Programs, 2022-2023
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Date of Evaluation _____11/3/2022_____   Short Self Study (SS*)__x_____
Program:___Human Performance_____ _____   Major x   Minor ☐

Evaluations submitted by: Bruce Cohen, Katy Casey, Matthew Winden, Edward Gimbel, Kelli Danielski
Review meeting attended by: Katy Casey, Matthew Winden, Edward Gimbel, Kelli Danielski

NOTE: Because the final result of this program's previous review was "Continuation without qualification," the program was required to submit a short self-study that addresses only the recommended actions from the previous report. Some programs may choose to include introductory or summary remarks or other pieces of information but this is not required.

If the program included introductory remarks, please add any comments you have on this introductory information. (Note: Programs are not required to include introductory remarks.)

If the program included introductory remarks, please add any comments you have on this introductory information. (Note: Programs are not required to include introductory remarks.)

Thank you for the detail.

The introductory comments did a nice job of summarizing the changes which have occurred in the program since the last self-study. It included additional, pertinent, big picture information on the direction of the program. It also did a nice job of incorporating how they addressed the recommended actions from the previous self-study.

The program notes significant changes since the last full review (notably transitioning to a standalone major and building online offerings). The steps that the department describes taking in response to these changes are appropriate, and demonstrate a thoughtful approach to growing the program while providing maximum flexibility for students.

The introduction provided the review team sufficient context to review the self-study. Thank you for taking the time to prepare the remarks.

Recommendation #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.

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

Good Progress	5
Making Progress	0
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #1.

No comments. Good progress.

In process curricular changes were implemented. The new major was approved and rolled out during this time frame. It seems the curriculum was refined, generally, relative to the previous HHPR emphasis. With the change in course offerings and pre-requisite revisions (as noted by the College Expert), the program has made sufficient progress in time to degree. All of these actions have directly addressed the recommendations of the AR and made significant progress.

1.a+b: The curriculum for the new major is focused and well-developed. Working to offer all required classes both face to face and online each academic year is quite impressive and demonstrates the faculty's adaptability in responding to the pandemic in a way that can both develop the program and serve student needs. 1.c: The new mission statement is solid.

This action was met with the successful launch of the major in Fall 2020 and a fully online option in 2021. The additional depth and rigor of the new curriculum was noted. The program should be commended to responding to a changing demographic of student interested in flexibility in course offerings. Additionally, the program is pursuing accreditation- is there inherent value in terms of recruitment and quality with this endorsement? The revised mission statement is a good mix of vision and practicality in terms of the benefits of this program to perspective students.

Recommendation #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.

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

Good Progress	4
Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #2

Well addressed.

Excellent progress across most of these areas. Needed lab upgrades have been obtained, although additional needs still exist. Faculty have dedicated office space and have identified meeting spaces which work for the department. Larger desks have not yet been found, although this may also be a result of other department needs (where these desks are shared). Tables have been discussed as another option. Class offerings have increased, with core courses offered every semester. This has helped to impact enrollment caps (keeping them below 40) which is reasonable. Advising has been helped with the addition of new faculty and a professional advisor in COEPS for 2nd year students. Aside from the desks, all of these actions have directly addressed the recommendations of the AR and made significant progress.

Progress has been made in responding to the resource challenges noted in the last self-study. While some challenges remain, the department seems to have done a good job of prioritizing and allocating resources where they will do the most good.

The program has little control over resources, but has worked successfully with the College to secure equipment to upgrade labs. Additionally, there seems to be improvements to faculty and meeting spaces that are reported as sufficient to address student, faculty, and staff needs. Of particular note is the programs' work to provide courses at a frequency and modality that meets student demand. While not a major focus of the report, the advising progress

seems significant and beneficial. The College supported hiring of appropriate staff, including a professional advisor to help with workload.

Much of the progress not made in this area is due to situations that are out of the program's control (budget).

Recommendation #3

Assessment. Continue the good progress you have made in assessing student learning in the program.

Recommendation #3 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	1
Making Progress	4
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #3

No further comment. Thank you for the extensive work.

The program has an incredibly detailed and thorough assessment strategy. It clearly has the potential to inform curricular revisions over time. I am concerned about the level of effort required to implement such a sophisticated strategy and the work burden imposed on faculty as a result. However, this is a top-tier assessment strategy and if the department has full buy-in, it creates the opportunity to drive real improvements in the curriculum. The department has made excellent progress on this recommendation.

The assessment plan is quite impressive. The department has made regular progress toward assessing all learning outcomes on a regular rotation, and has mapped their learning outcomes to their new course rotation effectively.

The program created an assessment plan to measure the five SLOs. The SLOs are mapped to the curriculum and assessed. The criteria for performance are specified as a percentage on the exam or project. The program provided a summary of progress on each SLO, and included examples of how the information was used. However, the specific knowledge and skills expected of successful completers is not clear for each SLO. For example, SLO 1 is assessment in a capstone exam, and students must meet the 60% criterion for performance, but it is not clear what they know based on this result- how do you determine if students know human anatomy and physiology concepts [specifically] are assessed. This is important, because it is not clear you have enough information to make changes to help students meet the 60%. The summary of SLO 5 is targeted and specific, which would be a good model for the other SLOs. Do you have rubrics for each SLO? Very impressive amount of indirect data from alumni, internship supervisors and students. The information collected provided good insights on students' pedagogical preferences. Much of the data was collected prior to the curricular change and it will be interesting to see changes in perceptions after a few years of the new curriculum.

Many of the SLOs are linked to newer courses in the curriculum, so I look forward to seeing more data regarding performance goals in the future. It will be interesting to continue to look at the measures addressed in the SLOs as students work through the new curriculum from admission to the institution, taking all of the new courses in the Human Performance curriculum.

If the program included additional information/remarks at the end of the short self-study, please add any comments you have on this additional information.

(Note: Programs are not required to include additional information/remarks.)

Overall, the program clearly and substantially addressed the recommendations over the last 5 years. No additional comments provided.

It is early days for the new major, but the work evinced in this self-study and the attached assessment plan suggests that good progress will continue to be made.

Recommended actions: Please make sure recommended actions are clearly stated so the program will know what is expected.

1) Assessment

- Continue with assessment plan to evaluate the new major, with particular attention to the online major.
- Create rubrics or checklists for each SLO so it is clear what specific knowledge and skills are being tracked.
- Consider how data will be collected and look for opportunities to create efficiencies and automation, so the work of the faculty and staff can be analyzing the data versus collecting the data.

2) Enrollment and Student Success

- Reflect on program enrollment since creation of the major, review in-person versus online enrollment and student performance.

3) Resources

- Continue to advocate to address resource challenges facing the department, particularly pertaining to equipment and subscriptions. Share current status of sustainable funding sources for equipment.

Should the program be required to submit a progress report before their next full self-study?

Yes, the program should submit a progress report by [insert due date].	0
No, a progress report is not needed.	5

Additional comments:

They appear to be making excellent progress.

While the program report supports "continue without qualification" - they will be expected to submit a full self-study in 2027.

Of the top 5 items requested for their lab upgrade, three were purchased. I am curious on the cost of the #2 and #5 items, and wonder what the next steps are in procurement of the items listed. I assume those items purchased were germane to running the HP program efficiently, but am hopeful there is a plan for future purchases to ensure the program's lab equipment is up-to-date and can support an increase in enrollment and/or competition with other schools in the state who have similar programs.

Recommended Result

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Continuation without qualification	5
Continuation with minor concerns	0
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	0
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	0
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.	0
Non-continuation of the program.	0