

# Physical Education Program (PEP) Site Review Report

February 28, 2019

External Review Report-Submitted by: Bryan McCullick, Ph.D., Department of Kinesiology, College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens; and Michael E. Cena, Ph.D., Department of Teacher Education, College of Education, and Director for Bachelor of Integrated Studies, Weber State University.

The review team visited with PEP students, professors, the program advisor, the department chair, local physical educators, and other support staff of the Department of Health Promotions/Human Performances—where PEP is housed— on February 20, 2019 from 8:30 am to 4:00 p.m.

## 1. Overview/Introductory Statement:

The Physical Education Professional program (PEP) prepares students for work in physical-activity venues by focusing on discipline-defined scientific foundations and how to incorporate best practices and policies in workplace and school settings. PEP provides a secondary-licensure teaching track to teach skills and knowledge applicable in K-12 teaching contexts.

Graduates with bachelor's degrees go on to supervise and manage recreational programs, organize and direct intramurals, and teach in unique education environments such as: (a) alternative schools, (b) charter schools, and (c) Job Corps. After completing a secondary teaching track, graduates are qualified for the careers mentioned above and teaching physical education and/or coaching in public/private secondary schools. Students who earn secondary physical education licenses can also earn dual certification to work in elementary schools.

The visiting reviewers found a robust, well-designed program with clearly defined objectives, assessments, and program improvements based on analyzing data trends. We especially noted the strong improvements in response to the 2014 program review.

Most of the visitation team's time was spent discussing and clarifying key aspects of PEP with its major stakeholders. Without exception, those whom we interviewed felt that the program, faculty, staff, and facilities were excellent; but a few raised a couple of concerns that are reported below.

In summary, Weber State University's PEP program is a carefully-designed professional experience based on rigorous national standards where program outcomes and assessment drive program improvements.

## 2. Program Strengths:

Thoughtful curriculum planning was articulated with national SHAPE (Society of Health and Physical Educators) National Standards for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education.

Programs of Study were congruent with current knowledge bases on preparation for physical education professionals and teachers. Program sequencing was apparent and constraints of state and university policies were carefully followed. Each program-offering provided students with robust coursework rooted in practical experiences and academic rigor. Furthermore, coursework was carefully aligned with: (a) program mission, (b) National Standards for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education, and (c) program student-learning outcomes (SLOs). There was sufficient evidence of an appropriate allocation of resources consistent with the number of admitted students and degree graduates.

Student Credit Hours (SCHs) were not, however, the concern of the review team and, thus— not evaluated. Required courses were regularly offered and students were made aware of course offerings upon entry to the major, minor, or BIS emphasis.

Without question, PEP faculty have developed clearly written and measurable SLOs. Program self-study also revealed that PEP faculty had implemented assessment systems to monitor teacher candidate progress in meeting all 27 elements of the National Standards for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education—as well as Utah state standards. SLOs, assessments, and informed decisions were reflective of PEP mission and responsive to “constituencies served” (p. 11., *Weber State University Five Year Program Review, Reviewer Guide*). PEP used practical assessment tools to determine achievement of SLOs and appropriately used data for program evaluation and improvement on a regular basis.

These support Weber State University’s mission, and reflected current best theories and practices in the preparation of PE professionals. PEP faculty have taken great care to ensure articulation with the most appropriate disciplinary skills, knowledge, and dispositions.

### 3. Program Challenges:

One procedural concern was that the faculty appear to have little, to no, input in determining student teaching placements. According to faculty interviews, this responsibility resides with the Teacher Education Field Experience Office in the Department of Teacher Education. This placement created a sense that PEP faculty had no say in where, and with whom, their teacher candidates were placed. The visitation team felt that this was a valid concern considering that PEP faculty have created relationships with regional mentor teachers who are well-informed as to program’s expectations and best practice in teaching school-based physical education.

Another consideration is that some teacher education *pro-core* courses could possibly be incorporated into existing PEP courses. If possible, this might eliminate the need for redundant content and be beneficial for teacher candidates. However, it was noted that Utah policy stipulates that programs should have the same curriculum, statewide, to better facilitate student transfer. Such a policy handcuffs PEP faculty in doing what they think would be best for teacher candidates. (An *example of how potential content overlap could be resolved*: Combining PEP 4700 – Methods Teaching Junior High School Physical Education with PEP 4710 – Methods of Teaching High School Physical Education possibly allowing

for another course to boost teacher candidates' content knowledge while remaining within a 120 credit-hour limit).

4. Areas where the program did not meet standards (and why):

The visitation team did NOT note any areas where standards were not met.

5. Recommendations for change:

There are three areas the site visitation team recommends be considered for program improvement:

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Finding</b>	<b>Suggested Improvement</b>
1. Consistency of communications regarding PEP's mission.	PEP did—according to recommendations from their 2014 review—update and clarify their mission statement. However, what the visitation team was presented in written documentation differed significantly from what was posted on the program's website.	This is a perennial problem for many organizations—keeping web-based information current. We recommend that support staff annual, or bi-annually, review and update what is on both HPHP and PEP webpages.
2. Collaboration with WSU Career Services	PEP did not have data regarding either student employment or efforts to advise PEP students about WSU career services opportunities.	Conversations with WSU career services could foster better student understanding and knowledge of services available, free of charge, to them.  Additionally, although there are constraints, WSU career services might assist with collecting post-graduation employment data.
3. Conversations with the Teacher Education Department	PEP faculty and leadership raised concerns about pedagogy overlap and student teaching placements	We recommend collegial discussion take place between the HPHP/PEP and Teacher Education program chairs and professional staff to discuss challenges and options for student teaching

		<p>placement and mentor teacher selection.</p> <p>Conversations could also take place about streamlining curriculum toward secondary licensure.</p>
--	--	---

6. Additional recommendations from the site visit team:

The site visitation team feels the above recommendations will provide opportunities for greater professional discussion and collegiality. We do not have further suggestions.

7. Improvements from last site visitation (Spring 2014):

Progress from the 2014 program review was quite evident. Annual curriculum examination and revision should continue to insure fidelity to program aims. Specific improvements included: (a) better definition of PEP's mission, (b) improved student advisement, (c) stronger adherence to PEP program policies and procedures, and (d) outstanding quality of instruction.