



Weber State University
Five or Seven Year Program Review
Reviewer Guide and Worksheets

Dear Program Review Committee Member,

Thank you for your willingness to participate on the committee to review one of Weber State University's academic programs. Whether you have come from across the country, within the state, or from here on campus, your support and expertise are appreciated and valued. This document contains guidelines, instructions, and worksheets for the program review visit. You may complete either an electronic or a hard copy version of this document.

If you have questions about the review process prior to your visit, feel free to contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at (801) 626-8586.

Name of programs under review: Exercise and Sport Science and Nutrition Education

Name of reviewer: Dr. Jeffrey Michael Willardson

Reviewer affiliation: Associate Professor, Health and Human Performance Department, Montana State University Billings

Name of reviewer: Dr. Hugo Valle

Reviewer affiliation: Associate Professor, School of Computing, Weber State University

Contents

Purpose of Program Review	4
Program Review Process	5
Self-study Format and Standards	6
Executive Summary	6
Self-study Format.....	7
Program Evaluation Worksheet	8
STANDARD A - MISSION STATEMENT	9
STANDARD B – CURRICULUM	10
STANDARD C - STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT	11
STANDARD D - ACADEMIC ADVISING	13
STANDARD E – FACULTY	14
STANDARD F - PROGRAM SUPPORT	16
STANDARD G - RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL COMMUNITIES	17
STANDARD H - PROGRAM SUMMARY	18
Suggested Questions for Program Review Evaluation Team Members	20
Questions for program department chair	20
Questions for individual faculty members	21
Questions for students – groups or individual	24

Purpose of Program Review

The primary purpose of program review at Weber State University is to improve academic programs. An academic program may consist of an entire department which houses several majors, or an academic program may be a component of a department. Program reviews are not conducted to expressly identify individual programs for discontinuance. Reviews will result in an identification of program strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for change. The program faculty, responsible academic dean, and provost will respond in writing to these recommendations as part of a program-improvement plan.

Responsibilities of Program Review Committee

The program review committee is charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Review of the content of the program to ensure that it is consistent with high standards and practices within the discipline.
2. Review resources (faculty, facilities and selected budgets, such as travel budgets) to ensure that they are consistent with supporting a quality program.
3. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the program.
4. Note any concerns or recommendations about the rates of recruitment of new students, placement of graduates and sensitivity to community and professional needs.
5. Review sufficiency of the evidence of student learning.

Program Review Process

Program reviews are conducted on a 5 to 7-year cycle. Exceptions to this schedule may occur as a result of previous review recommendations or outside accreditation schedules.

The faculty representing a department scheduled for program review develops an extensive self-study report during the fall semester. The final self-study report goes through a series of approvals, culminating with sign off from the Dean of the appropriate college. The purpose of the self-study is twofold. First, it provides an opportunity for department faculty to collaborate at a program-level perspective to consider their programs and the status or 'health' of those programs. Second, the self-study document is sent to members of the program review committee to provide them with information and background about the program under study, to help those individuals become better acquainted with the program they are being asked to evaluate.

At the conclusion of the site visit, recommendations and commendations are compiled by the site visit team chair and presented in a report to the department chair. The chair shares the report with the program faculty, who is then given an opportunity to formally respond to that report. All reports and responses are then forwarded to the appropriate Dean, who also develops a response.

At the beginning of the fall semester following the site visit, the Dean's response along with the self-study, review recommendations/commendations, and faculty response are forwarded to the Provost's Office. Program reviews are then distributed to the institutional reviewing committee (often the Faculty Senate Executive Committee) and a formal review is scheduled with this committee and the department chair(s). The department chair makes a presentation to the committee; the committee asks questions of the department chair; finally, the committee makes a recommendation to the Provost about the program under review.

The final step is development of program review reports by the Provost for distribution to and consideration by the university's Board of Trustees and the Utah State Board of Regents. These reports are developed and delivered during the spring semester.

Self-study Format and Standards

The most critical element of program review is the self-study that is prepared by the program faculty. The self-study document is both a description and an analysis of important aspects of an academic program. Once this document has been completed, it is reviewed and approved by the responsible Academic Dean prior to its dissemination. The self-study is approximately 25-30+ pages in length, exclusive of appendices, and should follow the format described below. An executive summary of the self-study is also prepared by the Program Faculty. This summary document is 3-5 pages in length, exclusive of the appendices, and includes brief information about the program under review.

Executive Summary

- Mission Statement
- Curriculum - types of degrees, number of courses, admissions process
- Student learning outcomes and assessment
- Academic Advising
- Faculty
- Program Support
- Relationships with the External Community
- Student, Faculty, Contract/Adjunct Faculty and Staff statistical summaries (Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research)
- Information of review team members (name - current position - place of employment - contact information)

Self-study Format

- I. Cover Sheet/Title Page
- II. Program Review Elements and Standards
 - A. Mission Statement
 - B. Curriculum
 - 1. Curriculum Map
 - C. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
 - 1. Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses
 - 2. Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major
 - 3. Evidence of Learning: High Impact Service Learning
 - D. Academic Advising
 - E. Faculty
 - F. Support (Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library)
 - G. Relationships with the External Communities
 - H. Results of Previous Program Reviews
- III. Appendices
 - A. Student and Faculty Statistical Summary
 - B. Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile
 - C. Staff Profile
 - D. Financial Analysis Summary
 - E. Relationships with External Communities
 - F. Additional information as determined by Program

Program Evaluation Worksheet

FOR USE BY PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS

This form is to be used by each team member to record program data and information during the team visit. The following quality ratings are suggested:

- S** Strength; especially effective practice or condition
- G** Good; meets expected standards
- C** Concern; action could be needed in the future
- W** Weakness; action needed
- X** Did not evaluate – indicate why the area was not evaluated.

At the conclusion of the visit, leave the original of this form with the team chair, who will use it to prepare the draft statement for the institution.

STANDARD A - MISSION STATEMENT

Evaluate how effectively the mission statement articulates the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The expected outcomes of the program need to be clearly defined.	S	Well written concise mission statement.
b.	A process by which these accomplishments are determined and periodically assessed based upon the constituencies served by the program.	S	In 2022, four initiatives were designed to assess the ESN program in relation to general WSU objectives, high impact educational practices, community partnerships, and undergraduate research. Each of these four initiatives is on the cutting edge of modern college education.
c.	A clearly defined educational program, including a curriculum that enables graduates to achieve the mission.	S	A well designed curriculum to serve students in two different tracks, including, <i>Sports Nutrition</i> and <i>Integrative Nutrition</i> . The <i>Integrative Nutrition</i> option is more practical and prepares students to enter the job market directly after graduation, while the <i>Sports Nutrition</i> option prepares students for a Masters program to become a Registered Dietician. This program serves the needs of all students with interests and career goals in nutrition. There are also a <i>Bachelor of Integrated Studies</i> and <i>Nutrition Education Minor</i> options.
d.	The program mission statement must be appropriate to and support the mission statements of both the college housing the program and the university.	S	

Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD B – CURRICULUM

Evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program should demonstrate that the curriculum for each degree and for any general education/service courses offered by the program is the result of thoughtful curriculum planning and review processes.	S	Detailed tables were provided outlining the degree requirements for four options: <i>Sports Nutrition</i> , <i>Integrative Nutrition</i> , <i>Bachelors of Integrated Studies</i> , and <i>Nutrition Education Minor</i> . The course offerings comprise a comprehensive range of topics from clinical, athletic, multicultural, and medicinal.
b.	The curriculum should be consistent with the program's mission.	S	
c.	The program should be able to demonstrate that there is an appropriate allocation of resources for curriculum delivery that is consistent with the mission of the program, the number of graduates, and the number of major/minor and general education SCHs produced.	G	Continued emphasis on reducing the number of adjunct instructors with classes taught by full-time faculty.
d.	Courses to support the major/minor/general education/service programs are offered on a regular basis to ensure students are able to complete graduation requirements in a timely manner.	G	There appears to be a bottleneck with availability of CHEM 1210 course.

Rating: *S* = Strength, *G* = Good, *C* = Concern, *W* = Weakness, *X* = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD C - STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

Evaluate the extent to which the program has clearly defined outcomes.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	Learning outcomes should describe the expected knowledge, skills, and behaviors that students will have achieved at the time of graduation (overarching program goals).	S	Detailed tables provided showing Nutrition Program Learning Outcomes divided into 4 <i>concepts</i> and 4 <i>competencies</i> . Each course in the curriculum was rated on the <i>concepts</i> and competencies, with specified exam scores to show that students are meeting expectations.
b.	Learning outcomes must support the goals of the program and the constituencies served.	S	
c.	Learning outcomes should be directly linked to the program's curriculum. An explicit curriculum grid illustrating this alignment, as well as the depth to which each course addresses each outcome, is publicly available.	S	See comment above.

Rating: *S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

Evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment process based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program has a developed set of measures for assessment that are clearly defined and appropriately applied.	S	Table 4 from the Program Review Self Study document specified percentages of students that had to achieve a specified exam score to demonstrate concepts and competencies are being achieved.
b.	Each learning outcome is assessed with <i>at least one direct measure</i> of learning; thresholds for acceptable performance are defined (for each measure) and published.	S	Evidence was consistent and specific for each learning outcome. The program ensures that each learning outcome is assessed with at least one direct measure of learning, and clear threshold for acceptable performance are defined.
c.	Demonstrate that evidence of learning is being gathered on a regular basis across the program, that the evidence is aggregated, and reported at the aggregate.	S	The program has a robust system in place for gathering evidence of learning on a regular basis across the program.
d.	Demonstrate that these measures are being used in a systematic manner on a regular basis and are reviewed against department-established thresholds, i.e., are the program faculty meeting regularly to discuss the evidence?	S	The program demonstrates a strong commitment to aggregating and reporting this data, which is an important aspect of evaluating the overall effectiveness of the program.
e.	Demonstrate that the assessment of the program mission and student outcomes is being used to improve and further develop the program. Is the evidence acted upon? Is it clear what drives program change?	S	

Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD D - ACADEMIC ADVISING

Evaluate the following related to the advising process.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program has a clearly defined strategy for advising their major/minor, or BIS students that is continually assessed for its effectiveness.	G	It was suggested that mandatory advising at least once per year. This will ensure that students are receiving regular guidance and support to help them stay on track.
b.	Students receive appropriate assistance in planning their individual programs of study.	G	It was suggested that the program could benefit from a more frequent communication with students to ensure they are staying on track.
c.	Students receive needed assistance in making career decisions and in seeking placement, whether in employment or graduate school.	G	Students need to see advisors more frequently to receive information on career goals to ensure they are in the appropriate track within ENS.

Rating: *S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

STANDARD E – FACULTY

Evaluate the extent to which the faculty demonstrates the following characteristics.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	Faculty size, composition, qualifications, and professional development activities must result from a planning process which is consistent with the program's mission.	S	Most faculty members are new, with few anticipated retirements; possibly one retirement in the next five years.
b.	The program maintains a core of full-time faculty sufficient to provide stability and ongoing quality improvement for the degree programs offered.	C	Cost of living is a challenge along the Wasatch Front. The starting salary for tenure track faculty is insufficient for a reasonable standard of living.
c.	Contract/adjunct faculty who provide instruction to students (day/evening, off/on campus) are academically and professionally qualified.	S	
d.	The program should demonstrate efforts to achieve demographic diversity in its faculty.	G	Two faculty members, one tenure track Hispanic/Latino; and one adjunct instructor who is Indian represent minorities.

Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
e.	The program should have appropriate procedures for the orientation of new contract/adjunct faculty.	S	
f.	Processes are in place to determine appropriate teaching assignments and service workloads, to guide and mentor contract/adjunct faculty, and to provide adequate support for activities which implement the program's mission.	S	
g.	<p>Teaching is systematically monitored to assess its effectiveness, and revised periodically to reflect new objectives and to incorporate improvements based on appropriate assessment methods. For both contract and adjunct faculty, there is evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Effective creation and delivery of instruction. ● Ongoing evaluation and improvement of instruction. ● Innovation in instructional processes. 	S	Current nutrition faculty attend and participate in professional conferences each year. As needed, the faculty also attend WSU sponsored training for professional improvement.
h.	A formal, periodic review process exists for all faculty, and the results of the reviews are available.	S	Tenure track faculty are reviewed annually.

Rating: *S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

STANDARD F - PROGRAM SUPPORT

Evaluate the nature and adequacy of the program support based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The number and capabilities of the support staff are adequate to meet the mission and objectives of the program.	G	It was mentioned that more sustainability with Lab Managers is needed.
b.	Administrative support is present in assisting in the selection and development of support staff.	S	
c.	The facilities, equipment, and library support needs are adequate to meet the mission and goals of the program.	S	It was noted that there is a fund available to support request for faculty equipment, which amounts to \$40,000 per year. This fund can significantly contribute to improving the teaching effectiveness by providing them with the necessary tools and resources to enhance their instructional practice.

Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD G - RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL COMMUNITIES

Evaluate the relationships according to the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	If there are formal relationships between the program and external communities of interest they should be clearly defined.	S	Relationship with Dairy West allows for internships and capstone experiences for students.
b.	Such relationships should have a clearly defined role and evidence of their contribution to the program (curriculum, equipment, faculty, budget, etc.) should be demonstrated.	S	
c.	If the program has an external advisory committee, it should meet regularly and minutes of the meetings be made available.	X	Nothing reported on this aspect.

Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD H - PROGRAM SUMMARY

Evaluate the effectiveness of the program to implement recommendations and make changes based on previous reviews.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program must show how it has implemented any recommendations from the previous review and what effect these changes had on the program. If any recommendations were not implemented the program should explain why they were not put into place.		<p>Overall, a very good program and meets the needs of students. The only suggestions would be as follows: a) revisit tenure track faculty starting salary given present economic circumstances, b) revisit advising requirements for students, possibly make it mandatory, c) continue work on reducing the number of adjunct instructors. The program should be commended for the comprehensive curriculum that includes timely classes to reach employable skills to students.</p> <p>Additionally, the program has done an excellent job establishing external outreach and building relationships with community organizations, which provides students with valuable experiences as they complete their educational journey.</p>

Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

Please include any other notes you feel are relevant to your review of the program:

Notes:

Suggested Questions for Program Review Evaluation Team Members

Questions for program department chair

1. What are the mission, goals, and objectives of the program?
2. How are program goals and objectives assessed?
3. Whom does the program serve?
4. What are the special/unique features of the program?
5. What relationships exist between the program and external communities?
6. Is there an advisory committee? Is it active? What is the meeting frequency?
7. Are any major curriculum changes planned? What? When to implement?
8. Is a continuous improvement plan in place? How is it impacting the curriculum?
9. How much time and what resources are available to the faculty for professional development?
10. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the various support departments?
11. Who is responsible for certifying that students have completed requirements before graduating?
12. What are the hiring criteria for adjunct faculty?
13. What type of new faculty orientation is provided to full-time and adjunct faculty?
14. How is the effectiveness of faculty determined in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship?
15. What are the program's advising procedures?

Questions for individual faculty members

1. How much time and what resources are available for professional development?
2. How many faculty members teach in this program?
3. Is the administration supportive of the program?
4. Does the program provide appropriate procedures for orientation of new faculty?
5. What professional organizations are you a member of? Are you active? Hold any offices?
6. What are the student learning outcomes for this program? How are they assessed?
7. How are the results of the student learning outcomes assessment used?
8. How do you go about obtaining needed equipment?
9. Is there an effective process for faculty evaluation?
10. What unique or unusual teaching methods are used in your department?
11. Are there formal relationships between the program and external communities?
12. What is the role of the faculty in curriculum revision?
13. What changes should be made to improve the program? To improve the facilities?
14. What advising opportunities are available to the students?
15. What is the role of the faculty in student advising?
16. Is there adequate secretarial and computing service available to you for preparing examinations, handouts, demonstrations, etc.?
17. How large are the classes?
18. Is a continuous improvement plan in place? How is it impacting the curriculum?

Questions for students – groups or individual

1. Are the faculty members in the program competent in their fields?
2. Are faculty members available to you at times convenient to you?
3. Are adequate advisement opportunities made available to you?
4. If you have laboratories, are they well equipped? Do you get hands-on experience?
5. Do instructors provide effective delivery of instruction?
6. Do you plan to continue your education after graduation? When? Where?
7. Do you plan to accept a job after graduation? When? Where?
8. What is your overall view of the program? Would you recommend it to a friend?

Program Review Evaluation Team Report Guidelines

The Program Review Evaluation Team generally appoints one member of the team to prepare a 3-5 page narrative report, consistent with the self-study standards, addressing all self-study standards (A-H, see below), which identifies the following:

- program strengths - reference standard where appropriate
- program challenges – reference standard where appropriate
- program weaknesses - areas where the program did not meet the standards and why - reference standards
- recommendations for change - suggested changes for meeting the standards
- additional recommendations from the review team

Please be explicit about strengths, challenges, and weaknesses.

Standards:

- A. Mission Statement
- B. Curriculum
- C. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
- D. Academic Advising
- E. Faculty
- F. Support (Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library)
- G. Relationships with the External Communities
- H. Results of Previous Program Reviews

Nutrition Program and Exercise and Sport Science Program Review

Program Strengths

It was a pleasure to serve as an external reviewer for the *Department of Exercise and Nutrition Sciences* (ENS) at Weber State University (WSU). There was a genuine collegial spirit amongst colleagues that was evident in the time visiting with administrators, faculty, and staff. The mission statement on the ENS is well written and it clearly reflects the desire to prepare students for postgraduate education as well as immediate careers in the nutrition field.

There is a well-designed curriculum to serve students in two different tracks, including, *Sports Nutrition* and *Integrative Nutrition*. The *Integrative Nutrition* option focuses more on practical skills and prepares students to enter the job market directly after graduation, while the *Sports Nutrition* option prepares students for a master's program to become a Registered Dietician. There are also *Bachelor of Integrated Studies* and *Nutrition Education* minor options. Therefore, students are well served in this program and are well prepared for careers in many capacities.

In 2022, four initiatives were designed to assess the ENS program in relation to general WSU objectives, high impact educational practices, community partnerships, undergraduate research, and data driven decision on value/equality, affordability, and access. Each of these four initiatives is on the cutting edge of modern college education. Detailed tables were provided outlining the degree requirements for the four options: *Sports Nutrition*, *Integrative Nutrition*, *Bachelors of Integrated Studies*, and *Nutrition*

Education Minor. The course offerings comprise a comprehensive range of topics from *clinical, athletic performance, multicultural,* and *medicinal* and in many cases bring in experts from the community as adjunct instructors to enrich the learning experience of students.

Detailed tables were provided that stated the ENS Learning Outcomes divided into 4 key concepts and 4 competencies. Each course in the curriculum was rated on the concepts and competencies, with specified exam scores to show that students were meeting expectations. Evidence was consistent and specific for each learning outcome. The ENS program ensured that each learning outcome was assessed with at least one direct measure of learning, and a clear threshold for acceptable performance was defined. The program has a robust system in place for gathering evidence of learning on a regular basis.

The program demonstrates a strong commitment to aggregating and reporting this data, which is an important aspect of evaluating the overall effectiveness of the program.

In conversation with Dean Kristen Hadley, a strength of the ENS Department is the number of new faculty that bring fresh and cutting-edge perspectives on the latest discoveries in nutrition science. There is a generous amount of funding available yearly (i.e., \$40,800) that is utilized for equipment purchases to support quality teaching. Faculty also have many opportunities to be funded for professional development activities to attend conferences and present their work.

These sentiments were echoed by Dr. David Aguilar-Alvarez, Department Chair of ENS, who stated that there might be one faculty retirement in the next five years. Therefore, the ENS Department is very stable and will continue to be one of the strongest departments within the Moyes College of Education at Weber State University. A key aspect noted by Dr. Aguilar-Alvarez was the

internship and post-graduate opportunities students have available through connections with external organizations. For example, Dairy West, a Utah company that promotes the dairy industry and products locally, nationally, and globally has been a great internship site for ENS students. Moreover, there is a relationship with the University of Utah to enable students to become Registered Dietitians (RD). Students complete prerequisite courses in the *Sports Nutrition* tract and then qualify for entry into the RD program at the University of Utah. The academic advisors, Heidi Costello, and Matthew Smith, do an outstanding job of keeping students on track with required course work to complete degree requirements in a timely manner.

An additional praise worth aspect was the way the ENS Department works together with other departments to share equipment for teaching and research purposes. The facilities are spacious, and equipment is up to date to accomplish the purpose of the mission statement. According to Anthony Ludwig, Human Performance Coordinator, lab equipment is kept in great condition and disposable supplies for lab testing are replenished regularly. Moreover, according to Janna Trovato, adjunct instructor, the cooking equipment in the lab is adequate and meets the needs of her cooking classes.

Lastly, the student interviews were all positive regarding the class environment and availability of faculty for office hours as well as the teaching style of faculty.

Program Challenges

In assessing the ENS program, only a few challenges were identified. One item that came up was the bottleneck with the Organic Chemistry 1210 course since this is a common pre-requisite for post-graduate programs. With relevance to students staying on track, it was recommended that academic advising be mandatory for students or at least one visit with an academic advisor per year.

Continued emphasis was also placed on reducing the number of adjunct instructors with classes taught primarily by full-time faculty. A goal of the ENS Department Head was to have at least two full-time faculty with the ability to teach a given course. Additionally, more stability in the lab managers was emphasized as an area of need and moving this position from part-time to full-time.

Program Weaknesses

An area in need of improvement was the starting salary for tenure track faculty. Given the current economic circumstances and inflation, the cost of living along the Wasatch Front and in the Ogden area specifically has skyrocketed. The current starting salary for a tenure track assistant professor is not sufficient to support a reasonable standard of living, especially in cases where the individual is supporting a spouse and children.

Another area mentioned was the need for new faculty to get to know tenured faculty and receive more guidance and mentoring through the tenure process.

Recommendations for Change

Overall, the ENS program is highly effective in meeting the needs of students. The only suggestions would be as follows: a) revisit tenure track faculty starting salary given present economic circumstances, b) revisit advising requirements for students, possibly make it mandatory, c) continue work on reducing the number of adjunct instructors. The program should be commended for the comprehensive curriculum that includes timely classes to reach employable skills to students. Additionally, the program has done an excellent job establishing external outreach and building relationships with community organizations, which provides students with valuable experiences as they complete their educational journey.

Dr. Jeffrey Michael Willardson: _____  _____ 05/05/2023

Dr. Hugo E. Valle: _____  _____ 05/04/2023