

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Follow-up Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Asian Studies Minor, 2015-2016**

**Date:** April 5, 2016

**Time:** 1:00-2:00pm

**Place:** Upham Hall 322

**Attended:** Interim Provost John Stone; AVC Greg Cook; Dean David Travis; Program Coordinator Margo Kleinfeld; faculty and staff in the Asian Studies program Jian Guo, Larry Newman, Elizabeth Kim, Marjorie Rhine, Kasumi Kato; Audit & Review Team Chair Linda Yu; Audit & Review team members Joan Cook, Corey Davis, Jolly Emrey

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments. *Program coordinator and faculty discussed strengths of the program. Although enrollment is low, the program is viewed by many other institutions as the “model” program due to its well-designed curriculum. This is a unique program in the UW System.*
- 4) Discussion of Review Team’s evaluation. *Review team summarizes major strengths of the program. The discussion focuses on the following issues:*
  - a) **Program outlook.** The program has experienced low enrollment, especially after the introduction of the Japanese Studies minor. What is the long-term strategic plan for the program?
    - i) Enrollment: what can be done to attract more students/interests? What is the desired enrollment? *The program agrees that student recruitment is very important and is of high priority. The program’s language requirement was discussed. It’s not clear whether the language requirement is a barrier for students taking the minor. Additional discussion will be conducted among faculty and staff involved in the program. The impact on enrollment for Asian Studies minor as a result of the introduction of Japanese Studies major/minor is discussed.*
    - ii) Resources: does the program have sufficient resources, and what additional resources are needed? *The program doesn’t have sufficient resource to support its activities. The program coordinator doesn’t received load reduction for her additional responsibilities and there’s no student help. Dean Travis agrees additional resources are needed to move the program forward. Discussion focused on effective structuring of the program, i.e. identify a logical “home” for the program.*

*Faculty of the program and Dean Travis agree that the program is important and essential for the College and the University. However, the current structure prohibits effective utilization of resources. The program will most likely discontinue as a stand-alone minor and be homed under Race and Ethnic Studies as one of several minors. It’s possible that a designated faculty will be assigned to coordinate these minors. Additional discussions will happen in the College, and appropriate curricular actions will be taken to make any*

*necessary changes to the program's structure, curriculum, etc.*

- b) Development of an assessment process. What are the challenges, and more importantly, how will the program overcome challenges in the development and implementation of an assessment plan? A list of specific issues is identified in the recommended actions section.

*It is clear that the program needs a systematic assessment plan. Specific student learning outcomes should be identified and data collected to evaluate student learning. Both internal and external constituencies need to be part of the process. The program faces the common challenges that other inter-disciplinary programs on campus encounter.*

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists recommended actions in two phases (see page 12) related to program continuation, assessment, enrollment, and collaboration with the Japanese Studies program.

*The audit and review committee provides a two-phase action recommendation. A progress report addressing phase one recommendation is due March 1, 2017.*

*The program has indicated that the Asian Studies Minor will not continue in its current form. Therefore, there is no phase two action needed. Assessment (recommended actions outlined in this audit and review report) will be addressed as the program relocate to its new home. If this situation changes and the program continues as a standalone program, then the phase two action must be addressed and a second progress report will be due by November 1, 2018.*

- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with major concerns*

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- Submit a progress report addressing program continuation by March 1, 2017. If continued, submit a second progress report as described on page 12 by November 1, 2018.
- **Next full self-study will be due in October 2019.**

- 7) Adjourn.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater**  
**Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies**  
**Undergraduate Programs, 2014-2015**  
**Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation January 22, 2016 Short Self Study (SS\*)             
 Program Asian Studies Major            Minor X

**Evaluations submitted by:** Linda Yu (chair), Xueqing Chen, Joan Cook, Corey Davis, Jolly Emrey  
**Review meeting attended by:** Linda Yu (chair), Xueqing Chen, Joan Cook, Corey Davis, Jolly Emrey

**I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality**

**1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.**

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.**

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	5
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

1. Strategic Plan - the connections between the minor and the strategic plan items are logical, but some additional concrete examples for each or a bit more specificity with respect to how the minor connects to the items identified would be nice to see for Strategic Plan Items 1 and 4 in particular.
3. The program does inherently include elements of inclusive excellence. Perhaps some discussion about not only the content but also about attracting underrepresented students to the program might be worthwhile. This is mentioned with the understanding that the program is seeking to grow its minors.

3. IE Goal #1 is clearly demonstrated, with more than ample evidence. However, evidence for IE Goal #2 is vague. It would be helpful to have some examples of specific faculty members and specific IE-related professional development activities they have engaged in.
3. What specific activities, goals, competencies were addressed?
4. Little has been done to address the previous A&R recommendations.
4. Recommended actions are very general in nature, which targeted the assessment process of the program. Not sure how the restructuring of the minor may affect the recommended actions.
4. How did the change in leadership impact the program?

## I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

### 1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### 2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### 3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and making decisions about changes to the program goals.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	3
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### 4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a "vision" for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### 5. The program earned recognition or awards.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	3

### 6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0

No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4

### Comments

1. The revised mission statement is a big improvement over the old one.
1. It sounds like the Advisory Committee was not involved in revising the Mission Statement, and it has not been approved by (or seen by?) the Committee.
2. Goals and objectives are identified but were not undertaken.
2. Program goals and objectives should be established on an annual basis moving forward.
2. Have there not been any other goals over the past 5 years (other than eliminating the Japanese Studies track)?
3. There is a committee which has never met and has never collected any assessment data.
3. There is not a process for the program to set goals, gather and review data for assessing program goals, and make decisions about changes to the program goals.
3. While the program coordinator provides primary leadership, the Advisory Committee needs to be much more involved in setting and monitoring goals. It's not just the job of one person.
4. There are ideas or "a vision," but not specific plans.
4. I believe it's time to ask whether this minor is still needed and, if so, who is invested in it. It seems that Asian Studies and Japanese Studies are competing against one another in some ways--why are both needed as separate programs?
5. Recognition and Awards. It is noted in the self-study that there are no recognitions or awards to be reported.
6. Accreditation. It is noted in the self-study that "the program does not offer any special accreditation." Is there accreditation available for a minor of this type?

## II. Assessment: A. Curriculum

### 1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	5
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### 2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

### 3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	3
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### 4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the

**classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.**

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)**

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

5. It is not clear how online courses are evaluated.
1. It may be worthwhile to see if any of the assessment plans discussed in the appendices under the former program coordinator could be adapted to the SLOs (understanding that the minor may revise these SLOs in the near future).
  3. Only enrollment data were offered. The explanation of (or more specifically, the rationale for) the Japanese Studies track and its transition into a stand-alone minor was confusing. Why was the Japanese Studies program seemingly so effective in drawing more students?
  3. What data were considered in making the curricular changes (i.e., adding courses, separating the two programs)?
  3. It sounds like there has been little ongoing oversight, little strategic planning for this minor.
  4. It would be helpful to have the number of Asian Studies students who have completed travel study or the membership numbers for related student organizations.
  4. Perhaps some additional detail on the independent study and UGR projects as well as some detail on assessments used with these opportunities could highlight some things the program is currently doing and/or offers to current/potential minors.

**II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning**

**1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.**

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	4
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	4
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	4
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	4
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

1. There is no mapping of SLOs to individual courses.
1. The mapping to LEAP is a good start, but as the self-study author noted, they needs to be revisited if/as SLOs are revised. Several may be difficult to assess in a way that gives unambiguous information about the degree to which students have achieved them.
3. The program coordinator's steps (pg. 13) do not constitute an actual assessment plan, but I agree that these are a good guideline for what is needed to create an assessment plan.
3. Although a plan is articulated in the report, there has been no progress made towards assessment.
- 3-6. No assessment data was collected, and there is no established plan to do so.
4. Work with Office of Academic Assessment to develop and implement a meaningful and manageable assessment plan.
6. The strategies mentioned are good possibilities.

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data****1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	4
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4

**4-5. [MAJORS ONLY] Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4

**6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

- 1-2. There is little evidence that the program can remain viable, divorced from Japanese Studies.
- 1-2. This is noted in the self-study, the trend data suggest that the minor has seen a decline in its enrollment; however, this decline would likely reflect the split with Japanese Studies as well (albeit that is a small program). It should be noted that data are offered here and that there is recognition that efforts will be made to grow the program.
- 1-2. The low enrollment is a valid concern for the program moving forward.
6. What are some ways to facilitate communication between the minor and departments to increase enrollment in low enrollment courses, and to better utilize resources?

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates****1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4



**2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.**

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	5
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

2. It would be good to include some external evidence of employment opportunities (surveys, Labor Dept. data, news articles, etc.).
2. Can be difficult to get this information for minors.

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)****1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge**

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**


**IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics****1. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2-3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

It will be helpful to identify expertise area of faculty.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement****1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments****IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities****1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

1. Faculty are active in research.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding****1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments****IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service****1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program****1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.**

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

- Does the program coordinator get a course release?
- The program needs additional resources if it is to build enrollment.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings****1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.**

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments (please label by item numbers, e.g., I.1; I.2; etc.).**

Given the library budget carryover, are there additional resources (films, software, games, books, travel periodicals/guides, etc.) that could be ordered to better serve students and/or faculty/staff? Are there other facilities, equipment, etc. that would be helpful? Not sure in which category support for study abroad or field trips would go, but would this be helpful?

**V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program****1. Program strengths are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**4. Other comments by the program (not rated).**

Yes	
No	

**Comments**

2. There is clearly a recognition on the part of the coordinator that the program needs increased enrollment and that it needs an assessment plan. Robust marketing is noted as a means for attracting more students, but there is no specificity here with respect to a plan. It might be of benefit to speak with other minors or programs about their methods for attracting enrollment in courses and for attracting enrollment in minors/programs. It is unclear now how this will be achieved. In addition, the assessment plans seems to be something that is on the back burner until SLOs can be modified. Perhaps, some kind of smaller assessment project (given current SLOs) could be implemented. The appendices include ideas that the former coordinator had developed. Any one of these might be a starting point.
  3. Faculty/staff changes and support from departments is something that needs to continue to help the program meet its goals for attracting more students in courses and in the minor.
- 2&3. Very thoughtful comments and good suggestions are offered.

**VI. Reviewer Conclusions****1. Strengths of the Program**

- Interesting program.
- The interdisciplinary focus of this minor is a strength and answers the call to break down silos.
- The program also addresses multiple inclusive excellence goals in the university's strategic plan.
- It is interdisciplinary and it offers students opportunities to increase/enhance global awareness.

**2. Areas for Work or Improvement**

- Lower enrollment in the past three years
- The nature of the interdisciplinary focus seems to have created (all-too-common) problems, as the minor seems to lack a community of faculty who meet regularly to discuss program goals, assessment, curriculum and other topics that are more routinely discussed and addressed in programs with a single home department. Assessment, in particular, has clearly been neglected. Additionally, recruitment is clearly an area to work on. The Asian Studies minor and the Japanese Studies minor need to coordinate their efforts in this area and others.
- Assessment is an area of work/improvement. While the coordinator indicates that more revision to the program and to the SLOs will be forthcoming, I think that assessment could be considered on more than one level: first, assessment of the program in terms of the courses being offered and how they map not only to LEAP ELOs but also to the goals that the program has self-identified. These are complementary and this kind of detailed mapping might help with respect to other issues such as recruitment of students and buy-in from other faculty/staff or departments that support this minor with faculty/staff and curricula; second, the assessment of some of the SLOs currently reported in the self-study could take place in evaluating not only your minors, but also students enrolled in the courses you offer. It could start small and be very manageable. As mentioned earlier, reviewing some of the ideas of the former coordinator might be a fruitful starting point. It is very clear that an assessment plan with targets and

measurable outcomes needs to be put into place very soon.

- Low enrollment and lack of systematic assessment plan.
- The self-study outlines these well: Promotion, assessment, and communication

### 3. Other comments/questions

- I am left wondering why the Japanese Studies minor was spun off from the Asian Studies minor. Is the Japanese Studies minor now a demonstrably better curriculum than it was as an emphasis? The Asian Studies minor has clearly suffered.
- It might be worthwhile to get on the agendas of department meetings whose faculty/staff contribute to the program to discuss ideas about marketing the minor.
- The college and university need to decide whether this minor, in its current structure and separate from Japanese Studies, is something we want to continue. If so, decisions about desired enrollment need to be made (is the current level okay? need to grow it?) and resources committed to the program.

### 4. Recommended Actions

The audit and review committee recommends a two-phase action:

Phase 1: Submit a progress report that focuses on the continuation of the program by March 1, 2017.

- i) The program should work with the Dean and the program Advisory Board, in consultation with Japanese Studies program, to determine if the minor should be continued.
- ii) Develop a 5-year strategic plan that outlines program development, staffing, and resources if the program will continue.

Phase 2: If the program decides to continue, submit report on the following recommended actions by November 1, 2018.

- i) Assessment
  - (1) Develop a process, which should include significant involvement of the Advisory Committee, for setting and monitoring program goals.
  - (2) Develop and implement the assessment plan that has a clear schedule and identified instruments for collecting and disseminating assessment data.
  - (3) Modify and/or enhance SLOs when needed as indicated by assessment data or input from internal and external constituencies.
- ii) Enrollment
  - (1) Determine goals regarding enrollment and develop strategies to meet them.
  - (2) Develop enhanced recruitment efforts and provide evidence on the effectiveness of these efforts.
- iii) Collaboration
  - (1) Work with Japanese Studies minor to resolve the confusion and competition that seem to have sprouted from the separation of these two programs.
  - (2) Meet with contributing departments to get assistance and support in data collection and student recruitment.

**5. Recommended Result**

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns	
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	X
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program.	