

May 14, 2012

TO: Faith Hensrud, Provost  
Steve Rosenberg, Chair – Faculty Senate

FROM: Academic Program Review Council  
Chair, Laura Jacobs

Cc: Glenn Carlson, Chair – Health and Human Performance  
Wendy Kropid, APRC  
Xingbo Li, APRC  
Shevaun Stocker, APRC  
Shin-Ping Tucker, APRC

RE: Final Report on the Review of Programs within the Department of Health and Human Performance

### **Introduction**

The program review of the Health and Human Performance Department (HHP) was originally scheduled to submit its self-study to the Academic Program Review Council (APRC) in January of 2011. Members of the APRC were, at that time, Jeff Schuldt (Chair); Priscilla Starratt; Wendy Kropid; Laura Jacobs; and Glenn Carlson. Because of considerable confusion regarding the SSCI document, its implementation, and understanding of the general timeline, only one program of four slated for evaluation in 2011 was received. In spring of 2011, the Faculty Senate appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to examine and streamline the SSCI.

In October 2011, the Council, now under a new chair and with new members, met and prepared to receive the three overdue reviews, and an additional department review. The 2011-12 Council included Wendy Kropid; Xingbo Li; Shevaun Stocker; Shin-Ping Tucker; and Laura Jacobs (Chair). The self-study was conducted based on an adjusted periodic review schedule of programs on campus, and followed the Self-Study for Continuous Improvement (SSCI) format. Data sets were obtained through the work of Leann Brown, Institutional Research. While awaiting reviews, the Council oriented new members to the SSCI document being used by the programs under review, and consulted with the Ad Hoc Committee on recommended modifications to the SSCI. The APRC has submitted a separate report on the challenges and recommendations regarding continued use of the SSCI, either as used for this review cycle, or as it was modified by the Ad Hoc Committee. The submitted departmental program reviews should be read in light of the issues raised by the SSCI process itself.

On December 15, 2011, the Health and Human Performance Department (HHP) submitted its self-study. Members of the Council were assigned sections of the report, and submitted summary comments beginning in January. The Council as a whole reviewed the entire self-study and wrote an executive summary and 16 page detailed report, which it submitted to the department April 17, 2012. The Department Chair subsequently met with the Chair of APRC on April 18 to discuss specific points of the APRC report. The Department Chair apologized for the draft-like quality of the self-study, explaining that a temporary program assistant stepped in at the last moment and that the Chair had not sufficiently reviewed the final draft before submission. The Department Chair also stated that a response to the

APRC response would be provided; however the lateness of the semester has precluded submission of that response to APRC. Following is the final report of the APRC. The full document, including appendices, and APRC initial response will be made available for review.

**I. Department Mission and Alignment**

It is clear that the HHP department values student engagement and success. They are clearly dedicated to providing clarity for students as they advance through the majors and minors in the department and this is reflected in the preparation the department provides in mandatory courses, in advising students, and in supporting student organizations, as well as work they do to stay connected with alumni.

**II. Helping Students Learn**

The APR Council genuinely believes that the HHP Department plays an integral role in being an active part of a complex and diverse campus community and that the department is firmly committed to student engagement and a student-centered approach. Unfortunately, the department has not advocated for themselves through complete, thorough, and thoughtful responses to the review process in a manner that aligns with the actual work they are doing.

The APR Council recognizes the department's voluntary decision to include the Special Education and Early Childhood Education programs in this departmental review. As those programs were not part of the department when the department began the review process, the Council applauds the inclusion of these programs. This demonstrates the effort the department has made to adapt and include these new programs into their structure. Building upon those connections, APRC recommends the department use evidence-based measures to provide documentation of the quality of all its programs.

**III. Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives**

The AQIP language, "Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives" was one of several stumbling points for the Department, which led to many answers that more appropriately belonged in the prior section. APRC recommends that the Department define specific, measurable objectives they have for students outside of the major/minor curriculum and integrate the results into future planning.

**IV. Understanding Students and Other Stakeholders Needs**

As with the prior section, there was confusion over the identity of 'other stakeholders'. The inclusion of data was helpful in understanding the job market and employee distribution of the department graduates, especially as it was provided at the program level.

**V. Valuing People**

Explanation of how the department is working towards the retention /tenure of staff in its incorporated programs, including the development of a mentoring plan, is necessary.

The department clearly values professional presentations and interactions. APRC recognizes that resources are often less than optimal, and the HHP Department has made a conscious decision to set aside funds in support of faculty; however, more proactive departmental work on supporting staff is encouraged.

APRC recommends the department develop processes to examine staff loads that insure program quality does not deteriorate and academic standards are upheld.

#### **VI. Department's Planning for Continuous Improvement**

APRC recognizes the department's diligent work to maintain alignment with national and state-based standards around DPI approval for teaching licensure, for those programs impacted by this. APRC recommends further examination of specific strengths and opportunities for those programs that are still developing assessment plans.

The HHP Departments' strategic plan is dependent on realizing capital improvements in building infrastructure and equipment needs. APRC notes that linkage between the Campus Physical Plan and all other planning instruments has been weak to the detriment of long-range planning for all programs. Thorough explanation of standards and how the needs are determined will strengthen the position of department requests in future.

#### **VII. Program Recommendations**

- APRC recommends the department work to provide detail regarding specific work at program and department levels would better represent alignment with campus, with special emphasis on student engagement in high impact practices.
- APRC recommends that the department and programs express the uniqueness of its offerings by describing cross-relationships between different disciplinary areas such as biology and psychology. Provide careful examination and justification of areas of potential course duplication.
- The department must give a more thorough explanation and interpretation of its data on student completion, especially with regards to certification of its programs. An examination of the value versus cost of external program certifications by outside accrediting bodies should be conducted and reported.
- The department still needs to more clearly explain the changes it made as the result of its last review, and how those changes have impacted, or are expected to impact, the affected programs.
- Overall, the department needs to look to its data and future assessment results to provide more explicit planning goals and objectives.
- APRC recommends that the Department define specific, measurable objectives they have for students outside of the major/minor curriculum and integrate the results into future planning.

- APRC recommends the department further analyze the results of its surveys to determine whether they indicate satisfaction, and create strategies for how those results will be reflected in future plans.
- APRC recommends the department develop processes to examine staff loads that insure program quality does not deteriorate and academic standards are upheld.