

# Physical Education Program's Response to the Review Team Report

*by Brian McGladrey, Geri Conlin, James Zagrodnik, and Chad Smith*

## Introduction

The faculty of the Physical Education program wishes to thank the members of the Review Team for their time and effort spent evaluating our program. The Team "found the program to be of high caliber and professionally sound." Further, the Team noted several strengths of the program, which in part included: (1) the program's mission statement; (2) a clearly defined educational program; (3) statements of learning outcomes written in clear and concise terms; (4) students' receipt of a variety of support and knowledge regarding academic advising, career decisions, and placement in employment or graduate school; and (5) faculty members who are well-prepared, both academically and professionally, who continue to find new ways to improve existing courses.

As a faculty, we have worked diligently to develop a program that we believe best prepares WSU students to become professional physical educators, and we are grateful for the Team's recognition of our work, and for their compliments. However, the Team identified a few concerns and weaknesses; addressing them will only help to improve the quality of our program.

## Identified Concerns and Weaknesses

The concerns noted by the Review Team are addressed below, along with our responses:

- 1. The mission statement does not have any language about how the missions will be met. We believe it is looking for a "ways and means" statement.*

**Response:** We agree with the Team's assessment of the program's mission statement, and we will create a revision that includes language explaining how the mission statement will be met. This revision process will occur during Summer semester of 2014.

- 2. The self-study team rated Element A (curriculum) as a concern. There needs to be a clear scope and sequence of the program, specifically the teaching licensure track.*

**Response:** We agree with this assessment. Although we have articulated a "scope" to the program, a clear "sequence" for completion of coursework will be articulated in a "degree map," which will be completed during May of 2014 with the assistance of the Department's academic coordinator.

- 3. An Additional concern we had was the overlap of content between the physical education teaching licensure track courses and the required core education courses that these majors take prior to student teaching.*

**Response:** Although we agree that a certain overlap in material exists between the program coursework and that which students complete as required by the Department of Teacher Education, addressing this assessment may be problematic. During Fall semester of 2014, we will work to identify course overlaps between departments, and devise methods to reduce redundancy. A potential solution might include the development of an "opt-out" examination if redundancy issues cannot be reconciled. Conversely speaking, repetition is a proven method for learning, and what physical education students practice in their Teacher Education courses can be applied to their second field of study (e.g., health, English, math, etc.).

- 4. The (curriculum) grid shows a variety of assignments and assessments for each NASPE standard, but many of them are more course outcomes instead of program outcomes.*

**Response:** We agree with this assessment. Program faculties will develop rubrics that address each program outcome for each of the courses they teach, which ultimately meet with the approval of all. This rubric development process will require the academic year 2014–2015 to complete.

- 5. There are certain assessments that do meet this element (measures for assessment), such as the practicum evaluation guide, however the majority of the assessments do not have a universal tool for assessing them.*

**Response:** We agree with this assessment. Similar to the above, program faculties will develop assessments for each of the courses they teach, which will then be evaluated and agreed upon by the program faculty as a whole. This process will result in assessment tools that will be universal across multiple sections of the same course. Development of these assessment tools will occur during Fall and Spring semesters, 2014–2015.

- 6. As discussed in element A2, each artifact being used as an indicator of the program's outcomes needs a standard way to assess it.*

**Response:** We agree with this assessment. We will develop standardized tools for determining whether or not artifacts used as indicators of program outcomes actually

support those outcomes, and use these outcomes when considering changes to the program

*7. While success has been shown with the current format of academic advising, a clearly defined process is needed.*

**Response:** We agree with this assessment. The Department faculty has discussed options and strategies for reducing the academic coordinator's workload, to include requesting of the Dean that it be allowed to hire additional advising support. A permanent solution should be the result of discussion and work in Department faculty meetings during the 2014–2015 academic year.

Beyond addressing the concerns and recommendations listed above, the Physical Education faculty members, who are mentored at the department and college levels, intend to continue to evaluate the program for purposes of creating efficiency and appropriateness in the curriculum. The program faculty is committed to preparing students (physical educators) who are capable of teaching physical education to meet National Standards; this means that they are highly skilled in teaching all forms of physical activity, not simply team sports. In short, our objective is to prepare physical educators to provide quality physical education.