

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Communication Sciences and Disorders (MS), 2019-2020**

**Date:** 2/25/2020

**Time:** 12:00pm – 1:00pm

**Place:** WH 1013

**Attendance:** Interim Associate Provost Joan Cook; Interim Associate Dean Matt Vick; Interim Dean Robin Fox (Education & Prof. Studies); Assistant Dean Katy Casey; Department Chair/Program Coordinator Lynn Gilbertson; faculty and staff in the Communication Sciences and Disorders program Michael Hammer, Cody Busch, Pedro Aranda; Audit & Review Team Chair David Wachanga; Assessment Representative Catherine Chan

- 1) Call to order at 12:05 pm
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments

Catherine Chan commented on the strengths of the program, including maintaining its accreditation, the quality of the program and its graduates, and the dedication of its staff and faculty. Program Coordinator/Department Chair Lynn Gilbertson stated that the program is very competitive relative to its peers due to its affordability, small class size, availability of program faculty, and guaranteed field placements for its students. Interim Dean Robin Fox and Assistant Dean Katy Casey both stated that Lynn is a strong leader and advocate for the program, and the group is hard working and innovative.

- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

- a) Strategies make the program more competitive when compared to peer institutions in order to attract staff/faculty and increase the program's diversity

Lynn Gilbertson explained that the teaching load, constraints in salary offer, relatively small candidate pool, and potential impediments in research productivity related to being a regional comprehensive institution all contributes to the difficulty in recruiting and retaining faculty. The College is prepared to provide some support in making the salary offer more in-line with the market rate.

In terms of efforts to increase the diversity of students in the program, Lynn also stated the program is actively engaging in examining its admission criteria to identify potential barriers. It is also devoting more efforts to recruit students from underrepresented minority and multi-lingual backgrounds, and engaging the community through events such as open houses.

- b) Explore synergies and resources within the college that would enhance students' placement

Securing students' medical placements and the need for clinical supervision continue to be an impediment in increasing the size of the student cohort. Interim Associate Provost Joan Cook stated that without the advantage of additional revenue generated by tuition dollars from a larger class size, it is difficult to address some of the concerns of the program regarding resources. The program has begun to work on its five-year vision, and Lynn indicated that establishing an online, one-year post-baccalaureate certificate program is a good direction to explore.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 2 recommended actions:

- I. Engage in discussions with the Dean and other administrative leaders as necessary to agree on an immediate and longer-term plan for the program so that allocation/procurement of the following resources can be addressed:
  - Staffing (tenure-track faculty)
  - Space (classroom, research & clinic spaces; areas for students)
  - Equipment (to support teaching and research)

Lynn Gilbertson indicated that she has been in discussion with Interim Dean Fox, and both agreed that these discussions, including the idea of launching the online post- baccalaureate certificate program, would continue.

- II. To consider working with Campus Controller (Todd Carothers) so he can develop a financial plan of how those resources could be provided with specific levels of additional students admitted.

Interim Dean Fox indicated that attempts have been made to engage Todd Carothers in discussion and further attempts will be made to construct a financial plan for the program. Lynn Gilbertson also asked if the program could keep the revenue generated by the clinic services it offered, and Interim Dean Fox said she would inquire.

- 6) **Final Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
  - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
  - **The program's next full self-study will be due to the College Deans on October 1, 2022 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2022.**

- 7) Adjourn at 1:05 pm

*Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).*

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies  
Graduate Programs, 2019-2020  
Communication Sciences and Disorders (MS)**

Date of Evaluation 11/25/2019 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Program: Communication Sciences and Disorders (MS) Major  Minor

**Evaluations submitted by:** David Wachanga, Catherine Chan, Christine Neddenriep, Andy Yu, Matthew Vick,  
 Pavan Chennamaneni

**Review meeting attended by:** David Wachanga, Catherine Chan, Christine Neddenriep, Andy Yu, Matthew Vick,  
 and Pavan Chennamaneni

**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	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for I.A.1**

Please do use the full names for all of the abbreviations.

**2. The program supports other undergraduate and graduate programs offered at UW-W (if relevant).**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**No Comments for I.A.2**

**3. The program works to support at least two goals from the institution's Inclusive Excellence Guidelines.**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for I.A.3**

**4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review report; Progress Reports have been included (if relevant).**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for I.A.4**

I commend the program's efforts in addressing all the recommended actions from the last Audit and Review. Lots have been accomplished!

The report details changes made and an intention review process of data; however, no attachments are provided in support of these processes and efforts.

Regarding staffing, your report showed great information about your staffing status. Please say more about the reason why you could not fill the tenure-track positions since you have adjusted resources from under to graduate programs. What can college or university do to help?

The mission and vision statements connect nicely to UWW and COEPS. Note: LEAP is an undergraduate initiative at UWW (perhaps these goals came from the undergraduate program???) The program's listed 3 goals appear to be program goals but are not phrased as Student Learning Outcomes. GPAs are not very reliable in terms of evaluating program goals as they include many other factors and are not tied directly to specific goals that lead to actionable assessment data.

**No General Comments related to Section I.A**

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

**1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program and aligns with the mission of the School of Graduate Studies.**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for I.B.1**

**2. The program established and worked to accomplish goals designed to improve the quality of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for I.B.2**

You had the renewal of accreditation and should show it here not later.

Recruitment and Retention of Faculty/staff has been a challenge and seems to still be

**3. The program has a process for setting and evaluating progress on achieving program-level goals, and making decisions about program changes based on assessment data.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for I.B.3**

You can show some data, such as survey data or interviews, to demonstrate how program changes reflected that possible trend or feedback.

The process is described well. Could an example have been uploaded to provide evidence?

**4. The program is considering potential revisions to the mission, goals, or objectives (i.e., the program has a “vision” for the next level and how to get there).**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for I.B.4**

**5. The program achieved and/or earned special recognition or awards during the review period.**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for I.B.5**

These awards were fantastic! Highly recommendable.

**6. The program earned (or retained) specialized accreditation (if applicable) during the review period.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments for I.B.6**

Kudos to the program for maintaining accreditation since 1983.

**No General Comments related to Section I.B**

**II. Assessment: A. Curriculum & the Assessment of Students' Learning**

**1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, complete with a capstone experience.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for II.A.1**

Curriculum is somewhat unevenly distributed across semesters with the first semester being especially "heavy" (15 credits) and subsequent semesters including 9 or fewer hours.

An overview was not provided, but the attachment painted a picture.

**2. Expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students in dual-listed courses.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments for II.A.2**

Shouldn't dual-listed courses that are only offered at the graduate or undergraduate level be removed from the curriculum and offered as separate courses if they are not being offered as a dual-listed course?

The program should have explained the differences in this answer and not just attached the syllabi. Many of these courses require 2 SimuCase assignments... can students "get away" only doing 2 and getting credit in all 5 dual listed courses? 483/683 only requires completing two SimuCase assignments for graduate credit; others include literature reviews and content that is more extensive. 355/555 requirements are very vague...

**3. Changes to the curriculum were based on assessment data.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for II.A.3**

How did the changes in the curriculum meet the objectives of increasing the percentage of PhD faculty teaching the courses and in increasing the range of clinical experiences required by students?

The changes are well documented but how assessment data (rather than accreditation requirements) was used is not fully clear.

**4. The program offers additional opportunities for students, and students make use of these in ways that impact the University, community, and/or region.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for II.A.4**

How has student involvement in these activities impacted the University, community, and/or region?

Your internship or CSD services already achieved this goal. You can say more about it. Just a comment, not a question.

With such an intense program, the opportunities stated are sufficient.

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	

**Comments for II.A.5**

Apart from including the chair as an instructor to provide support and serve as a resource to adjunct instructors, are there additional - perhaps online resources/support the program can provide? Perhaps the LTC or other ComDis programs that offer online instructions can provide some recommendations.

**No General Comments related to Section II.A**

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

**1. The program has clearly articulated learning performance outcomes for students, which are "mapped" to the curriculum.**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for II.B.1**

Great work!

**2. The program has an Assessment Plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the learning outcomes.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for II.B.2**

A variety of measures included.

---

Besides assessing students for their required minimum abilities, how could some program level assessment be done to work on continuously improving student learning in the program?

**3. Research/scholarly activity, as defined by the program, is incorporated in the achievement of student learning outcomes.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1

**Comments for II.B.3**

Are students taught to use single case design research methods to evaluate the effects of their intervention implementation?

---

You mentioned, "Actually "doing" research culminating in a "product" is not an expectation of our graduate program." However, you said "Scientific and research fundamentals for the profession including evidence-based practice are introduced and assessed in COMDIS 701: Introduction to Graduate Studies." Your program obviously is a very research- and science-based program so I am afraid your thoughts are conflicting here. Please provide your research outcomes and justify how your program used these results to help students.

---

The program's definition of research is fine; students don't have to learn to do academic research.

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for II.B.4**

Congratulations to the program for impressive student performance (e.g., 100% pass rate for PRAXIS and employment after graduation). Does the program have any plan to improve on the item - the Birth-3 and medical placement - that students consistently see opportunities for improvement?

---

Aggregate scores are provided-- range? Standard deviation? Individual scores? What are you learning from your PRAXIS II exam results? What are you learning from the portfolio evaluations?



This assessment data is important for students to meet licensure requirements. Program assessment can also be about improving the learning experience for diverse students and may not always need to relate to standardized tests or employment.

**5. The program has developed a process for using assessment data in making changes to students' learning outcomes.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for II.B.5**

What specific changes have you made to the program as a result of the assessment data you collected?

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for II.B.6**

**No General Comments related to Section II.B**

**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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for III.A.1-2**

**3. Composition of students reflects the diversity of the University, and the program has developed methods of recruiting and retaining students and to enhance diversity among students in the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for III.A.3**

If the program would like to expand the characteristics of students they would consider during the application review process, perhaps including additional prompting questions that help reveal diverse/unique attributes of applicants will be useful.

I appreciate your efforts to diversify your cohorts. How are you increasing diversity with regard to gender?

**4. Graduation rates indicate that students complete the program in a timely manner.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for III.A.4**

**5. Program level has provided evidence to support its claim of being oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level.**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for III.A.5**

While the program is satisfied with its enrollment, a staffing request plan could be submitted to accept more students. Local superintendents have requested more licensed speech and language pathologists.

**No General Comments related to Section III.A**

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates**

**1. Graduates of the program find employment or continue their education.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for III.B.1**

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for III.B.2**

**3. The program differentiates the data between those graduates seeking full-time employment upon graduation and those graduates of the program who are already employed and may be seeking career enrichment opportunities, promotions, new job responsibilities, etc., upon the attainment of the degree.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
N/A	6

**Comments for III.B.3**

**4. The program effectively tracks graduates of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for III.B.4**

Could track the graduates in a more intentional way.

---

LinkedIn would be another way. If your college has a career office or similar office/person to do this job, that would be helpful too. Would UWW alumni office provide some helpful information? I trust building this post-learning relationship would be important for your dept. once you need help.

**No General Comments related to Section III.B**

**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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for III.C.1**

The report states "Getting into a graduate program in our discipline is very competitive, so the actual competitive edge may not really be relevant." I humbly disagree. This basically implies this program is riding on the market demand. How about the demand down? Knowing your own strengths would be helpful to map with external opportunities and defend threats. Since the report says, "Additionally, our academic instructors have a wealth of clinical experience to support application of research and theory," then, please provide research outcomes to strengthen your competitive advantages of this program. Please also provide the information of competing programs and compare/contrast to show the competitiveness of this program. This is competitive intelligence.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Graduate Faculty Characteristics**

**1. Characteristics of the faculty (e.g., gender, ethnicity, rank, percentage of time devoted to the program and course responsibilities) are clearly indicated.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for IV.A.1**

Gender and ethnicity not included.

The instructors asked for ethnicity data.

**2. Expectations, preparation, and work experience of the graduate faculty are conducive to the effective delivery of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for IV.A.2**

What percentage of courses are now taught by faculty with doctoral degrees?

**3. The program has identified how changes in the composition of the graduate faculty have affected the program (if relevant).**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments for IV.A.3**

Definite challenges with staffing. Asking nontenured track faculty to teach overloads puts them at a disadvantage for earning tenure.

**4. The program has identified staffing needs and pending changes that may affect the delivery of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

No Comments for IV.A.4

No General Comments related to Section IV.A

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement**

**1-2. Graduate faculty engage in activities to enhance teaching, advising, involvement in course or curricular revision, new course development, etc.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for IV.B.1-2**

Please list those (non-tenure track) staff members too since the question is about "the faculty and teaching staff engaged in to enhance their teaching and academic advising." Also, what were the staff members' uses of professional development funds to enhance teaching or advising activities?

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities**

**1-2. Graduate faculty engage in scholarly/creative activity in ways that support or advance the graduate program.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for IV.C.1-2**

How would these research outcomes support or advance this program?

---

Strong evidence of active scholarship

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding**

**1-2. Graduate faculty pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts in ways that support or advance the graduate program.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for IV.D.1-2**

Impressive grant activity.

Great job! This program has a very strong grant performance worthy of recognition.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service**

**1-2. Graduate faculty engage in professional and public service in ways that benefit internal and external constituencies.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for IV.E.1-2**

All faculty and staff are engaged in service through scholarly organizations or through local service.

**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 graduate student population.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for IV.F.1**

It is not the fault of the program but it is clear that staffing and overall resource levels impose challenges on almost all areas of work in this program. The program is encouraged to continue to work in conjunction with the Dean and other administrative leaders to map out the long-term plan, including staff and resource allocation, for the program. Needs are evident!

The program could have laid out a plan for growth (with such strong demand) and what faculty staffing would have been required.

**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	5
---------------------	---

Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited	0

**Comments for IV.G.1**

It is not the fault of the program but it is clear that having sufficient resource, including space and equipment, is a challenge for the program. The program is encouraged to continue to work in conjunction with the Dean and other administrative leaders to map out a long-term resource allocation plan for the program.

Evident needs!

**V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program**

**1. Program strengths are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for V.1**

The program has accomplished a lot despite challenges in staffing and other resources. I assume the following is a type but as a reminder, SOAS is only administered to graduating undergraduate students; Graduate Outcomes Assessment Survey (GOAS) is the survey for graduate students - data from this survey are available from the Office of Graduate Studies.

The final statement could offer what the staffing plan and resources needed for growth are.

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for V.2**

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**No Comments for V.3**

**No General Comments related to Section V**

**VI. Reviewer Conclusions**

**1. Strengths of the Program**

Continuous accreditation. Efficient delivery of program needs despite challenges in staffing and resources levels.  
Great outcomes of graduates.

High quality program with strong demand; strong students; dedicated faculty; quality field and clinic experiences;  
increased diversity within cohort.

This program is held to very high standards by its accrediting body. It has managed a time of large staff/faculty  
turn over well. It provides a critical service to serve people with speech and other disorders.

**2. Areas for Work or Improvement**

Staffing needs to be increased/stabilized for sustainability of the program - this is not the fault of the program.  
Securing additional space and resources to address equipment needs.

The program provided little data to demonstrate student outcomes beyond aggregated averages. Additional data that  
is referenced as being collected (exit survey, portfolio evaluations, Graduate Student Outcome Survey  
Data, employers' survey) should be analyzed, included, and used to support changes in the program.

Substantial needs for faculty hiring/retention, facilities, and competitive salaries for faculty,  
Program assessment should consider how to improve learning beyond those minimums for all students (such as  
increasing diversity or increasing the number of graduating taking positions in hard to fill areas).

**3. Recommended Actions**

Engage in discussions with the Dean and other administrative leaders as necessary to agree on an immediate and  
longer-term plan for the program so that allocation/procurement of the following resources can be  
addressed: -- Staffing (tenure-track faculty) -- Space (classroom, research & clinic spaces; areas for  
students) -- Equipment (to support teaching and research)

To consider working with Campus Controller (Todd Carothers) so he can develop a financial plan of how those  
resources could be provided with specific levels of additional students admitted.

**4. Final Result: *Continuation with minor concerns***

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	
<b>Continuation with minor concerns</b>	<b>X</b>
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress reports to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress in addressing the major concerns	
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	

**The program's next full self-study will be due to the College Deans on October 1, 2022 and to the Assessment  
Office on November 1, 2022.**