

Weber State University Program Review
Athletic Training Program
On-site visit February 11, 2014

Overview/introductory Statement:

This report as part of the five year review process is written after reviewing the online self-study documents and performing an onsite visit. While on site, the Dean, Chair, Program Director, Faculty, Clinical Preceptors, and Students were interviewed. The Review Team also toured teaching and laboratory facilities on campus. The Review Team submits the following findings based upon the Program Evaluation Worksheet.

Program strengths:

The Athletic training program is a well-supported and a strong program within both the Department of Health Promotion and Human Performance and the Moyes College of Education. The three fulltime faculty along with adjunct instructors teaching the courses cover the heavy responsibility of planning and providing a competency based curriculum to Weber State Students. The facilities tour while onsite revealed well designed teaching facilities and adequate equipment making the Athletic Training Program strong. The program is in line with the programs in the state and superior to many across the country. This program is in line with national accreditation standards through CAATE (Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education). This national accreditation requires annual compliance in addition to regular self-studies and site visits.

Program challenges

Concerning Standard C, the program has a high ratio of courses taught by adjunct rather than full time faculty. This is being addressed with a new hire for fall 2014 but needs to be further evaluated for program delivery.

Regarding Standard D, The Review Team agreed with the self-study and verified through various interviews that advising is adequate but could be strengthened for the benefit of students. The program has responsibility in advising students in their curricular plan as well as requirements and prerequisites for graduate and professional education. Students mentioned a concern with the faculty level advising related to the GRE exam and preparing for graduate school in Athletic Training.

Students indicated a few problems with advising and curriculum planning related to the regular and accelerated tracks of the Athletic Training program. Students in the traditional track were not offered AT 3501 and another course because of the numbers of students on the accelerated track of the AT program. Students mentioned that advising related to graduate school and professional schools could be included on programmatic map sheets or the plan of study. The review team understands that adjustments and division of responsibility related to advising is currently underway.

Areas where the program did not meet the Standards and why.

The Athletic Training program met all of the standards and only received one concern related to faculty and adjunct ratios and one for advising. The concern identified by the self-study was in part verified by the Review Team. While we understand the concern with a high ratio of adjunct faculty compared to full time tenure track faculty, the adjunct faculty are strong and passionate about their involvement in the program.

Recommendations for change – suggested changes for meeting Standards

Specific suggestions are addressed below in each evaluated section.

Additional recommendations and comments from the review team: None

A – Mission

Outcomes are well defined as included in the self-study. The Review Teams' only suggestion is that the program makes them more accessible to students. Clarify the distinct programming offered and available and how they achieve the articulated mission.

B – Curriculum

While the curriculum is planned, students on the various tracks may have class offerings limited and possibly changed unexpectedly. One student mentioned “waiting” for class to come around because most students were in the accelerated program and she was not. The program may benefit from a course offering evaluation comparing student potential schedules from each Athletic Training track. Further evaluation including the Athletic Therapy and the Master’s program may help determine curriculum needs. This will assure that students can maintain the proscribed curricular plan and move toward graduation in a timely manner.

The administrators mentioned that the faculty were aggressive in gaining the resources they need to keep the program at a high level. This is a definite strength of the program and is desirable to assure that materials and equipment needed to teach Athletic Training competencies and proficiencies are provided to students. The Dean and Chair appear to have continued and ongoing interest in providing the Athletic Training program with required curriculum support.

C – Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

We understand that the Role Delineation Study (RDS) was used for this self-study and that the competency matrix will be used for CAATE accreditation. The adequate rather than Strong rating on this standard is only the perception from faculty and students that the competencies in part and certainly the Athletic Training proficiencies should be more accessible to students and perhaps directly in syllabi. The A-Track matrix we talked about on site could be made publicly available.

D – Academic Advising

Assessment of academic advising was adequate through the current structure and processes used in the Athletic Training program. The reviewers heard from almost all groups interviewed that more advisors are needed. The Dean supports more advisors so that faculty are free to do what they do best; teach and research. We encourage that more advisors are hired to help the one strong but over worked advisor currently employed by the Department. Determine the advisor to student ratio that is more in-line with other majors on campus. Then determine the appropriate ways to engage the advisors with all student groups including those from Athletic Training.

E – Faculty

We agree with the assessment in the self-study concerning ratio of adjuncts. The additional hire this fall will certainly help with faculty load. We do recommend keeping many of the high quality and very enthusiastic part time faculty in teaching roles and connected to current practices in the field. The new faculty hire helps make this standard adequate. Depending on program growth and development an addition hire may be necessary.

F – Program Support

The administrative and library staff along with others supporting the College, Chair and Programs are a strength to the Athletic Training program. The addition of the suggested position Department lab coordinator could enable the Health Promotion and Human Performance department to further assist several majors and all of their students.

G – Relationships with External Communities

The relationships with the medical and athletic training communities is strong and a strength of the program. Many of the staff are Weber graduates and so they have a strong relationship with the program. The review committee suggests that the program consider alumni and or an external advising board to expand and strengthen the relationships with the broader medical community.

H – Results of Previous Program Reviews

The Athletic Training program continues to maintain the national athletic training accreditation through CAATE : Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education.

Review Team:

Mike Diede, Associate Professor, Athletic Training Program Director, BYU
Melinda Alexander, Associate Professor, Teacher Education, Weber State University
Tamara Dahlkemper, Associate Professor, Nursing, Weber State University
Brad Hayes, Assistant Professor, Athletic Training Program Director, University of Utah